

Wednesday, 28th 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 Government 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.

Wednesday, the 28th February, 1923.

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

BILL LAID ON THE TABLE.

The SECRETARY OF THE COUNCIL: Sir, in accordance with rule 25 of the Indian Legislative Rules I lay on the table a copy of the Bill to amend the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922, which was passed by the Legislative Assembly at its meeting held on the 27th February 1923.

CONFERENCE RE REGULATIONS UNDER THE ELECTORAL RULES.

The HONOURABLE DR. MIAN SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI (Law Member): Sir, with your permission I should like to make an announcement to the House. I desire to state for the information of Honourable Members that a Conference of provincial representatives has been summoned by the Government of India to consider the regulations made under the Electoral Rules. The Conference will begin its meetings on the 7th proximo. As Honourable Members are aware, the power to make regulations under the rules is vested in Local Governments. Some Honourable Members may, however, be interested in the subject and they may wish to make suggestions for the amendment of the regulations. Any such suggestion may be made preferably in writing addressed to Mr. Hammond, c/o Home Department.

The HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI (United Provinces East: Muhammadan): May I know, Sir, whether the provincial representatives that are coming to Delhi will work in conjunction with the Committee that was appointed by the Government of India in September last to propose the necessary amendments and modifications in the Electoral Rules?

The HONOURABLE DR. MIAN SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI: This Conference, I believe, has been arranged in connection with that Resolution.

RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF INDIANS TO THE TRAFFIC INSPECTOR CADRE.

The HONOURABLE RAI BAHADUR LALA RAM SARAN DAS (Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to move the following Resolution:

"This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that a reasonable proportion be fixed for Indians in the cadre of Traffic Inspectors in the Transportation Branch of each State Railway in India."

Sir, one of the oldest aspirations of Indians under British Rule has been to obtain a large share in the public administration of India. From

[Rai Bahadur Lala Ram Saran Dac.]

the time of Raja Ram Mohon Roy we have been insisting that in the recruitment of services there should be no distinction of caste, creed or colour. From the very beginning of our agitation in this matter the Government have, in theory at least, recognized the justice of our claims. From 1833 onwards right up to the present moment the declared policy of Government is not to import racial distinction into the question of recruitment of services.

I will to-day, Sir, not take the wider question of the employment of Indians in all the public services, but will only confine myself to one Department, *viz.*, the Traffic Department of the State Railways in India. In the superior Traffic establishment there are 11 District Superintendents in Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway (of whom only 3 are Indians), 18 District Traffic Superintendents on Eastern Bengal Railway (with only 3 Indians) and 27 on the North-Western Railway (of whom there are only 2 Indians). When we come to the cadre of Assistant Traffic Superintendents we find we have 16 on the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway (9 Indians, *i.e.*, 56.25 per cent.), 23 on Eastern Bengal State Railway (9 Indians, *i.e.*, 39 per cent.) and 44 on North-Western Railway (17 Indians, *i.e.*, 38.6 per cent.).

As far as the superior service in the Traffic Department is concerned, we have 43 Indians out of the total cadre of 139 or say about 31 per cent. So there is now no reason for complaint. In the Permanent-Way Inspector on North-Western Railway the figures are distinctly better, as Indians hold 29 out of 65 posts, but when we come to the subordinate Traffic service, the Indians fare very badly. In the North-Western Railway including the Kalka-Simla Railway there are, I understand excluding the Office Clerks, 261 posts carrying a salary of Rs. 250 and over. Out of these 261 posts only 25 are held by Indians (*i.e.*, only about 9.6 per cent.). Sir, such a very low proportion in this branch of service requires an explanation at the hands of Government. If we take the case of Traffic Inspectors alone in the North-Western Railway we find that there are 44 posts of Traffic Inspectors in the Transportation Branch of which there is one permanent and two officiating Indians, and 7 in the Commercial Branch out of which not a single one is an Indian. This means 5.8 per cent. On the Eastern Bengal Railway there are 21 Traffic Inspectors (Transportation) of which 2 are Indians, *i.e.*, 10.5 per cent., whereas of the 18 Commercial Traffic Inspectors there are 8 Indians or a percentage of 44.5.

On the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway there are 23 posts of Traffic Inspectors in the Transportation Branch, out of which 11 are Indians. The same Railway has 16 Commercial Traffic Inspectors of whom 15 are Indians and in both cases all of them are holding permanent appointments. The number of Traffic Inspectors (Transportation) drawing a salary of Rs. 250 and over is 17 of whom 7 are Indians.

On the North-Western Railway the first Indian Traffic Inspector, Transportation, was appointed in 1903 and on agitation the second one in 1921 and the third, in 1922. Thus the House will see that during this period of long 18 years (1903 to 1921) no Indian was promoted or recruited. If the usual answer is given that no suitable and competent man was available, I ask the Government how did the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway find the right sort of men. Where there is a will there is a way. But may I ask, Sir, what is the test a man is called upon to show or is it the discretion of the local officers? Is efficiency to depend on the sympathetic

nature or otherwise of a local officer, or is to depend on some practicable tests of the abilities of the man concerned?

Sir, people can no longer remain satisfied with the use of discretionary power, they want something definite and substantial. We would have no complaint if such appointments were filled or promotions made on results of examination, competitive or otherwise. Sir, we want fair field and no favour. We only want justice—we feel, Sir, that the just claims of Indians in the Subordinate Traffic Department of State Railways are under the present system not at all safeguarded. Let there be efficiency bar fixed which should be crossed as a result of examinations. Even if it is held that efficient men are not found on the North-Western Railway fit for promotion, the authorities concerned are to blame. On this line European, Anglo-Indian and Parsi Assistant Station Masters start on Rs. 250, while the Indian Station Masters after a life-long service seldom reach up to that grade, or even rise to Rs. 200. How can one expect Indians of good education and strong common sense to join the Traffic Department? There are 180 posts of Assistant Station Masters carrying a salary of Rs. 250 to Rs. 300, 25 posts—Rs. 320 to Rs. 350, 16—Rs. 360 to Rs. 400 and 10—Rs. 425 to Rs. 500. On these posts there are 6 Parsis in the grade of Rs. 250 to Rs. 300, one Parsi in the grade of Rs. 360 to Rs. 400 and one Muslim drawing Rs. 350 and there is none in the highest grade. In the Traffic Department particularly in the posts of Traffic Inspectors there is a block, which should be removed. I therefore urge the Government to fix a reasonable minimum proportion of Indians among the Traffic Inspectors. I purposely refrain from suggesting at this moment what this initial percentage should be. Let this proportion be like that in the Indian Civil Service increased every year at a fixed rate. The Public Services Commission recommended that except the Royal Engineer Officers the rest of the Traffic Officers should gradually be recruited from Statutory natives of India and I should have at least 50 per cent. of the vacancies in State Railways. However I leave the matter of fixing the exact minimum percentage to the Government after consulting the Railway Council. With these observations I commend this Resolution to this Honourable House.

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK (Commerce Secretary): Sir, this Resolution refers to one grade in the Railway service, and I freely admit that the Honourable Rai Bahadur has clothed it in an air of sweet reasonableness. He advanced the principle, in support of his Resolution, of the gradual Indianization of the different services, and he has asked not for 50 or 20 or 30 per cent., but has left it entirely to the discretion apparently of the Government and the Railway Administrations. Yet, at the same time, Sir, I think I can put some considerations before the House which show that it is not possible to accept the Resolution even when it is clothed in that manner. What are these Traffic Inspectors in Transportation grade? That is the highest grade of the subordinate service. Above them are the Assistant Traffic Superintendents, which is the lowest grade of the Superior service, dealing chiefly with direction and control. The Resolution of my Honourable friend asks us to accept some arbitrary percentage based entirely on the fact that a certain number in the highest grade of the subordinate service should be recruited in a particular manner. My Honourable friend has cited the authority of the Public Services Commission. That undoubtedly recommended the further Indianization of the different services in the Railway Administration. It dealt however with the superior branches, and the figures which my Honourable friend cited

[Mr. D. T. Chadwick.]

show that in the superior branches Indianization is being carried out. We have evidences every day of the good will of the Government to carry out the Indianization of the services in the various branches. But the Public Services Commission took the superior services and others with which it dealt by branches. If they had done anything else, I do not think their recommendations would have commended themselves to the common sense of this House or to the country. They did not say that a certain percentage in every grade should be so and so and so and so. They recommended that we should work up ultimately to a particular percentage for a branch as a whole. Now, Sir, in any organized business or undertaking, promotion from one grade to another must be based very largely upon selection so as to give openings to men who seem to be capable and also upon seniority so as to give a reward for their long and faithful services. To select the highest grade of any branch and to say definitely that so many must be recruited on another plan and for another reason will, it seems to me, most likely lead to discontent in any service, and, Sir, discontent leads to waste and inefficiency; especially is this the case in concerns like the Railways which are to be judged mainly by their commercial results. Therefore, Sir, on the general principle, it is objectionable to allocate a certain number of posts in any grade to a particular caste, race, community or creed, and it is still more objectionable when you restrict that to the highest grade of all.

Now, Sir, I look for a moment to the duties of these Traffic Inspectors in the Transportation Branch, and what are they? I have got here the instructions that are generally given to them. They are supposed to devote, at any rate they are expected to devote, a large part of their time to outdoor work, the inspection of all the stations, station yards, cabins, gates and theoretically once a quarter make a very thorough inspection of the stations and their working in every detail. They have to examine all the train reports, muster rolls, log books, they are responsible for seeing that signal men know their duties and they have to test them. They have to look to the condition of the traffic, weighing machines, test them, they have to examine the loading of trains, look into fares, rates and trade conditions. They have to bring to the notice of the superior staff any irregularities on the part of guards and station masters. All matters involving the safety of the public and their comforts, and the safety of their property, must receive their immediate attention. They have to watch and test all traffic working in their section and report any inefficiency or irregularity to the higher officials. When any new rules or methods are introduced, they are responsible to see that the station staff thoroughly understand them. They have to be ready to proceed without delay to the scene of any accident or obstruction and, in the absence of any superior officer, or until he arrives, they have to take charge and be responsible for safe working at the scene of action, the clearing of the line and the prompt resumption of traffic. There are many other duties but those give a bird's-eye view of them. It is obvious that they are very wide and very responsible. If I may say so, these men are the eyes and the ears of the superior staff. They are the N. C. O.'s, if you like, of the railway administration. Now, Sir, it is necessary to select for your N. C. O.'s and for men with duties of that nature those who have had considerable experience as station masters and guards on the railway and whose personal qualifications lead their superiors to think them fitted for it. We are proceeding with the Indianization of the superior service. It is no kindness, Sir, I submit to our new Assistant Traffic Superin-

tendents to give them as their N. C. O.'s men who have been selected upon any other grounds than those which I have stated. My Honourable friend has shown that a considerable number of Indians are being taken into the superior service of the Traffic Branch. It is only fair to them to give them as their chief lieutenants men of experience because it is from them that they must learn much of their work. It is only fair to them to give them as good men as the railway administration can provide. It is only fair to the general public and to the State, which has such a large commercial stake in the railways. Therefore, Sir, the appointments to these particular grades should be, I submit, solely in the hands, or mainly in the hands, of the administrations of the railways. Our administrations carry a heavy burden. They have responsibilities to the State, responsibilities to the general public, and we have to trust the administrations to select for this very important subordinate grade—I am only speaking about one grade—men whom they consider the best fitted for it. The avenue of approach to that grade cannot be by direct recruitment, as, obviously, from the duties which I have detailed, it requires experience of the railways and the working of the railways, particularly of the local railways. The avenue of approach must be by promotion from the lower grades. It will inevitably happen that increase in the Traffic Inspectors of a number of any community or caste will depend upon increase in the numbers of that community in the lower grades. That has happened in every service of which we have had experience. Not so many years ago, in the top grade of our Deputy Inspectors in Madras there were many who were not Indians. To-day every one of them is an Indian. Really and mainly owing to the fact that more Indians came in in the lower grades, so that now they have monopolised the whole of the first division. So, Sir, I submit it is generally administratively wrong to reserve a certain number of posts in this top grade for any particular caste. It is generally wrong, it is actually unkind to the young Indians whom we have taken in as Assistant Traffic Superintendents to give them anybody except the best that the line can provide. Thus, while the Government is unable to accept any such fixed proportion, at the same time we are perfectly prepared and ready to intimate to the railway authorities that they must give a chance to the Indian for promotion to this grade wherever they consider him fit. While we cannot reserve posts in this grade for particular people yet at the same time we cannot tolerate that any should be debarred therefrom by extraneous personal accidents. The experience and the personal qualities of the men must be the only point that must be considered in the promotion of these lower subordinates into the upper grades. My Honourable friend has shown from his own figures that in the staff of the railways there has already been a large increase of Indians employed in this grade. That is probably very largely due to the fact that there is a much larger proportion of Indians amongst station masters and guards. I hope I have placed some reasons before the House to think that even a restricted Resolution of this nature is inadvisable to put into operation; that the Government is not opposed to the general Indianization of the services; that we are anxious to see more and more of them employed. But at the same time we do not think it is fair to the Agents and to the Administrations of our important railways to cripple them or hamper them by laying down a fixed and arbitrary proportion of the N. C. O.'s that must be selected from any particular community or class.

The HONOURABLE MR. V. G. KALE (Bombay: Non-Muhammadan):
Sir, I intervene in this debate because I expected Government to make a

[Mr. V. G. Kale.]

clear pronouncement as to what practical policy they have been pursuing in connection with the Indianisation of the superior services, both in the State and the Company-managed Railways.

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: Might I rise to a point of order, Sir? The Resolution does not refer to the superior services, which begin at the Assistant Traffic Superintendent's Branch, but it refers I think to the Traffic Inspectors and the Transportation Branch which is one particular grade of the inferior services. I avoided that question: I thought it was out of order, Sir.

The HONOURABLE MR. V. G. KALE: If my Honourable friend had waited and allowed me to proceed, I think he would have seen what I was driving at. At this time last year, I moved a Resolution in this House and the Honourable Mr. Innes, on behalf of Government, gave an assurance that he would look into this question and that he would see to it that the Railway Companies did come into line with Government in the matter of the Indianisation of the Services. At the same time, he gave an assurance that he would make personal inquiries into the facilities which are available to Indians for training themselves for the various offices under the Railways. I must say, Sir, that I was disappointed with the remarks of my Honourable friend opposite. He was speaking of the Non-Commissioned Officers in the railway services. Probably, he was not conscious of the meaning that has recently been attached to N. C. O.'s and I am afraid that these officers on the railways have really become N. C. O.'s in the matter of Indians who do not get their proper opportunities and proper chances in the railway services. He gave us a long list of the duties that are to be performed by these officers. No one denies that these duties are very important and responsible. But what has that to do with the question under discussion? What the Resolution asks is simply this, that a reasonable proportion should be fixed for Indians in the cadre of Traffic Inspectors in the Transportation Branch. I do not see what difficulty there is in the path of Government to fixing a certain proportion and working up gradually. I think that is the only way in which Government can proceed. Government has always stated that their policy is the policy of Indianisation. Now, how is that policy being carried out and how is it going to be carried out? That is the whole question. There is no difference of opinion between Government and the public now with respect to the general policy of gradual Indianisation, as we have been repeatedly told. But the question arises how that Indianisation is going to be effected. Here is a practical suggestion which has been thrown out by the Honourable Mover of the Resolution. When a practical suggestion is, however, made, Government turns round and says, "No, this is impracticable." I want Government to tell me what is practicable. I want Government to tell me what they are themselves actually doing in this matter. I can understand that unless there is a large number of Indians from whom the promotions can be made, the policy is not practicable. But I want to know what Government is actually doing in that connection and what facilities for training and what opportunities are being given. If we are satisfied that Government is doing its level best in this connection, providing facilities and making promotions from among the Indians available, I do not think that there will be any ground for complaint. But there is no evidence produced to prove that. Then, it has been said that it is not possible for Government to fetter the discretion of the Railway authorities. But I think it was only last year that the Government gave an assurance

that they would draw the attention of the Railway authorities of even the Company-managed Railways to this problem of Indianisation and that they would try to see that these Company-managed Railways came in a line with the State-managed Railways. Some information on this point was expected, but I am sorry to find that such information has not been forthcoming. I quite agree that unless a man has qualifications, unless a man is fit for the performance of these very responsible duties, he cannot be appointed or he cannot be promoted. But it is due to this House that it should be told by Government whether they are actually giving effect to their own declared policy and whether proper and adequate facilities are being given to Indians in order that they might qualify themselves. My Honourable friend said that the Honourable the Mover's Resolution was asking something for a particular caste or castes. The question of caste was not, however, raised at all. It was a question of Indianisation, pure and simple. Whatever community or whatever caste among the Indians a man might belong to, what is required is that Indians ought to be given opportunities. It is contended that posts cannot be reserved. I might ask, how is it that at the present moment certain posts seem to be actually reserved for certain people? If there is no reservation, how is it that Indians have not been appointed in larger numbers? Practically the higher posts, which are the posts referred to in this Resolution, are a monopoly of a particular small class or section of the general population of the country. There seems to be then some kind of reservation. There appears to be some kind of monopoly. It is the breaking of this monopoly that we want and it is the opportunities for rising to the higher posts that is asked for in this Resolution. I think Government might see their way to accept the Resolution because there is a concrete proposal contained in the Resolution. What Government always wants is concrete proposals and deprecates general propositions. Here is a concrete proposal which has been made and there is no difference of opinion between Government and the public with regard to the general policy of Indianisation. I do not see any other way of moving the Government to give effect to its own policy. With these words, Sir, I strongly support the Resolution.

The HONOURABLE COLONEL SIR UMAR HAYAT KHAN (West Punjab : Muhammadan): Sir, I am going to say something which happened behind the scenes. Before this Resolution was being moved one of my friends came to the Mover of the Resolution and said "Why don't you fix a proportion?" to which he replied that if he fixed a proportion, it would be difficult for the Government to accede to the Resolution. When I saw that, I thought nobody would disagree to a Resolution like that and I was practically certain that such a Resolution, so worded, would be accepted, but I was amazed when I heard that even such a Resolution was not admitted. Then, Sir, in the Punjab at any rate, what I have seen is that people belonging to the domiciled community, and the Eurasians, have monopolised the whole of the Railway services. I think they are just as much Indian as anybody else, and I am quite willing that they should get these posts. But the thing that one objects to is that they should monopolise these posts. Their numbers and the numbers of others should be taken into consideration and they should get the posts according to proportion. Even that, it may be said, is too much, but I think the Mover of the Resolution was ready to come down to the very minimum, the very lowest number. Even that was not taken as sufficient by the Government. Details have been put before us about the respective numbers and very few out of them are Indians. It is sufficiently bad, I think.

[Colonel Sir Umar Hayat Khan.]

They (the Indians) all see the thing through and naturally there is discontent. We were told just before this that if we fix a proportion there will be discontent, but I think there will be far more discontent when they hear what their numbers are and how they are being treated and when such a Resolution is brought to remedy it, it is thrown out. Of course some arguments have been put forward on the other side, but the general public outside will say that they are not given what was asked for and that all this is a sort of lame excuse. Then, Sir, it has been said that on the Company Railways there are many Indians. I think that these Indians are taken there because they take less emoluments, they do just as good work and these Companies are clever who employ them. They want to get good staff on small pay. That is perhaps why they are taken there. Then, Sir, when Assistant Traffic Superintendents and District Traffic Superintendents are Indians and do good work, why can't they do so at a lower rung? It is known to the House and to everybody in the country that the production of B.A.'s and M.A.'s is far in excess of what the Government can supply with employment. It is known that there is discontent. If B.A.'s and M.A.'s, well-educated, cannot get these posts, and men who are far inferior to them get them, I think they have some cause for it, and it is for this that we want more posts in the Railways so as to employ these men. With these remarks, Sir, I strongly support the Resolution and if it is thrown out by the Government, I hope that every Indian who wants to be true to his people will carry it by his vote.

The HONOURABLE MR. PURSHOTAMDAS THAKURDAS (Bombay: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, this Resolution is one of those which we used to call a hardy annual at the Councils before the year 1920. The demand of the Provincial Councils and I daresay of the Imperial Council also before that year for Indianisation was more or less insistent and continuous, but I should not be surprised if after the Reformed Councils were started, Resolutions of this nature were brought before the Legislatures at the headquarters more often than even once a year. In fact, Sir, the necessity of employing Indian agency in all branches of administration in India has been recognised by the British Parliament ever since the year 1833. We are now in the year of Grace 1923, which practically makes it 90 years since the claims of Indians to Government service in India were recognised and were publicly announced. I must confess that in spite of all that has been said both by Government and by public opinion outside on this score, the reply of my Honourable friend, the Secretary for Commerce, to this Resolution, which I look upon as a very very modest one indeed, rather disappointed me. I do not think the Honourable Mr. Chadwick said much that would convince this House as to why Indians were not appointed in larger numbers till now on the railways of India, railways which are run with the tax-payer's money and railways which are financed by the tax-payer. Particularly has the Indian got a claim on the State railways for which between the Government and the railway administration there is nothing of what is called a buffer. I could have understood and I fully realise my Honourable friend the Rai Bahadur's anxiety not to include company railways, for, I suppose he suspected that in that case the Resolution might very easily have been met by Government in opposition by saying that they had no adequate control over the administration of company railways. But I at any rate have not been able to perceive anything in what the Honourable Mr. Chadwick said regarding the incapacity

of Indians to qualify themselves for these particular posts. Sir, successive Secretaries of State and prominent British statesmen in the past have reiterated the necessity and the desirability of having Indians in the administration of the Government of India. The most prominent and perhaps the one who has put the case in a nutshell was Lord Lytton. He said if the large fund of capacity of Indians to qualify themselves for the various posts was not properly utilised for employment in the higher grades of the service, "the fault was ours for moving in a vicious circle. We do not employ natives more largely because they are not well qualified and they are not well qualified because we do not employ enough of them." This is the vicious circle in which I am afraid many Government officials who have to reply to Resolutions like the one we are discussing at present have to move. I was hoping that the Honourable Mr. Chadwick would perhaps strike out another line of argument or rather conciliation and hold out hopes to the satisfaction of the Honourable Mover of this Resolution as to what Government proposed to do hereafter. I am still hoping that some other Member from the Benches opposite may be able to supplement what the Honourable Mr. Chadwick had to say. For I cannot help thinking that the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend is, to say the least of it, a most modest one. The Honourable speaker who preceded me told the Council that he was going to tell them something that happened behind the scenes. I do not have the privilege of having had such opportunities, but I look at it from the point of view of the Indian public as it has been treated by the Government till now. The demand of the Indian public all through has been that rather unsweet word 'Indianisation of the services.' What they say is: Indians have the first claim on the various services under Government for several reasons; some of them being that they are sons of the soil, that they can give the cheapest agency required for the purpose and that they are not of that class which will leave the country at a certain age or after a certain period of time and therefore, an Indian's experience is not lost to the country. These are three main grounds on which this claim has been based. The Honourable Rai Bahadur says that Government should be pleased to fix a certain percentage. I am sure he would have very much liked to have put before the House exactly what the demand of the Indian public is; but he wants some action immediately, he wants some action definitely and he wants to know exactly what Government propose as a reasonable proportion. I think, Sir, these are definite demands. I also feel that these are demands in which Government must take some action, and I was looking forward to the Honourable Mr. Chadwick saying exactly what the Government idea was. I feel, Sir, that the time when the Indian public could be satisfied or even this Council and the Legislature could be satisfied with vague promises of Government being able to do their best and so on is gone and past. What we now want is something definite, something that we can take count on and audit, as it were, next year or the following years and say to Government, "You promised this percentage. Where is it?" If after the existence of railways in India for 60 or 70 years the figures that have been put before the House by the Honourable Mover are correct, I think Government will admit that there has been a good deal of lee way that has to be made up by the railways of India and it is the duty of Government to see that that lee way is made up. I will only refer, Sir, to the way in which in the past opportunities for training of Indians were denied. I need only mention the instance of the College which was started in England in 1870 or 1873 for the purpose of training engineers for India in direct opposition to the wishes of the then Government of India because the Secretary of State thought fit to carry the scheme

[Mr. Purshotamdas Thakurdas.]

through. I am quite aware that thirty years later a similar college for training Indians was started in India; but if these are the opportunities lost to India I do not think Indians are wrong if they plead now that the lee way should be made up and that prompt and speedy action should be taken.

I see that the Honourable Mr. Chadwick has appealed to the Council not to handicap officials in the railways by compelling them to recruit on grounds not of pure merit but on grounds which he called racial. I fully agree with the Honourable Mr. Chadwick in his protest in the ordinary course of things and as a general rule. But I think the Government of India are bound to recognize the other side of the shield. Here are the railways that have been in existence for 70 years and here is the fact that at the end of 70 years in the superior ranks there is only a sprinkling of them—1 per cent. Is it the fault of the non-official? Is it the fault of the public of India? In fact, I would say, is it the fault of the Indian if he now loses patience and says "We will never be efficient in the eyes of the officials, perhaps for another quarter of a century. We now insist that a certain percentage should be laid down and carried through." It may not be what I would do in my business; it may not be what others would do in their businesses; but, Sir, in my business I would train men belonging to my family first; I would train my son or my nephew and so on first; I would train my friends' sons there after that and so on. Therefore, the parallel is not the same. I do hope that the Government will not treat this question as a racial question. It is a question of India having waited much too long to get justice from the powers that have been from time to time. It is no use now going back to this point. I think it is the duty of the Government now to begin with a clean slate and to take the Legislature into their confidence and say "We mean business and this is the pace at which we propose to go." This is the demand of the Resolution, modest as it is, for it leaves the fixing of the percentage absolutely to the discretion of the Government and I should have thought that Government would have been the first to accept the Resolution.

The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA (Bombay: Non-Muhamadan): Sir, I have only one or two remarks to make of course in support of the Resolution. As the previous speakers have said, the demand made by the Honourable Lala Ram Saran Das is indeed a very modest one. Let us examine wherein lies the difference between the demand made by him in the Resolution and the reply given by the Honourable Mr. Chadwick. The Honourable Mr. Chadwick does not for one moment deny that there is justification for bringing forward this Resolution. The Honourable Mr. Chadwick says that in the higher branches of the Railways Indians are employed in larger numbers; in the particular branch to which the Honourable Mover of the Resolution referred, he said he would ask the railway authorities to give full consideration to the request contained in the Resolution. He opposes the idea of a percentage on the ground that if a percentage is named the hands of the railway authorities will be fettered inasmuch as they may have to take up men who are not properly qualified. May I ask the Honourable Mr. Chadwick whether this argument did not prevail with the Government when they proclaimed that the different services will be gradually Indianized, and whether they did not fix percentages themselves for the purpose? Perhaps the Honourable Member

might reply that these percentages were fixed because the men were drawn from a class who had submitted themselves to certain examinations, etc. The case here is exactly a parallel one. Here too we do not ask that all and sundry should be appointed. Men will be trained and from them selections should be made of Indians to the appointment of Traffic Inspectors. The Honourable Mover has not fixed a percentage. He has left it to Government. He has not said that even a minimum percentage might come into operation immediately; he expects that it might come into operation gradually, and yet Government chooses to reply that they cannot accept such a proposal. All I can say is that the Government reply is most disheartening from the point of view of the Indian public.

The HONOURABLE MR. LALUBHAI SAMALDAS (Bombay: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to support the Resolution. When the Honourable Mr. Chadwick began in the usual way by saying that the Resolution was modest. I thought he was going to accept it. He has been for so short a time in the Government Benches that I thought that he had not learnt the art of coating a bitter pill with sugar, but I am sorry to say, Sir, that he has learnt the art. His attitude came as a surprise to all of us on this side of the House. He gave reasons which have been met by my Honourable friend Mr. Purshotamdas Thakurdas, but there is one reason, which was not met, and which I think must also be met. He said that young Indians appointed as Assistant Traffic Superintendents may not want these Indians who might turn out to be inefficient. May I ask him a question, Sir? Are these Assistant Traffic Superintendents ever consulted when making the appointments of Traffic Inspectors, and have they ever said that they don't want Indians and they would prefer to have Traffic Inspectors from other communities? Unless he can satisfy us on that score I think that argument cannot hold good. Then the other argument also that the Railway administration cannot find a sufficient number of suitable men cannot hold good. I am quite sure, Sir, that in all these years a sufficient number of Indians will have proved their capacity to come up to the highest grade. The only reason must be that, as my Honourable friend Mr. Purshotamdas said, the men at the top-wanted men of their own community, and naturally the rights of Indians were passed over. There is a very strong feeling in the country, Sir, that the rights of Indians are not properly considered in making appointments in the Railway Services, and I think the time has come when Government must declare a policy that they will at least accept a fixed percentage to be reserved for Indians. I hope, Sir, that the House will pass this Resolution.

The HONOURABLE LIEUTENANT RAO BAHADUR CHAUDHRI LAL CHAND (Punjab: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I think all Indian Members with the exception of those that are in the employ of the Government are with the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution. They are not with the Mover, simply because they have no other option but to side with the Honourable Mr. Chadwick. I must confess that I was quite ignorant of the responsibilities, duties and qualifications of these Traffic Inspectors until I saw one Inspector this morning. He was an Inspector in the Accounts Department. I asked him what were the duties of these Traffic Inspectors. He said that they had to look after the megal staff on Stations class A and B. They had to look to the cleanliness of these stations as well and were in fact highly paid jamadars. I asked him what their qualifications were. He said that

[Lieut. Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand.]

they had to pass 20 examinations, but they had to please certain officials and they got the job. I asked him, how many Indians there are in this service? He said that Indians are not eligible for these posts, because they are reserved for Europeans who are not qualified for any other service and who have to be provided for. The picture is, I believe, overdrawn, but that is the feeling that exists among the Indian employees on our Railways and Government ought to see their way to remove that feeling.

My friend the Honourable Colonel Sir Umar Hayat Khan referred to something that happened behind the *purdah*. Sir, nothing happened behind the *purdah*. It was I who approached the Honourable Mover this morning and accused him of being very timid and for bringing forward an over-modest request before this House. I have had a very bitter experience of vested interests owing to the absence of these percentages. In the Punjab we have been trying since 1914 to get the zemindars a due representation in the different branches of the Public services. We approached the Government with deputations and Resolutions, and Government in their anxiety to help us issued circular letters from time to time. The position was examined in 1918, and after five years, it was found that the position was just the same as it was in 1914. My experience is that these recommendatory circulars, these pious wishes, do not help. Indeed it is very difficult to divest people of their vested interests, and that is why I was pressing the Honourable Mover to fix a percentage. The Punjab Government had to do it. In 1919 they appointed a Committee and as a result of its recommendations they issued a Resolution that in all branches of the services under the Punjab Government zemindars should have so much share which was in some cases 66 per cent. and in others 50 per cent. I do not mean to say even that had had its full effect. Even the fixing of a percentage has failed to have the desired effect, and that is why I was asking the Honourable Mover to fix a percentage. The Resolution in its present form is over-modest, and my only surprise is that Government does not accept even this modest Resolution in its present form.

The Honourable Mr. Chadwick referred to the discontent that would follow if Government were to accept this Resolution in its present form. I think the discontent on the other side will be much greater than what he anticipates on the side of those who have got vested interests in the service. The majority of the Indians in these Councils and Assemblies under the Reforms will be no good if they are denied their due share in the different services of the State. I think, Sir, even now Government ought to see their way to accept this Resolution. With these few words, I support the Resolution brought forward by my Honourable friend Lala Ram Saran Das.

THE HONOURABLE DR. MIAN SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI (Law Member):
 Sir, I am sure the House will recognise that the Government of India have every sympathy, real sympathy, for the legitimate aspirations of Indians to take their proper place, to play their proper part in the public services of this country. As a result of the recommendations made by the Public Services Commission, Honourable Members are aware that Government have already arrived at various decisions with regard to almost all the departments of the Public Services in this country. To suppose that the Government are not actuated by the same liberal spirit of Indianising our public services in regard to the railway services is, I submit, really unreasonable. Indeed, the speech delivered by the Honourable Mover of the Resolution

has itself indicated that in the higher branches of the railway services something has already been done. Personally, I am aware of the dissatisfaction which exists among the subordinate ranks of our railway employees in regard to the absence of opportunities afforded to them to rise to the higher grades of the subordinate service, and I am sure that my Honourable friend and colleague, Mr. Innes, will take every reasonable step to remove that dissatisfaction. The real objection, as I understand it, to the Resolution put forward by my Honourable friend in the form in which it has been framed, is this, to fix a proportion in one grade of a service may really in its results be detrimental to the very object which my Honourable friend has in view. If my Honourable friend had sought to fix a reasonable proportion in all the grades of the subordinate service, the matter ^{is not} would have stood on an entirely different footing. But, even in regard to this grade, in order to meet my Honourable friend half-way, I suggest to him a modification in his Resolution, and, if my Honourable friend will accept this modification, I am sure the Honourable Mr. Chadwick would be prepared to accept the Resolution in that form.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: I must remind the Honourable Member that, if he wishes to move an amendment, it is the House and not the Honourable Member who can accept it.

The HONOURABLE DR. MIAN SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI: Well, Sir, I wanted to suggest to the Honourable Mover a modification in his Resolution and not to move an amendment myself.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The only method by which a modification in the Resolution can be brought before the House is by an amendment.

The HONOURABLE DR. MIAN SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI: In that case, I ask your permission to move this amendment.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Will the Honourable Member read me his amendment?

The HONOURABLE DR. MIAN SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI:

"That this Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that a larger number of Indians be employed in the cadre of Traffic Inspectors in the Transportation Branch of each State Railway in India than is the case at present."

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Will the Honourable Member hand it in at the table?

To the Resolution under discussion, amendment moved:

"That for the words 'a reasonable proportion be fixed for Indians' the words 'a larger number of Indians be employed' be substituted, and that the following words be added at the end of the Resolution: 'than is the case at present'."

The Resolution, if amended, will read as follows:

"That this Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that a larger number of Indians be employed in the cadre of Traffic Inspectors in the Transportation Branch of each State Railway in India than is the case at present."

That amendment and the Resolution are now open to the debate of the House.

The HONOURABLE MR. B. N. SARMA (Revenue and Agriculture Member): Sir, I ask the House to accept the amendment proposed by the Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi because I think it is more in consonance with the object which the Honourable Mover has in his mind as well as with the principle of action by which we should be guided in the determination of questions like this than the Resolution. I shall not deal now with the general question of Indianisation but content myself with asking as to whether in determining a proportion, although you may not fix a proportion with regard to the lower services, you may not be contravening the principles by which we should be guided in our present and future practice. There is a school of thought which deprecates the fixation of any proportion and I know that there is a tendency to struggle against that basis for two reasons: firstly, because it is opposed to the contention in some quarters that the principle ought to be that you ought to employ Indians, including therein the term "statutory Indians," wherever you can and wherever it may be possible to do so and that by fixing a proportion you will be contravening that principle. Secondly, there is the danger generally in this as well as in other matters that the minimum would tend to become a maximum. The wording of the Resolution, therefore, I think we may take exception to, on the ground that, if it be clearly dissected, the Indian community itself may find its interests jeopardised by putting forward a proposition of that description. (*Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas*: 'Why?') Why? Is it the desire of the House to say that it should be open to the Government to employ other than Indians in any certain proportion in the subordinate service? I take it—I am speaking not of the higher services but of the lower services with which we are dealing at present—I thought that the object which is being put forward is that, as far as possible in the lower services with which we are now dealing, the agency that should be employed should be Indian and it is only where Indian agency is not procurable that we should have to go to outside agency. Therefore, in saying that there should be a proportion which should be Indian, you are really jeopardising the interests which you are supposed to be safeguarding. I therefore think that the Resolution as it was originally worded would be detrimental to the interests of the community whose interests it is supposed to safeguard. But, apart from that, Sir, there is also the practical difficulty which those who have to face this problem in this as well as in other Departments are experiencing, and I think Honourable Members were rather hasty, if I may be permitted to say so, in thinking that the Honourable Mr. Chadwick was unduly conservative in raising objection to the proposition as tabled before the House. Now, these promotions whether in this Department or in other Departments have to be made from the senior men who are duly qualified for preferment, and assuming that we find that the senior men, well qualified for the purpose, happen owing to past policy to be men other than an Indian in the sense in which the term is perhaps employed here, would it be right for any administration to sacrifice the interests of those people, to overlook their claims, to penalise them, because they happen to belong to that particular community? That was the difficulty which confronted the Honourable Mr. Chadwick and not that the Commerce Department or the Government of India are in any way unsympathetic towards the aspirations of Indians. But in translating into practical action these suggestions they are confronted with this problem that they cannot sacrifice the interests, the vested interests of the people now in service, qualified for promotion, and they cannot be superseded by others simply because the latter happen to belong to a particular community whose interests perhaps have not been safeguarded

in the past as they might have been safeguarded. That is the real difficulty with which any administration is bound to be confronted, and that is the reason why the Honourable Mr. Chadwick has said, "It is true that we are for Indianisation, but it must be generally a slow process, it must come from below, and therefore I cannot promise any definite proportion, although we shall try our level best to increase the number of Indians duly qualified as far as possible in this particular branch." I take it also, Sir, that Honourable Members when they use the word "Indian" include the term "Anglo-Indian" also because I do not think it would be wise, safe, or expedient to draw any distinction between our Anglo-Indian brethren and other Indian communities in the matter of service. It may be that in some Departments one particular community may occupy a larger proportion than other communities—I am not justifying that it should be correctly so—but it may be that owing to various conditions of service, owing to various peculiarities, or owing to past history, you may find some particular community occupying a larger proportion than perhaps may be desirable. But the change can only be gradual and I think, therefore, Honourable Members will rest satisfied with the assurance which has been given on behalf of Government that every legitimate attempt would be made to increase the number of Indians as far as may be consistent with justice to do so in the traffic branch and as traffic inspectors, on the assumption that we use the word "Indian" to include "Anglo-Indians" also. I am not asking you to draw no distinction. It is an unsatisfactory feature that the pure blooded Indians as it were occupy a very small proportion. It is a legitimate cause for complaint that so few of them are there, and I think every endeavour will be made and ought to be made to increase their number. But I think in fixing this proportion, it should be our principle not to draw any distinction whatsoever between Statutory Indians and Indians in the ordinary acceptance of the term. However, that is a side issue. On the main point, Sir, I think the amendment which has been suggested by the Honourable Member for the Legislative Department, Sir Muhammad Shafi, is an eminently reasonable one. The Government agrees to do its best to employ a larger number of Indians than is at present the case. It will be of course an increasingly large number and the principle has been accepted. I think, therefore, the House ought to accept the amendment.

The HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY (Central Provinces: General): Sir, at this stage I do not propose to detain this Council by speaking on the original proposition; in respect thereto several speeches have been made and many solid and sound arguments have been advanced. I therefore only propose to speak on this amendment. I am one of those Members who have consistently supported the officials as well as the non-officials when a proper, appropriate and well-worded amendment by way of compromise has been sought and pressed in this Council. But I feel that on this occasion I cannot support this amendment. In my opinion,—and I say it with great respect to the Honourable the Mover of this amendment, this amendment is simply an eye-wash. The amendment, if it was of a specific nature, would appeal to every one of us, and I for one would immediately accept it. What is the position? What is the real fundamental difference between the proposition and the amendment which has been put forward? The proposition requires a fixed proportion. The proposition requires Government to accept a principle, namely, that a reasonable proportion of appointments may be fixed for Indians and the amount of that proportion has been wisely left to the will of the Government,—to

[Sir Maneekji Dadabhoy.]

their better judgment. If you now substitute the words " a larger number " for the words " fixed proportion " which is the main object of the amendment, what is the net result of that suggestion? The whole proposition is rendered nugatory. It is not an amendment. It absolutely changes the entire character of the Resolution which we have been discussing all this time. It introduces altogether a new Resolution, and it is not really an amendment of it. If the amendment is carefully criticised, that is the only natural inference. Then, what is the case of Government? It asks us to substitute the words " larger number " in the Resolution. I am afraid this Council will not be satisfied with a mere assurance of this nature. Government always, for years together, have been saying this one thing, that they are anxious and sympathetic, and that they are always prepared to take a larger element of Indians in the various branches of the services. We all know about the general sympathy of Government. We all know their sympathy in this particular connection. But the object of this proposition is to bring it home to Government in a fixed manner the nature of the request made in this Council and ask them to pronounce their definite decision on the nature of this request. I shall not refer to the special case of pleading made out by the Honourable Mr. Sarma. If his argument is correct, he has no business to be a Member of the Executive Council, and to hold a post, a post which is generally a listed appointment and which belongs to the Indian Civil Service. That would be the natural inference of the argument which the Honourable Mr. Sarma has advanced before the Council to-day. We are not now dealing with cases that are special. In making these remarks I do not for a moment wish to minimise the difficulties of Government in this matter. I can clearly see the position of Government. I know the Government will have considerable difficulty in the matter of adjusting this proportion. It might to a certain extent create dissatisfaction and discontent in the department. I extend my fullest sympathy to the Honourable Mr. Chadwick in the arduous task which he has before him in accepting this Resolution; but the proposition which the Honourable Mover has placed has a definite object, and the Government must find out some sort of *modus vivendi* in this respect to meet the wishes of the public. I therefore regret exceedingly that I cannot see my way to support this amendment and even in a matter like this, which is of a very important character, if Government is defeated, it should meet its defeat cheerfully and endeavour to find a solution.

The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA: Sir, I too oppose the amendment. On giving fuller consideration to the proposal which fell from the Honourable Leader of the House we cannot but come to the conclusion that if the amendment is accepted the working of it will not be practicable in the manner indicated in the Resolution of the Honourable Lala Ram Saran Das. I can best prove what I mean by giving concrete instances. I understand, Sir, that in the North Western Railway they have 44 men holding the position of Traffic Inspectors of whom at present only one is an Indian. Now if the amendment is carried, namely, that a larger number be employed than at present, Government in their estimation might think they are doing the right thing if they raise the number of Indians to 5. On the other hand, on the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway, I understand there are 10 men filling this position and because a former Agent of that Railway was sympathetic to Indian aspirations, there are about 4 Indians there. Gov-

ernment will then say that they will increase the number of Indians on this line by one or not at all and they would be right according to the amendment. The aim of the Honourable Lala Ram Saran Das cannot therefore be fulfilled by the acceptance of the amendment of the Honourable Sir Muhammad Shafi.

The RIGHT HONOURABLE V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI (Madras: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, I quite agree that the amendment is scarcely less unsatisfactory than the Resolution. I will not go so far as my Honourable friend Sir Maneckji in describing the amendment as an eye-wash. I would give it a more euphemistic term; I think it is a legitimately tactical move. The attitude of the official spokesman on this Resolution has been of a nature that would inevitably have brought Government a sorry defeat. The amendment is intended to pull the Government out of an awkward situation. The situation is awkward, Sir, because Government in this matter under malignant influences have assumed an attitude entirely out of accord with their continual professions, and, I am happy to think, considering the way they have behaved in other departments of the public service, also out of court with their well-established practice. I am inclined to be somewhat reminiscent over this railway matter. Railways, Sir, have been a sore subject with us; and if I may venture a personal note I am one of those who believe that the thorough defeat which Government sustained recently over a railway matter would not have been theirs if from the beginning in regard to the Indianisation of the railway services Government and the companies together had adopted a more reasonable and more satisfactory attitude. However, I am disposed to recall an incident of about twelve years ago when the Imperial Legislative Council still sat in Calcutta in a very small room but in a room where great things were done. I remember a Resolution moved by my own lamented master, Mr. Gokhale, to the effect that a more rapid pace should be adopted by the companies in respect of Indianisation. What, Sir, do you think was the attitude of a person called the Railway Member—but I think he was only the President of the Railway Board in those days? He said that Indians were as a rule fatalistic by conviction, and that the European community who had large interests would object to the employment, on a very much larger scale, upon the transport machinery of that kind, of people who would, when accidents happened or were likely to happen, simply say "Oh, that is fate; what can we do?" Now, the Honourable Mr. Chadwick has been trained in the more sane-minded atmosphere of my Madras Province, so that he adopted a gentle variant of that theme to-day. Instead of condemning Indians as a class as fatalists and therefore unfitted for service in a small patch of the railway service, which still apparently is reserved as a monopoly for inefficient, instead of calling them fatalists and therefore disqualified, he enumerated a formidable array of their duties. Now, I heard this array of duties with the closest possible attention, and I am not satisfied myself that amongst these duties there is anything which is beyond the capacity of a very ordinary Indian mortal. There are patches of the service which are considered monopolies of particular communities. We have broken into patches before and we will break into this patch as well; we shall annex it as we have annexed other branches of the public service in our own country. I am dissatisfied with the Resolution for the reason that it adopts in the railway service that unsatisfactory and most vicious principle of fixing a proportion for Indians. Indians, Sir must have the run of the whole service in this country. It is theirs root and branch; other people may come in with a modest request for a proportion. Why should we ask for a proportion? As rapidly as circumstances

[Right Honourable V. S. Srinivasa Sastri.]

permit, more rapidly than Government wish, more rapidly than the railways and the Honourable Mr. Chadwick apprehend, much more rapidly the services will become the property of their owners in this country. Well, left to myself, I should oppose both the Resolution and the amendment and leave this matter to be settled in a place where better notions will prevail of what is due to Indians and what is due to other members of the Indian nationality. However, since the motion has been brought here, I should accept the amendment and ask my Honourable friends Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy and Mr. Sethna to relent in their attitude, justifiable as it is, for this reason, Sir. The amendment asks for a larger proportion and leaves it there with perfect indefiniteness. We shall be free when we feel stronger to come up here and ask for a definite proportion which shall be scarcely less than 85 per cent. If we ask for a proportion now and leave it to the sweet will of the Government as personified in the Honourable Mr. Chadwick, we shall get a proportion which the country will reject and the Honourable Rai Bahadur Lala Ram Saran Das will be abused all over the country for having brought it about. For that reason I object to this Resolution, and I implore my friends to be wise and to accept the amendment.

The HONOURABLE DR. MIAN SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI: May I be permitted to make a personal explanation, Sir?

My Right Honourable friend Srinivasa Sastri characterised my amendment as a "legitimate tactical move". I assure the House that I did not conceive of that amendment in the way that my Right Honourable friend has characterised it. So far as I am concerned, it was an honest effort on my part to bring about a compromise between the Mover on the one hand and the department administering the Railways on the other.

The HONOURABLE MR. PURSHOTAMDAS THAKURDAS (Bombay: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, when I was hearing the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri, I felt that he was going to ask the House either to accept some other amendment he may have thought of so as to bring in all the points which may have been aimed at by the Honourable Mover, or to accept the main Resolution. Although he looks upon the amendment of the Honourable Mr. Chadwick as an eye-wash or as a tactical move, I fail to see how the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri could ask this House not to stand by the original Resolution, for I feel, and I would repeat it again, that the sole aim of the Honourable Mover is to commit Government to a certain fixed proportion of Indians to be admitted into the service from year to year, a method which can be audited by this House and by the Legislature every year. I feel that, in spite of what the Honourable the Leader of the House has said, the amendment is nothing short of getting round that rather strict method of committing Government to a policy, and I am sure the Honourable the Leader of the House will not mind it if I say that I am sorry I differ from the point of view he takes. If the Honourable Mr. Chadwick will put before the House the Resolution in any other amended form, if he likes it, and if it will definitely give the House something on which to examine the figures of the employment of Indians in these posts next year, I at any rate will gladly support it. Failing that, I think the House should stand by the Resolution, especially in view of what has fallen from the various Honourable Members including my Right Honourable friend over there.

The HONOURABLE SIR ZULFIQAR ALI KHAN (East Punjab : Muhammadan) : Sir, it is not my desire to detain the Council long, especially when I see that the galleries are crowded with Members from the other House . . .

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The Honourable Member must not refer to anything outside this House.

The HONOURABLE SIR ZULFIQAR ALI KHAN : What I wanted to say was that the Resolution of the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri is to come off and that I therefore do not wish to detain the Council by making a long speech. I rise to say, Sir, that I give my whole-hearted support to what the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri has said. I agree with him that there is no use at this stage to insist upon a percentage to be fixed by the Government for the larger employment of Indians in the Railway Department. But I must say that it must be borne in mind by the officials that the public outside will not be satisfied with *beau geste* but they will require the Government to give substantial proof of their sincere desire that they will meet the wishes of the Members in a material manner. With these few words, Sir, I heartily support what has fallen from the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri and would ask the House to support the amendment.

The HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA (Bombay : Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, I should say, after the discussion in this House by so many able speakers, that I am in accord with the original motion. The honours of the arguments are all on the non-official side. And after all, what is this official compromise? It is nothing else but an attempt to please us here for the time being. That is all. What are these assurances to us? I consider the assurances given in this House, as those that were given in the old Imperial Legislative Council, as empty assurances. They are really, as my friend Sir Maneekji Dadabhoy pointed out, "eye-washes." They remind me of the old declaration in the House of Commons by John Bright as to the traditional policy followed by the East India Company in these matters, namely, say one thing and do another secretly. In 1833 the Charter Act was passed, and it was said that men of "proved merit and ability" should always be employed in the services of the State. Another declaration was that there should be "no governing caste in India." I ask all the Members of this House, both official and non-official, is there not still in the Government of India what you call "a governing caste," a caste which monopolises all the high offices of the State and leaves the crumbs to Indians? Is there anybody who can say that there is "no governing caste in India?" If there is one, of course, it is very natural for them to preserve all their monopolies, all their vested interests so called and all their privileges as long as the sun and the moon endure, whatever the popular voice may say to the contrary. That is the meaning of it. Assurances and assurances reassured are hollow. I often have said, not here, but elsewhere, and I do repeat it in this Chamber now that there is that Machiavellian maxim, "put not your trust in princes" and so please do not put your trust in Government assurances. Government assurances are written in water. That being the case, what is the situation? Speaking of percentages, I will give you one instance, Sir. There was the Statutory Civil Service, for which the late Mr. Dadabhoy Nowrojee fought and fought hard for a long time to admit competent Indians into the Civil Service. The Government of India Act of 1858 was amended prescribing a percentage. That

[Sir Dinshaw Wacha.]

percentage was fixed by Parliament at One-sixth of the number of members of the Civil Service. But even in spite of Parliament fixing that one-sixth percentage, it was never maintained. There was a great hue and cry in this country. Now, where was that assurance of Parliament? As a matter of fact, there was such an agitation that a Public Service Commission was appointed in 1886 of which I think Sir Charles Atkinson was the Chairman, which abolished that service as most unsatisfactory. Men of "proved merit and ability" were not selected. The selections were made by patronage, and the whole of the Statutory Service went to the dogs. The whole country was glad it went to the dogs, because it was a most unsatisfactory service in every way, and I think the Government got nothing but discredit for the method and manner in which it was maintained. Under those circumstances, I ask whether this House can any more depend upon assurances, doubly assured and trebly assured! They are all in vain; they are writ on water. The Government promises and assurances are like piecrusts. That is the long and short of it. Therefore, Sir, I do hope that every Member of this Assembly will support the Honourable Rai Bahadur Lala Ram Saran Das in his original proposition. That is the proposition which ought to be vigorously supported.

The HONOURABLE MR. LALUBHAI SAMALDAS (Bombay: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I was rather surprised when my Right Honourable friend, who began so well, gave his case away in the end. He said he would like the fight to be fought out in another place where the question as between Indians and non-Indians could be fought out much better. I do not know what was at the back of his mind. Possibly, he was referring to the other place where with a big elected majority they can fight much better than here, and, if my supposition is correct, it means that my Right Honourable friend has lost faith in the House where he sits. I have not lost faith in the House and I think we can fight it out here as well as in any other place.

Leaving that aside, my Honourable friend Mr. Sarma said that the danger in accepting the original Resolution was that the minimum might be turned into a maximum and he said we might be jeopardising the rights of Indians. He also has lost faith both in the non-official majority here and in another place. If Government fixed the minimum very low and stuck to it, and we found that the minimum could be exceeded, we could put pressure in both Houses to have the minimum raised. We will not allow the minimum to become the maximum. So he need not be afraid that by passing this Resolution we will be jeopardising the rights of our own countrymen. We will see that the minimum does not become the maximum.

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: Sir, may I say a few words on this amendment? I had no anticipation that I was going to raise such a wide and general discussion covering so many points. I am speaking definitely to the amendment and I would plead with the House that it really does put it in a better form than the original Resolution. My chief point is this. This, in many of the railways, is a small grade. It is possible to work out percentages for a large block, but when you have to deal with a small grade, it is very difficult. I understand from my friend, the Honourable Rai Bahadur, that his chief difficulty is with one railway: that on other railways, in this very section there is a very considerable number of Indians. Now, go and fix a percentage. You will at once find, probably,

in that railway where there are already a good many Indians, it will make trouble among the other subordinates who will say that the Indians have got more than their percentage. (*The Honourable Mr. Purshotamdas Thakurdas*: "Surely that is the minimum that Government would fix?") But, then, Sir,—I appeal to them again—all that the House is interested in for the moment is that minimum. If you leave it at this, at "larger numbers," we will inquire further from Railways and you can easily find out by questions if these numbers are increasing reasonably from year to year. It is very difficult—I think Honourable Members must see the difficulty of my own personal position—to accept a fixed proportion for an administration for which I am not directly responsible and the inside workings of which are very much with the agents and the local officers. I assure the House that Government will press and does press for a greater and increasing proportion of Indians. My friend Sir Dinshaw Wacha recalls the case of old battles in which he and men of the old time took great part. Really, as he looks round here he must see that there have been results from them. (*The Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha*: "Sir, a century has passed and the same thing happens to-day.") Not at all, Sir. What I am saying is that he will see from the current Administration Report, that, even in this terrible Railway Department, 20 per cent. of your Engineering Department is now Indian. Their numbers have increased steadily. I would ask them to leave this grade alone. I dislike to accept the responsibility for saddling any administration with a fixed proportion in any one grade in which there may be only 10 or 20 posts. I am perfectly willing and I give every assurance that, whatever the numbers are at present of Indians in this grade, we will press on the Railways (and you can ask us here a year hence if we have done so) that they must do everything they can to increase that number and see that it is done. But I think the House will realise my position. It is very difficult to pick just one grade. I am prepared to agree and agree readily for a block of grades. In the first instance, I would ask the House to give us at least another year, when you can examine us again, and definitely let us try to increase the numbers. Where you have a small number of posts, an increase of a few makes a great difference in the percentage. We are not offering eye-wash. We are not trying to dodge issues. What I am trying to do is not to accept lightly a fixed rule on a service with which I am not myself at present familiar and cannot be familiar. That is my difficulty. It is a practical difficulty and I would ask the House at this stage and at this time to accept the amendment of a "larger number." In some of these railways there may be only 10 or 15 of these posts.

THE HONOURABLE RAI BAHADUR LALA RAM SARAN DAS (Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): I want to speak on the amendment, Sir.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: I think the Honourable Member had better reply on the whole matter.

THE HONOURABLE RAI BAHADUR LALA RAM SARAN DAS: Sir, I feel very gratified at the hearty welcome which has been extended to my most modest Resolution by the Honourable Members of this House. It is most refreshing to find even my gallant friend the Honourable Colonel Sir Malik Umar Hyat Khan supporting it and supporting it most heartily. I hold the Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi in great esteem but I am sorry to say that the amendment which he has moved does not satisfy me at all. Assurances, as our veterans of the House, the Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha and the Honourable Sir Manekji Dadabhoi said, count

[Rai Bahadur Lala Ram Saran Das.]

for nothing. If I may be excused, I can say that they are only lip sympathies but nothing practical. The Honourable Mr. Chadwick is wrong in saying that on the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway because there was a large scope for selection more Indians have been promoted than on any other railway. On the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway, which is a much smaller line, I find, Sir, that there are certain grades which in fact carry a lower salary. Even in case we leave aside those lower grades, even then there are 17 Traffic Inspectors there who are in receipt of a salary of Rs. 250 and over and out of them only 7 are Indians. So, my Honourable friend's argument about numbers does not hold good. On the North-Western Railway out of 44 Traffic Inspectors in the Transportation Branch only one Indian is holding the appointment permanently and two are simply officiating in that post. Out of the 7 commercial Traffic Inspectors there is not a single Indian. So, out of 51 posts, we have only 8 Indians occupying that post which is described as a great administrative post by the Honourable Mr. Chadwick. Is that just and fair? On the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway why there has been promotion among the Indians is that the traffic authorities there were more sympathetic. I have been trying with the Railway authorities to move into this matter, and I have been drawing their constant attention to this grievance. But all my efforts have been in vain. The Honourable Mr. Chadwick has corroborated what I thought will be the reply which the Government Member will give, and that is the stereo-typed reply that on the North-Western Railway efficient people are not found for filling up the posts of Traffic Inspectors. I do not hold that the promotion to the Traffic Inspectors should not be made from the lower ranks, but I say that although, as far as I can gather, there have been competent men in the lower grades to occupy higher posts, they have not been promoted because, unfortunately, they were Indians. I do not want to touch on racial questions. An Honourable friend asked me not to bring the racial question into the Council. But, I told him, Sir, even the Reforms Scheme is a racial question then. Indianisation of the services is a recognised policy of this Government and I want simply that policy to be observed and faithfully carried out. The Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri has remarked that my Resolution does not ask for a specific proportion. I refrained from asking for a specific proportion because I thought that perhaps in that form Government may not find it possible to accept the Resolution. What I am asking the Government is to fix a reasonable proportion—a reasonable minimum—and so long as the minimum is reasonable, I do not expect that my constituency or the public at large will have any grievance against me. The Honourable Sir Umar Hayat Khan has rightly said that Indian graduates can be had in any number, and I am sorry to inform this House that notwithstanding the recruitment of a number of Graduates on the North-Western Railway, I find that they are not being treated and encouraged as well as they ought to be; and some of them are thinking of resigning because they do not find good prospects. I do not want to take much time of this Council as the question which I have put before the House has the general approval of the House and so I commend this Resolution for the favourable consideration of this Honourable Council.

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK (Commerce Secretary): Sir, I very much regret that my Honourable friend will not accept the amendment. I have very little to add to what I have said before. The debate has ranged over a very wide ground. The superior staff of the Railways

was dragged in. There the number of Indians are being increased, and increased steadily as my Honourable friend will see from the last Administration Report. My difficulty, as I have tried to explain, with this particular Resolution is that it affects a small body. The complaint is chiefly against one Railway, not against them all.

The HONOURABLE RAI BAHADUR LALA RAM SARAN DAS: No.

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: I understand that there are a considerable number of Indians already in this grade in the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway. The numbers which the Honourable Member quoted as far as the North-Western Railway is concerned have, I think, excluded many who are Statutory Natives of India. Further, I really do not know what promotions can be made to this grade from the senior station masters, and I do not know that and I cannot know what the percentage in those lower ranks is. It is therefore very difficult for me to accept any specific proportion without knowing what exactly I should be doing to the men in the grade below. I assure the House that the sentiments of this House and the sentiments of this debate will be pressed upon the Railways, especially upon the one Railway which has been mentioned very strongly. I do not know how this will be worked, but my task will be made much easier if the House could accept the amendment and if we could have the words "larger numbers" substituted. Therefore, I am afraid, Sir, however much I would like to meet my Honourable friend in many ways, I cannot accept the principle of a fixed proportion for this one particular grade—certainly not without much more detailed examination with the Agents of the Railway Companies, which we will be perfectly prepared to do. After this undertaking it is rather unreasonable to ask me to accept the Resolution straightaway.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The first question is that in the Resolution under discussion the following amendment be made:

"That for the words 'reasonable proportion be fixed for Indians' the words 'larger number of Indians be employed' be substituted and at the end of the Resolution the following words be added, namely, 'than is the case at present'."

1 P.M. The Council then divided as follows:—

AYES—19.

Bahram Khan, Nawab Sir.
Barron, Mr. C. A.
Butler, Mr. M. S. D.
Chadwick, Mr. D. T.
Cook, Mr. E. M.
Crerar, Mr. J.
Forrest, Mr. H. T. S.
Froom, Sir Arthur.
Jha, Dr. G. N.
MacWatt, Major-General R. C.

Murray, Sir Alexander.
Muzammil-ullah Khan, Nawab.
Sarma, Mr. B. N.
Shafi, Dr. Mian Sir Muhammad.
Srinivasa Sastri, Rt. Hon. V. S.
Tek Chand, Mr.
Thompson, Mr. J. P.
Zahir-ud-din, Mr.
Zulfiqar Ali Khan, Sir.

NOES—18.

Akbar Khan, Major Nawab.
Ayyangar, Mr. K. V. R.
Dadabhoy, Sir Maneckji.
Kale, Mr. V. G.
Khaparde, Mr. G. S.
Lal Chand, Lieut.
Lalubhai Samaldas, Mr.
Miller, Sir Leslie.
Moti Chand, Raja.

Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Mr.
Ram Saran Das, Mr.
Ray, Raja P. N.
Raza Ali, Mr.
Sethna, Mr. P. C.
Sinha, Mr. Sukhbir.
Umar Hayat Khan, Col. Sir.
Vasudeva Raja, Raja.
Wacha, Sir Dinshaw.

The motion was adopted.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The further question is that the Resolution, as amended, be adopted.

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION *RE* APPOINTMENT OF INDIANS AS DEPARTMENTAL SECRETARIES, JOINT SECRETARIES, ETC.

The RIGHT HONOURABLE V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI (Madras: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, I beg to move that:

“This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that in order to give Indian members of the Indian Civil Service an insight into the larger problems of Imperial administration and policy, he would be pleased to appoint, so far as possible, at least one such officer as Secretary, Joint Secretary or Deputy Secretary to every Department of the Secretariat of the Government of India.”

It might be an advantage if, at the outset, I narrated to the Council how I came to conceive of this Resolution and to restrict its scope. I had been one of those who lugged the fond delusion that when once an Indian got into the ranks of the covenanted Civil Service of India, thereafter he became admitted into the full bliss of Paradise. That there are limitations to the Indian as there were to the Peri, who had only a glimpse of Paradise, I discovered when I was in England in 1921. Then, a very influential deputation of these Indian members of the Indian Civil Service, who happened to be on leave or other business, waited on the Secretary of State, and I heard full particulars of what happened. The deputation, Sir, was headed by one who is now the President of the Calcutta Corporation and by another who is now the Dewan of Mysore. Representations made by them, therefore, must carry with them a certain amount of authority, as guaranteed in fact and in felt grievance. This Government must have received information of the proceedings of that deputation, but, so far as the public is concerned, nothing whatever has transpired. The chief grievance was, to put it strikingly, that during the last 20 years, that is to say, after this century began, there have only been 8 Indians belonging to this service who have come into the Secretariat at all, and two of them were here for very short periods only. The Preamble to the Government of India Act lays emphasis on the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the public service. If ever this is to be regarded as a preparation of Indians for self-Government in the future, one would like to find practical proofs thereof in the extent of the scope afforded to the Indian members of the foremost service in this country for learning not merely the secrets but the most responsible features of administration. The Secretariat of the Government of India is then the sphere to which one would go for satisfaction upon the question whether the Government of India is serious in the pursuit of the policy of continuous and sleepless preparation of the Indian element for the work of carrying on and sustaining a fully developed system of representative government in this country. It is a fact, Sir, that I have ascertained that, excepting during the short space of about three or four months when the post of a junior officer in the Secretariat was occupied by an Indian member of the Indian Civil Service, since that preamble took shape, no Indian has been appointed,—there was an Indian before that—to any position in the Secretariat of the Government of India.

Since the elevation of the Member who happened then to be already holding a secretarial post to be Executive Councillor to the Government,

there is to-day in the scheduled and unscheduled departments of the Government of India not one Indian Member of the Indian Civil Service holding a post. Now that is a fact that I present to the Council. I will repeat it. There is not to-day one Indian Member of the Indian Civil Service occupying a secretarial post in either the scheduled or the non-scheduled departments of the Government of India. I think if there is a satisfactory answer to that charge I shall be very happy to know it. There are some Indians in the non-scheduled departments of the Government of India. They are not Members of the Indian Civil Service. I welcome them there, and personally I should be disposed to think that they are in too small a number there. But I happened to know that their claims had received the attention of the vigilant and powerful advocacy of my friend the Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali and when I discovered that the Indian members of the Indian Civil Service, who have, if anything, a claim to the scheduled departments second to none in the country, and a claim not negligible to the non-scheduled departments of the Government of India,—when I discovered that they had no look in, I felt that the time had come to put a question to the Government of India. My question is not in the form of a question; it is in the shape of a Resolution, because that will admit a full discussion and a complete answer from the Government Benches.

Now a few figures only remain for me to give to the Council. It would appear from a statement furnished by the Honourable the Home Member last year that there are 17 Secretaries and Joint Secretaries in the Government of India; that there are 18 Deputy Secretaries; that there are 10 Under-Secretaries, and 20 Assistant Secretaries. These figures, however, I am unable to verify. My figures are somewhat smaller under each head, but perhaps I am wrong in my calculation, for the reason that while the classified list shows certain people as occupying certain posts there may be others occupying posts similar in rank or emoluments but not under their respective classes in the list, which, however, Government are aware of and have brought into their calculation. I will take it that the Government's calculations, although somewhat outside the classified list, are certainly to be taken as more accurate. But then there are 3 Indians among the holders of posts either as Secretaries or posts assimilable to those of Secretaries. Those 3 Indians are, I take it, none of them Members of the Indian Civil Service. There are three people, Indians, occupying the post of Deputy Secretary. I believe none of them is an Indian—I mean an Indian member of the Indian Civil Service. Of Under-Secretaries there are two, neither of whom is an Indian member of the Indian Civil Service. Assistant Secretaries do not come within the scope of my Resolution and I will not therefore deal with them.

If it is asked, 'But how many Indian members of the Indian Civil Service are there who are qualified to come into the Secretariat of the Government of India?', I will give the answer presently, but before that I think I am bound to tell the Council that the Government of India have observed a certain principle, and I think upon the whole adhered to it, and although it would be impertinent of me to say so, I believe it is a salutary principle, that posts in the Secretariat of the Government of India should generally be bestowed on those whom the Local Governments have already taken into their Secretariats and in that way prepared for the responsible duties of secretarial office. Now it seems to me that it would be a perfectly legitimate question to ask, have the Local Governments prepared sufficient material for us to be able to choose from

[Right Honourable V. S. Srinivasa Sastri.]

for the still more responsible duties of the Secretariat departments of the Government of India? If the answer to this were either a complete negative or of very meagre scope, the blame would only be transferred to the Local Governments from the Government of India, which is a technical distinction and I think the blame might be apportioned as between them as they please. The public of India, however, would blame Government as a whole. But I think if we examine the matter, it is not as though we were left without sufficient material to choose from. I have got here some figures which I think might be useful. There are 7 officers upon the whole of between 5 years and 10 years' standing in the various Local Governments qualified for secretarial posts—that is, by having held secretarial posts under Local Governments. There are 2 officers of that stamp of between 10 and 15 years' standing. There are 3 of between 15 and 20 years' standing, and there are 4 of over 20 years' standing, who have received a secretariat training under the Local Governments. I think my Resolution is comparatively modest in that it requires only a beginning, that "so far as possible"—Government Benches please note the saving clause "so far as possible" under which they have on historic occasions taken refuge—a post of each grade should be conferred on an Indian member of the Indian Civil Service.

I will only repeat, Sir, in conclusion that I am certainly not adverse, on the other hand, exceedingly favourable, to the claims of members of services other than the Indian Civil Service; but we have got to remember that they are by Statute, unless the Secretary of State gives a special exemption in particular cases, they are by Statute debarred from holding secretarial posts in certain scheduled departments. In the non-scheduled departments they have not a monopoly but have to take their share along with members of the Indian Civil Service. To that extent therefore their claims are limited. The claims of the people who are embraced within my Resolution, it seems to me, are unanswerable. They have not been met before and my question is that they should be met hereafter, and in meeting their claims that the Government of India should bear tender consideration to the requirement which they have solemnly undertaken in the face of the world, that they will prepare Indians as rapidly as may be to sustain their own self-Government.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: I think this will be a convenient stage for the Council to adjourn.

The Council adjourned for Lunch till a Quarter to Three of the Clock.

The Council re-assembled after Lunch at a Quarter to Three of the Clock. The Honourable the President was in the Chair.

The HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI (United Provinces East: Muhammadan): Sir, in the last century the custom for a historian who wanted to write a history of the world, more or less comprehensive, was to begin from the flood. If I were to follow a similar course, I believe I should be perfectly justified in beginning from the Charter Act of 1833. I might even go further back, but at any rate that will be a very convenient period to start from. I would, then, come to the Proclamation of 1858 which laid down as to how Indians were to be treated under the British Government. The Proclamation, as this House knows, said:—"And it is Our further will

that, so far as may be, Our subjects of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in Our service the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability and integrity duly to discharge." It would, of course, be incumbent upon me to refer to the announcement of the 20th August 1917 which laid down the policy of the British Government as regards India in more clear and stronger language and then, Sir, I would be guilty of a serious omission if I refrained from referring to the Message of His Majesty the King Emperor sent through His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught to both the Chambers of the Indian Legislature, which was read out on the 9th February 1921 and which contained the following striking passage: "To-day you have the beginnings of Swaraj within my Empire, and widest scope and ample opportunity for progress to the liberty which my other Dominions enjoy." Sir, I would refrain from following the example of the historian of the last century. I would at once come to the terms of the Resolution that is before this House and while coming to the Resolution I want just in passing to offer my hearty congratulations to the Indian members of the Indian Civil Service whose cause has espoused the eloquent support of the Right Honourable gentleman from Madras. The same weighty support has not been extended to the less fortunate members of other services. I must say, Sir, that I was not quite sure whether the position taken up by the Right Honourable gentleman on the last Resolution that formed the subject of debate this morning was quite consistent with the position that he has assumed now. As Honourable Members will remember, he was opposed to any proportions being laid down for Indians so far as the railway and other services were concerned on the ground that India is our country and that we are entitled to all the public offices and that we have a right to give such a number of posts to the people not belonging to the country as we deem proper. He was totally opposed to any proportion being laid down on the ground that all the posts should go to Indians. It is not a little surprising, remembering that speech as I do, to find that my Right Honourable friend is contented now with only one post out of three at least going to an Indian member of the Indian Civil Service. I thought the Right Honourable gentleman claimed that all posts, namely, whether of Secretary, Joint Secretary, or Deputy Secretary should go as a matter of right in the first instance to Indians, without shutting the door in the face of those Englishmen who have been serving this country or who want to serve this country in the future. This, however, is by the way, and I do not want to dwell on the consistency or inconsistency of his position any further. While heartily supporting the Resolution of my Right Honourable friend, I move, Sir, as an amendment that—

"for the words 'Indian members of the Indian Civil Service' the word 'Indians' be substituted, and that for the words 'such officer' the word 'Indian' be substituted."

The Resolution, as I seek to modify it, if my amendment is carried, will read as follows:—

"The Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that, in order to give Indians an insight into the larger problems of Imperial administration and policy, he would be pleased to appoint, so far as possible, at least one Indian as Secretary, Joint Secretary or Deputy Secretary to every department of the Secretariat of the Government of India."

Sir, I should make it quite plain that nothing is further from my thoughts than in any way to disregard or ignore the claims of those Indians who are members of the Indian Civil Service rather I want, if possible, to broaden

[Saiyid Raza Ali.]

the scope of the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri's Resolution and to include within its terms many Departments which, as his Resolution stands, would fall outside its scope. Sir, the way in which the Indian element has been excluded from that seat of real power, that seat of learning the art of Government, namely, the Secretariat of the Government of India, is known to everybody. The history is almost sad, and it will not serve any useful purpose to show to the Council the way in which the persistent, legitimate demands raised from time to time in the old Imperial Council have been neglected by Government. I believe it will be known to many Honourable Members that, speaking on behalf of Government, in a debate that was raised on this very question in the old Imperial Legislative Council on the 17th of March 1911, the Honourable Mr. Earle announced the policy of Government in the following words:—"There is nothing to prevent the Government of India from appointing a Secretary to the Government of India from amongst the ranks of Indian officials, if they think fit"; but that 'if,' Sir, as this House will have seen for itself, was a very big 'if' indeed. The weight that should be attached to the appointments mentioned in the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri's Resolution, or in the amendment that I seek to incorporate in that Resolu-

tion, is not only the weight that attaches to a few posts going to Indians, but in fact it raises the entire question of the Indian people standing on their own feet in the long run by learning the art of Government. Sir, a system of Government which excludes the claims of the children of the soil to going through the Secretariat training and performing responsible functions there was disastrous. The position was put in very clear, terse and strong language by that friend of India, Sir Guy Fleetwood Wilson, who served in this country as Finance Member. Dealing with the Secretariat of the Government of India, Sir Guy Fleetwood Wilson on the 8th March 1911 in the course of a debate said that, really, the Secretariat of the Government of India was "the holiest of the holies." He was dealing with the introduction of the Indian element into the Secretariat. Subsequent to that, Honourable Members will remember that at the Simla Session of September 1921 I moved a Resolution drawing the attention of Government to this important question. My Resolution was in fact worded in language which drew the attention of Government more forcibly to this question. Unfortunately, Government at that time did not think that the time had arrived when a Resolution which sought to revolutionize the whole system of administration should be accepted in its original terms. An amendment was proposed to that Resolution by the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoi, and ultimately the Member on behalf of Government, the Honourable Mr. Craik, who was Home Secretary at the time, himself brought forward an amendment to my Resolution which was carried, and ultimately the Resolution, which commended itself to the Government of India and was passed unanimously by this Council, ran as follows:

"That this Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that Indians should be given opportunities for becoming qualified for appointment to the offices of Secretaries, Joint Secretaries and Deputy Secretaries in the Army, Marine, Education, Foreign and Political, and Public Works Departments of the Government of India."

Seventeen months have elapsed since this Resolution was passed.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: I draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that his fifteen minutes have elapsed.

The HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI: With your indulgence, Sir, I will finish as soon as I can. The position now compares rather less favourably with the position held by Indians in the Secretariat in September 1921. Whereas in the latter month, there was one Indian Secretary to the Government of India, now there is none. At that time there was one Joint Secretary, whereas if we were to turn to the Government of India List to-day we would not find one Joint Secretary. Strictly speaking, there is not one Indian who is employed as a Joint Secretary. No doubt there are three Deputy Secretaries, but one of them can be called a Deputy Secretary only by courtesy, as his services have been requisitioned here for the purposes of the Budget and he holds a temporary post. In that view, Sir, there are only two Indians, who are employed as Deputy Secretaries to the Government of India. Sir, the position that I take is this, that while it is the duty of Government to make up its mind and to take a step in the right direction by introducing into the Secretariat Indian members of the Indian Civil Service for the Scheduled Departments, care should be taken to draft Indian officials from the provinces and employ them in the Army and Marine Department if possible, and in any case in the Education, Public Works and Foreign and Political Departments. My amendment is in no way antagonistic to the Resolution of my friend the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri. As I have pointed out, if those posts are reserved for the Indian Civil Service, they could go in large numbers to Indians as well. Let not their claim be ignored by Government. Whereas in the case of non-scheduled appointments it will not at all be difficult for Government to draft Indian officials serving in the Secretariats of the various provinces in large numbers. I know there are many Indian officers in the provincial Secretariats who are not members of the Indian Civil Service, and it will not therefore at all be difficult for Government, if Government have the will, to get the services of such officers. I hope, Sir, that after all the Government will bid good-bye to this halting, discouraging and disappointing policy

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: When I drew the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that his time was exceeded, I expected him to terminate his speech as soon as might be; I trust he will now try to do so.

The HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI: and embark upon a new policy which will find acceptance at the hands of this Council and which was in fact accepted by Government in September 1921. With these words, Sir, I move my amendment, which runs thus:

"That for the words 'Indian members of the Indian Civil Service' the word 'Indians' be substituted, and that for the words 'such officer' the word 'Indian' be substituted."

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: To the Resolution under consideration amendment moved:

"That for the words 'Indian members of the Indian Civil Service' the word 'Indians' be substituted, and that for the words 'such officer' the word 'Indian' be substituted."

That amendment and the main Resolution are now open for discussion by the Council.

The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA (Bombay: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, the Resolution moved by the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri deals with Indian members of the Indian Civil Service. The amendment which stands in the name of my Honourable friend Saiyid Raza Ali

[Mr. Phiroze Sethna.]

and which he has just moved deals with Indians generally; and because of the Resolution that he had moved on a previous occasion and as I was not sure—although the greater included the less—whether he included the Indian members of the Indian Civil Service, I suggested an amendment to add the words “and other qualified Indians” which, with your leave and the leave of the House, I will now withdraw, because the Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali has explained in the course of his speech that by Indians he means Indian members of the Indian Civil Service and other qualified Indians. Sir, when the Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali moved his Resolution about a year and a half ago, I could not see eye to eye with him, and at that time I observed that his Resolution was premature. I said so, because the Government of India Act of 1919 had then been in force only for a short time and I thought opportunity might be given to Government to see whether they would carry out the intentions of the Act to the letter. To-day I hold a different opinion and I am in entire agreement with both the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri and also the Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali; and if I hold the contrary opinion to-day, it is because, as the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri has shown, that nothing or hardly anything has been done by Government in the matter of appointing either Indian members of the Indian Civil Service or other qualified Indians to the higher appointments in the Central Secretariat. The Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri summarised by informing us that at the present moment in the Secretariat there is not one single Indian member of the Indian Civil Service, but there are some Indians who are not I. C. S. men.

I would like to go further into this matter and I ask the Government to say whether the details that I will just give are correct or otherwise. I hold that Government have had enough opportunities for appointing Indians since the Act of 1919 came into force but they have again no such opportunities as promised in the amendment of Mr. Craik to the Resolution of Mr. Saiyid Raza Ali in September 1921. I will first take those departments which form the exception in the third schedule to the Government of India Act and to which Indians who are not members of the Civil Service can be appointed. Those departments are Foreign and Political, Public Works, Education, Army and Marine.

Now, Sir, in the Foreign and Political Department, there has been no Indian. There was a change in the Secretary in the Political Department. There was a change in the Deputy Secretary both in the Foreign and Political Departments, and the Under-Secretary has gone on leave, and no Indian has been appointed.

In the Public Works Department, there was a change in the Deputy Secretaryship and no Indian was appointed.

In the Education Department, there was a vacancy in the Secretaryship and no Indian was appointed. There are two Indians in the Education Department, one is the Deputy Secretary, temporary, and the other is an Assistant Secretary and both are non-I. C. S. men.

In the Army and Marine Departments there is no Indian, although there were vacancies when the Deputy Secretary went on leave, and there was also the appointment of the Secretary to fill some months ago.

These, Sir, are the Departments to which non-I. C. S. men can be appointed and not a single more I. C. S. or non-I. C. S. has been appointed although there were opportunities as I have shown.

We now turn to those departments which according to the Schedule are the exclusive preserve of the Civil Service. First of all, there is the Home Department. In that Department there was a vacancy of the Secretary's position which has been filled not by an Indian and a Deputy Secretary and an Under-Secretary also were not filled by Indians.

We next take the Revenue and Agriculture Department. There was a vacancy of a Deputy Secretary. The place is still vacant, not filled.

We now turn to the Legislative Department, where there was an Indian Legal Assistant. He has been promoted and confirmed as Deputy Secretary; but there has been a new Joint Secretary appointed, who is not an Indian.

There is the Commerce Department. Although there were vacancies in the Secretaryship and Deputy Secretaryship, no Indian has been appointed.

In the Industries Department likewise no Indian has been appointed, although, as the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri pointed out, the Secretary was an Indian, who is now a Member of the Executive Council, and his place is given to an English member of the Indian Civil Service.

In the Finance Department, they have an Indian as Under-Secretary and an Indian as Deputy Secretary and the latter holds his appointment only temporarily.

Now, Sir, I have given these particulars after careful inquiry to show that there have been a number of occasions when Indians—I. C. S. and others—might have been appointed to some at least of the many vacancies that have been created in the Secretariat of the Government of India since the Act referred to came into force.

To summarise, therefore, there are at the present moment only four or five Indians in the Central Secretariat and all of them not members of the Civil Service. The Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri was perfectly right in saying that there is not a single Indian member of the Indian Civil Service in the Government of India Secretariat at the present moment.

In addition, the Government of India have adopted, I believe, the recommendations of what is called the Llewelyn Smith Committee, which laid down that Under-Secretaryships should be abolished. Now, if those posts had been continued there would have been chances for Indians to be appointed in that position. The Llewelyn Smith Committee recommended that Private Secretaries should be appointed to Members, but so far they have not been appointed; if they are, these posts or most of them might be given to Indians.

Now, Sir, I would like the House to understand that I do not for one moment say anything in regard to either the efficiency or the ability of these respective gentlemen who have been called upon to fill the positions which fell vacant since the Government of India Act came into force and which I have enumerated. I have the greatest esteem for them and hold them in high regard. I have not named anybody but I cannot refrain from naming only two because of my personal acquaintance with them and because of the fact that they hail from the same Presidency where I come from and because I know their work and worth. They are the Honourable Mr. Crerar and Mr. Graham in this House, one as Home Secretary, the other as Joint Secretary, Legislative Department, and I doubt not that every other member who has been called upon to fill vacancies is as able

[Mr. Phiroze Sethna.]

and as efficient. But, that does not prove the point or answer the question as to why Indians have not been appointed. That is the main issue, and the onus lies on Government to show whether they could or could not find Indians suitable to fill these posts or not. In this connection, Sir, I think I cannot do better than read a sentence from the speech made by the Honourable Mr. Craik on the occasion when the Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali moved his motion in September 1921. He said:

"Indians are eligible for all the posts which he (Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali) has mentioned and the sole test of selection for those posts is to select the fittest man, be he English or be he Indian. There is no other test whatever."

And he goes on by saying:

"The sole test for these posts is and must be that of efficiency, and no racial consideration should enter into the question of selection at all."

Therefore what is the conclusion we can come to? We can only draw one or two inferences, that Government tried to select Indians and they could not get them or if they found them they were not fit. The only other inference is that the Government conveniently did not put Indians into these positions. There cannot be a third alternative and I leave it to the House to decide what, in their opinion, is the real reason.

I contend that it is to the interest of Indians themselves as well as to the interest of Government that they should have Indians in the positions enumerated by the Right Honourable gentleman in his Resolution. If you have Indians working in the Secretariat, they are, as it were, behind the scenes. They know how the administration should be carried on, and consequently when they are put in more responsible positions, they will carry on those duties successfully and thus the intentions of Government, namely, to Indianise the services as rapidly as possible, will be adequately carried out. Again either a department is controlled by the Member in charge who is a European or an Indian. If he is a European and under him there are all Europeans and no Indians, then the European Member never gets to know the right Indian view of things; he has got to depend on the views placed before him by his European officials. If, on the contrary, the Member is an Indian, and if all the officers—the Secretary, the Joint Secretary, the Deputy Secretary, the Under-Secretary and the Assistant Secretary—happen to be Europeans, then I suppose because it is the practice that all these officials have got to prepare their own notes and their own reports on everything that is brought before the Member, and being all Europeans they would naturally agree in holding to one view on a subject, we can quite understand that, however much the Indian Member might be opposed to the united opposition of the European Members, he could not overrule them every time if he wanted peace and harmony in his department. Therefore I say, both in the interests of Indians and in the interests of the Government, it is advisable that in all the departments they must have at least some Indians, whether I. C. S. or non-I. C. S. men. The Right Honourable gentleman gave us this morning the number of them available

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: It is a very curious thing, but there must be some malignant influence at work to-day. I do not think at the last six meetings I have had to call Honourable Members' attention to the time limit, but to-day I have had to do so twice already.

The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA: According to me, Sir, I have spoken for only 10 minutes.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: According to my entry the Honourable Member has spoken for 14½ minutes.

The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA: I have much to say, but I will certainly accept your ruling, Sir. I will only say this. There is a certain section of the press in this country and in England who take to task Members of both Houses of the Legislature for constantly bringing up Resolutions asking for the greater and more speedy Indianisation of the services. This is done by individuals also. The House will remember I was taken to task by one Honourable Member of this very House, who, if he were present here to-day, would again have taken us to task, and perhaps severely, because there was not one Resolution but because the only two items on the Agenda to-day are Resolutions relating to Indianization of the services. I refer to the Honourable Sir Edgar Holberton. But if we bring these Resolutions forward, who is to blame, is it ourselves or the Government? It is frequently said the Moderates do not co-operate with the Government in the manner they ought to; that their co-operation is not boldly avowed, it is not constant, that it is timid and that it is punctuated with gestures of dissent for the benefit of the nationalist gallery. Let me assure the House that, so far as we Moderates are concerned, if the Government will only live up to their professions and their pledges we shall certainly be more constant and less timid.

The HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAR (Home Secretary): Sir, I shall first say a few words on the amendment only, reserving my right to speak on the Resolution

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The amendment and the Resolution are both under discussion in the Council.

The HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAR: If I speak at this stage, will I be in order in speaking on the Resolution later?

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: If the Honourable Member is in charge of the Resolution on behalf of the Government, he will have an opportunity of speaking on the issue before the House, and he will again have a further opportunity of replying after I have called upon the Mover to reply if the debate goes to that length. At present the matter before the House is the Amendment and the Resolution which are both being taken together. He will therefore have only one speech at this stage.

The HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAR: Sir, I welcome the amendment moved by my Honourable friend Saiyid Raza Ali because it gives a wider extension to the Resolution moved by my Right Honourable friend opposite and on this important question I am not only content but desirous that it should be debated on the widest issues. Sir, I have not for long followed with close attention the speeches and writings of my Right Honourable friend without failing to recognise that any case to which he lends his powerful and persuasive advocacy will be found an issue of moment; that it will be presented not only with eminent ability, but with scrupulous fairness and moderation; that it will be in close relation with fact, and that it will be an attempt and a powerful attempt to translate into practical politics some important and salutary principle. Sir, a case so presented cannot fail to be a formidable case, and I should feel much more uncertain

[Mr. J. Crerar.]

of my position in having to reply to my Right Honourable friend and the Honourable gentleman who succeeded him if I did not feel, in the first instance, that there is a great deal of misapprehension of fact, and I hope in the remarks which I have to make I shall be able to do a great deal to correct that misapprehension. The second consideration which to a large extent confirms me is this, that I feel that, in essence, there is really no divergence in principle between the views expressed by the Right Honourable gentleman and the views which are entertained and acted upon by the Government of India. My Right Honourable friend made one remark on which I shall venture to introduce a cautionary word. He spoke of entry into the Indian Civil Service as being entry into a paradise. If my Right Honourable friend is animated by any impression of that nature, I would certainly appeal to his humanity, an appeal which I am sure is seldom if ever made in vain, to hold his hand while there is yet time. But I take it that my Right Honourable friend's intentions related, not so much to the felicity of the denizens of that dubious paradise, but to the extent to which they are allowed on equal terms to partake of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and it is on that assumption that I proceed. I have two preliminary observations to make. They may be obvious, but they are of importance to the statement of my case and as such I hope Honourable Members will listen to me with patience and forbearance. It may be that the disposition of Governments and still more the disposition of their servants is to magnify their offices. But I do not think I am doing more than stating an obvious and palpable fact when I say that to the departments of the Government of India are entrusted in a very exceptional degree and in a very exceptional sense, many of the highest interests of the Indian public and the State. If that is so, I do not think it is a questionable inference to draw that in making appointments to these departments the Government of India must adhere scrupulously and strictly to the principle of selection on the basis of proved merit and ability. I use old, perhaps well-worn, terms, but they are terms which have a practical significance at this time perhaps more than any time that has preceded; and when I speak of efficiency I do not speak of a reasonable and tolerable degree of efficiency; the degree of efficiency which the Government of India has to get from the resources and the material at its disposal, necessarily imperfect, is a degree of maximum efficiency. If the answer to that proposition is accepted, I think it will follow that, apart from the immediate question of selection, there is a precedent proposition which requires careful and precedent attention, and that is the sources of supply. You cannot make good selections unless you take timely and judicious measures to extend and to improve your sources of supply; and I shall show that in that direction a very great deal has been done. It has been pointed out, I think by my Honourable friend Mr. Sethna, that the provincial Secretariats have been the main, and on the whole a satisfactory, recruiting ground. I am reminded that it was my Right Honourable friend who pointed it out. I shall refer to this in some detail at a later stage and I now wish to emphasize that our sources for selection are likely to be further extended in the future by an increase in the Indian element in the public services generally. The question of the definite reservation of a certain number of posts for a particular community stands very differently in its application to the administrative services generally, and to selective posts within or without those administrative services. It may be possible and practicable to lay down some definite principle in the case of administrative services generally,

but we should be adopting an exceedingly dangerous and exceedingly inconvenient principle if we proposed to apply it to selective posts.

I will now turn to the actual condition of affairs. It was pointed out by my Honourable friend Saiyid Raza Ali that when this question was debated in 1911 on the motion, I think, of the Honourable Mr. Subba Row there was at that time only one Indian in the Secretariat of the Government of India; and there were very few in the provincial secretariats. A great advance had been made by 1917. Taking the total number of superior posts in the provincial secretariats,—by superior posts I mean all posts of the grade of Assistant Secretary or of similar status and upwards—the situation was that there were 13 Indians and 111 others.

THE HONOURABLE MR. LALUBHAI SAMALDAS: What about Under-Secretaries? Can you give separate figures?

THE HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAR: The Assistant Secretaries were 4 Indians and 42 others. In the year 1922 the situation had undergone what I think the House will admit a very significant change. There were in October 1922 as nearly as I can ascertain 51 Indians holding superior appointments in provincial secretariats and 131 others; that is to say, the number of Indians in that period of five years had almost quadrupled.

I will approach the matter from another point of view. My Right Honourable friend estimated that of the members of the Indian Civil Service whom he regarded as *prima facie* qualified by the length of their service for Secretaryships—he took a period of twenty years' service—there were 15. I have not verified my Right Honourable friend's figures, but I am prepared to accept them. I observe at the same time that the number of European Members of the services in question with the same period of service was 473. There were also at the same time in the provincial secretariats five Indian Secretaries and 66 European Secretaries. Now, Sir, the proportion of Indian Secretaries to the number of officers of that length of service—in the case of Indians—is 83 per cent.; and the proportion in the case of Europeans is 14 per cent. I ask the House to consider whether those figures give any indication of any reluctance on the part of provincial Governments to increase the number of Indian secretariat officers in their service. As time is passing I shall not inflict too many statistics on the House, but I will now deal briefly with the state of affairs in the Government of India Secretariat. I again take all superior appointments including those of Assistant Secretaries up to the posts of Secretary and officers of similar status. There are at the present moment 14 Indians, and but for the fact—for which I think the House will not impute any desire on the part of Government or higher authorities than the Government of India to withhold positions of great responsibility and trust from Indians—were it not for the appointment of an Honourable gentleman to the Executive Council of the Viceroy, there would have been 15 Indians

THE HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI: May I ask, Sir, whether the Honourable Member will keep to the terms of the Resolution and confine himself to the posts of Secretary, Joint Secretary, and Under-Secretary and not go lower down?

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: It is a matter for comment possibly but he must allow the Honourable Member to develop his argument in his own way.

The HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAN: I have already made it clear to the House and I hoped I had made it clear to my Honourable friend Saiyid Raza Ali that one of the most important considerations arising is not so much of the actual question of selection as of the sources of selection, and if I referred to appointments which were not strictly within the ambit of the Right Honourable gentleman's Resolution it was with reference to the extension of the sources of selection. Now, Sir, I have given a summary of the figures regarding the present position in the Government of India Secretariat, and I have reason to believe that the numbers of the Indian Officers in the Government of India Secretariat will before long be increased. I think I have said enough to show that there is not only no reluctance on the part of the Government to give effect to their expressions of sympathy when this question has been previously agitated, that these are not merely empty expressions, but that very substantial effect has been given to them in such a way as to hold out the best hopes for a still more rapid and a still more effective increase in the future.

Now, Sir, I shall turn to the actual terms of my Right Honourable friend's Resolution. In effect, it consists of two propositions—a major proposition and, if I may venture to call it so, a minor proposition. The major proposition is, that Indians—if I may take the Resolution as it would be amended in the wider terms by my Honourable friend Saiyid Raza Ali's amendment,—that Indians should be given an insight into the larger problems of Imperial administration and policy. That is the major proposition, and with regard to that, I have no hesitation in saying that it has the complete and unqualified assent of the Government of India. Then his minor proposition is that as an expedient at least one officer should be appointed as Secretary, Joint Secretary or Deputy Secretary in every Department of the Government of India. Now, Sir, as regards the major proposition, I have already said that it has the complete and unqualified assent of the Government of India. My Right Honourable friend adverted to the Parliamentary Declaration of 1917, and I freely admit that it has a very important bearing on his major proposition. If we are to provide for the increasing association of Indians in all branches of the public service, it follows that we must give them opportunities for qualifying themselves to higher offices in the services, and on that issue there is no discrepancy whatever between my Right Honourable friend's position and the position of the Government of India. The discrepancy is only with regard to the expedient. That expedient, Sir, cannot be given effect to without a very definite abrogation from that criterion of selection by proved merit and ability to which I have already referred. If we were to fix that definite rule, it will be the first time that a distinction on the grounds of race will be imported into this important question. The Government of India is as alive as any one else to the desirability of Indians participating as fully as possible in the higher branches of the administration. They have everything to gain by it. If something can be done to correct the volume of ill-informed, and sometimes destructive criticism, which is so frequently brought to bear upon the Government of India, if something is done to show the difficulties of Government,—not simply the difficulties of concealing their proceedings, of explaining or explaining away their errors and omissions, but the real difficulties of Government of a totally different character which can hardly be appreciated by any one who has not been brought into close and personal contact with them,—the more those difficulties are appreciated by Indians the better will it be for the Govern-

ment of India. But, Sir, I think the Government of India took the right course in making no misguided and premature endeavour to secure those results by the sacrifice of principles of even greater importance. I do not think, Sir, that the result of the adoption of such a rule would really be to the benefit of the Indian officers themselves. It is now impossible for any one to say if an Indian officer who has been appointed to one of those posts that he was appointed otherwise than on the criterion of proved merit and ability. If this rule is adopted, I do not say that it will be possible to impute inefficiency or unworthiness to an officer so selected, but it would for a stringent critic be possible to say that a breach has been made in that old criterion of selection by proved merit and ability to which at present every Indian officer in that position can now confidently appeal. Now that has also an effect upon the European Members of the services, though I do not want to labour the point. But if a rule of this kind is adopted, it will undoubtedly trench upon the reasonable and proper interests of the European Members. Sir, not long ago than yesterday, we heard in this House a discussion on the question of compensation. We heard vehement, even passionate speeches on that subject, and on the indefeasible principle of justice and morality on which it rests. Sir, I have not heard any reference to that principle in the House to-day.

I think, Sir, I have said enough to establish my first proposition and also with regard to the position taken by my Right Honourable friend and by his supporters and the position of the Government of India. There is, if I may interpret my Right Honourable friend correctly, no substantial difference, and I would venture to suggest an amendment in the following terms to his Resolution which the Government of India would be perfectly prepared to accept:—

“This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that in order to give Indians an insight into the larger problems of Imperial administration and policy, they should be afforded wider opportunities to become qualified for appointment for the posts of Secretary, Joint Secretary or Deputy Secretary in all departments of the Secretariat of the Government of India.”

That, Sir, in my opinion, preserves in its integrity the principle advocated by my Right Honourable friend.

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI: May I have the terms of the amendment, Sir?

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Will the Honourable Mr. Crerar hand it in to the table?

(The Honourable Mr. Crerar handed the amendment to the Chair.)

THE HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAR: I put forward that amendment, Sir, because I venture to think that it does preserve in its integrity the principle for which my Right Honourable friend has been contending. There are two essential points to which the Government of India must adhere, and I fear that if the Government of India accepted the Resolution in terms originally drafted by my Right Honourable friend, those principles might be in jeopardy. These two are, firstly, that in making these appointments, the Government of India must reserve to itself an absolute discretion to regard the paramount interests of the public services and

[Mr. J. Crerar.]

secondly, that it must observe justice and equity in the treatment of all its public servants. I should be the last to suppose, Sir, that the Right Honourable gentleman or any other Honourable gentleman would for a moment desire or ask the Government of India to commit themselves to a position in which they might be obliged to infringe those two principles. An assurance of that kind would be an assurance which the Government of India could not honourably give because they could not honestly give effect to it.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: To the Resolution under consideration further amendment moved (this amendment also includes the Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali's amendment—in so far as it extends the Resolution to "Indians," as I understand):

"That for the words 'he would be pleased to appoint, so far as possible, at least one such officer as Secretary, Joint Secretary, or Deputy Secretary to every department' the words 'they should be afforded wider opportunities to become qualified for appointment to the posts of Secretary, Joint Secretary or Deputy Secretary in all Departments' be substituted."

The Resolution would then run as follows:

"This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that in order to give Indians an insight into the larger problems of Imperial administration and policy, they should be afforded wider opportunities to become qualified for appointment to the posts of Secretary, Joint Secretary or Deputy Secretary in all Departments of the Secretariat of the Government of India."

In so far as the Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali's amendment is concerned, it is included in this amendment. The amendment I have just read to the House and the original Resolution are now open to discussion.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PURSHOTAMDAS THAKURDAS: Do I understand that the Honourable Mr. Crerar has moved that amendment or what is the position?

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The position is perfectly clear. The Honourable Member has moved an amendment. I have now read it to the House and it and the Resolution are open for discussion to the House. If the House vote in the affirmative on the amendment, the amendment will be passed; if they vote in the negative the amendment will not be passed.

THE HONOURABLE COLONEL SIR UMAR HAYAT KHAN (West Punjab: Muhammadan): Sir, I have very carefully listened to the Resolution of my Right Honourable friend. Of course, it is his lot to put his case clearly and as he has done so, I think it is superfluous on my part to emphasise anything further. But, if that Resolution remained as it was, I am sorry that I could not have given it my full support, because I, for one, do not like to sacrifice efficiency on the altar of Indianisation. Because, Sir, in the Civil Service, all those who pass it in England are in one category. If they come out here and an Indian supersedes an Englishman because he is an Indian, I do not think that is a right principle. If there is an abler Englishman and senior, it will be hard lines to put a man above him. The whole question is, do we want this service? I think the Empire they have built, the work they have done, does show, as the Prime Minister said, they are the steel frame of the service. As long as he was misled and did not know about India, things went from bad

to worse, as all of us know. I do not think the English members of the Indian Civil Service were responsible for this. But directly it was known by the Prime Minister, he tried to please them, but unfortunately he had to go. Sir, we have got different races and religions and we generally pitch into each other as we did the other day at Multan. Now, all saw what both sides wanted,—an English Civilian. So we cannot dispense with them and, if we go and get others to supersede them, naturally they will get disheartened and go. Then, again, Sir, of course my Right Honourable friend may have gone to the Colonies and perhaps seen how Indians were treated there. But the same Indian Civilian whom he is backing up go to England and pass their Civil Service there. We cannot accuse the English for it, that is, the bad treatment of Indians. Englishmen and Indians are all equal subjects of His Majesty the King and I think the Right Honourable gentleman said in his speeches that he wants the whole Empire united. Well, if we want that ideal, how are we going to bring any invidious distinctions between various races? If we really have to become, as he wants us to be. Now, Sir, if the Resolution only said that much, I have said something against that principle. But in that Resolution a new life has been brought by my Honourable friend Saiyid Raza Ali. If that is embodied in it, I am absolutely for it, because that allows for all Indians to come in. Now, I must put before the House living examples. You have seen here are our two Indian Members at the helm in the Executive Council. Well, are they not doing their work? They are doing it beautifully. They are the Members. There are the Secretaries, about whom we are discussing. These Secretaries are under them. If Indians at the top can run the show, naturally if there are Indians on a lower rung, they can run it equally well. In my province, Sir, the provincial Civil Service has got one man in the High Court, and the place has not been filled better. Secretaries of the Financial Commissioners were used to be Members of the Civil Service, but then later it was given to one or two of the provincial Civil Service men and they did the work equally well. And see Lord Sinha and our Right Honourable gentleman there, the Mover himself. We have produced such Indians and I think, if Indians generally are given chances in the Secretariat or anywhere I think they will acquit themselves well. Then, Sir, of course, we speak of Indianisation, but being of different religions and I being a Member who has been returned by Muhammadans naturally would like to see that, if there is any Indianisation, I hope the Muhammadans will be taken according to their numerical strength.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Does the Honourable Member wish to move an amendment to that effect?

THE HONOURABLE COLONEL SIR UMAR HAYAT KHAN: Sir, considering the number of amendments made and the amendments to amendments, I do not like to go any further. I think, we have a sufficient number of amendments before the House already. With these few remarks, Sir, I support the Resolution, if the amendment of my friend Saiyid Raza Ali is also carried, but not otherwise.

THE HONOURABLE MR. V. G. KALE (Bombay: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I stand to oppose the amendment which has been moved by the Honourable Mr. Crerar. The debate which has taken place this afternoon amounts to my mind to a repetition of what happened early this morning. We are all agreed, it appears, on the acceptance of certain cardinal and general principles. But, when it comes to the application of those general principles, immediately there emerges a divergence of view. My Honourable friend

[Mr. V. G. Kale.]

opposite has laid down certain fundamental principles as principles guiding the policy of the Government of India in the appointments it makes to the various higher posts in the Secretariat, namely, efficiency and justice and equity. No one takes any exception to those principles. My Right Honourable friend Mr. Sastri and others who have spoken have never said a word which would in any way be interpreted to violate these fundamental principles. The amendment, however, goes entirely against the spirit of the Resolution. What was the main Resolution? That in order to afford Indians facilities, certain appointments shall be immediately made, as far as possible. What is the answer to this? The answer is, "We accept the principle." But the main demand, namely, that Indians should be appointed to certain posts, is not being acceded to. Only the principle is emphasised. Sir, we have had too much of the emphasising of principles. We feel that the time has come when some action should be taken upon principles which have been agreed to. Even an ounce of action is much better than a ton of agreement upon principles. So long as we are not going to have immediate action, I do not think that mere repetition of announcements that are made about principles by Government will carry any weight with the public. If the amendment of my Honourable friend had really promised something that Government contemplated doing in the immediate future, certainly that amendment would have commended itself to us. But, as that amendment denies very clearly the demand made in the Resolution, I do not think that it will carry any weight, at any rate, with this part of the House. The speech of my Honourable friend Sir Umar Hayat Khan has, I am sure, not strengthened the case of Government and I do not think that Government will congratulate him upon the assistance he has sought to give to it in this matter. He has imported the question of Muhammadan representation into the debate. No one has said that the Muhammadans should not get their due representation. I do not know why this question should be raised when there is no dispute about all communities being given their proper representation in the appointments that will be made. Here the question is whether the appointments are going to be made at all. Even before any appointment is made or contemplated, my Honourable friend raises the question as to where the Muhammadans will be in the distribution. Of course, there will be no Muhammadans if there are no Indians. Muhammadans are Indians. If the Government is going to appoint Indians, certainly Muhammadans will be appointed. So that I do not suppose that my Honourable friend has in any way assisted the cause of Indians or even of the Government of India by the sort of speech he has made. As the amendment is unsatisfactory to my mind, and as the speech of the Honourable Mr. Crerar in support of the amendment does not in any way give any satisfaction to the popular demand, so very reasonable and so very modest, which is embodied in this Resolution, I think the House will be only doing the right thing in connection with this amendment if it will throw it out. With these words I oppose the amendment.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PURSHOTAMDAS THAKURDAS (Bombay: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, it is usually said "Give a dog a bad name and hang it." It has lately been the fashion to run down Indian aspirations in the field of economic, commercial and industrial development by nicknaming it and qualifying it as political. It has today been the fashion, I see, in this House to call this Resolution a Resolution based on something racial. At the discussion to which the Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali referred 17 months back, the Honourable Mr.

Craik used stronger language than my Honourable friend opposite. He said :

"From the wording of the Resolution it seems to me that the Honourable Member is trying to introduce the serpent of racial discrimination where it does not at present exist."

My Honourable friend opposite used much milder terms, but both of them point to the same direction. I do not know what justification either those who nickname commercial aspirations as political or national aspirations as racial have. But I will remind my Honourable friend opposite of one thing, that if there is anything racial about this aspiration reflected by the Right Honourable Member in his Resolution, the fault does not lie with him. You have got to search the history of the past 90 years to find out who is responsible for it. I hold, Sir, in my hand quotations from three very eminent statesmen at intervals of twenty years each. They each of them said in absolutely unmistakable terms that the more employment of Indians in higher posts and generally in all posts of Government service in a larger measure was not only necessary but was what was due to Indians. The figures quoted by my Honourable friend opposite unveil rather a sad tale. My Honourable friend opposite may congratulate himself and congratulate Government that there is a certain increase of Indians since 1911 or 1912. But that is not the point. The fact still remains that the proportion of Indians in these higher services and higher posts is almost negligible.

My Honourable friend referred to appeals made in this House yesterday in connection with compensation. I am not sure, as I could not hear him distinctly, as to what he means, for I missed the latter part of his speech and I really would like to hear him when he gets up to reply at the end as to what compensation he referred to and what discussion in this House he had in his mind. I was not present in the House yesterday, but I know that for the last day or two there have been appeals going out in connection with Watans and Brahman priests and if there is anything common between the Watans and Brahman priests of Bombay and the I. C. S. or any other Government service, I would certainly be very much interested in hearing the developments of that argument of my Honourable friend opposite.

My Honourable friend said, Sir, that the major part of this Resolution consists in insight into the larger problems of Imperial administration and policy. With that very major part my Honourable friend said that the Government of India were in full sympathy. I felt when I heard that, that it was one important step taken—and that is one important point—in favour of my Right Honourable friend over there. But it always appears, Sir, from the history of these things that the most important and major parts of such Resolutions have the sympathy of Government. What appears to stick is generally the small tail at the end. It is this small tail in this case also which appears to have stuck and cannot find admission within the portals of the Government Secretariat, and in this particular instance, Sir, I submit that it is a very very mild, and very lean small tail. My Right Honourable friend only wants that as far as possible—mark, Sir, the very general term—one post may be given to Indians. If even the acceptance of that is looked upon by Government as grave interference with their rights of ensuring efficiency, all I say is, Sir, that it is not much good discussing any such Resolutions in this House unless one restricts oneself to block voting and to short speeches.

The HONOURABLE MR. J. P. THOMPSON (Political Secretary): During the luncheon interval, Sir, I occupied myself in working out certain statistics which I think will be of interest to the House, as they seem to show that it would be quite impracticable for the Government of India to give effect to the motion of my Right Honourable friend Srinivasa Sastri at once or even in the course of the next few years. The whole question so far as the Indian Civil Service is concerned turns on the number of Indian I. C. S. men who are available in certain years. I think that will be admitted. I believe I am right in saying that up to the time when the Royal Commission on the Public Services completed its labours, there had been no very perceptible rise in the number of Indians in the service; so that although the particular years for which I shall give the House statistics end with 1907 for a reason which I will explain, I take it that the position would be very much the same for a certain number of years after that date. We may take it, I think, that the Members of the Indian Civil Service who are normally considered for appointment as secretaries to the Government of India are men who have from 20 to 25 years of service in the country and that men who are considered for appointments as Deputy Secretaries are normally men with from 15 to 20 years' service. Now, the total number of I. C. S. men with from 15 to 25 years' service at the present moment is 450. Of these 29 are Indians, or 6½ per cent. The total number of appointments with which we are dealing under the Resolution of the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri is, I believe, about 28, in 9 departments. What the Right Honourable Member asks for in effect is that one appointment in each department should be given to the Indian Members of the Indian Civil Service, that is to say, that 9 appointments are to be given to 29 members of the Indian Civil Service, leaving the 421 non-Indians to compete for the remaining 14 appointments. In other words the Right Honourable gentleman proposes to give Indian Members of the Indian Civil Service a three to one chance of getting an appointment as Secretary or Deputy Secretary in the Government of India, while the non-Indians are to be content with a thirty to one chance.

Out of those 29 members who are Indians, a considerable number are naturally serving in the judicial line and I calculate that at the present moment there would only be 17 available in the ordinary course for secretariat appointments. The result would be that these 9 appointments would be practically reserved for 17 members of the Indian Civil Service, and if I may speak of my Indian colleagues from my knowledge of the way in which non-Indian members look at these appointments, I doubt very much whether, if Government were to advertise the fact that it intended to act on this policy, at once and offered these 9 appointments and called for applications for them,—I doubt very much whether a sufficient number of members of the Indian Civil Service would apply to fill all the appointments that were offered.

The HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY (Bombay: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I rise to speak with some hesitation, because I did not originally intend to speak on this Resolution. But certain observations which have fallen from the Honourable the Home Secretary need fuller discussion to my mind and a certain amount of elucidation, and it is for that reason that I venture to speak. My Honourable friend has stated that this Resolution seeks to import a racial question in the services of the country, and as such if for no other reason it ought to be

thrown out. May I remind the Honourable the Home Secretary what the genesis of the reforms is and what the new reforms are based on? May I ask the Home Secretary what is that one note, that one outstanding note pervading all through the Montagu-Chelmsford Report? It is the one note of developing the latent talent of the Indians and qualifying them for higher duties and higher obligations in their own country. Could anybody say that the reforms have been passed or conceived in a spirit of racial antagonism? And if that was the foundations of the reforms what does this Resolution after all seek to obtain? I quite agree that there is no occasion to introduce any heat or acrimony into this debate. The discussion of this subject must be approached totally from a practical point of view, irrespective of other considerations. My friend, the Home Secretary, if I have understood his speech correctly, lays considerable emphasis and lays in front of his whole argument that it is only proved merit and ability on the strength of which these selections should be made. He has also pointed out that it is not only a reasonable degree of efficiency that is required but the maximum efficiency that is required and that should alone guide in the making of these appointments. Now, Sir, he has also very properly alluded to the sources of supply as he very felicitously puts it, and says that it is impossible under present conditions to get that maximum standard of merit and ability in Indians. Now, Sir, as I understand this Resolution of my Right Honourable friend Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, I fear that the very object of this Resolution has been misconstrued. Mr. Sastri does not ask for attaching these Indians to various departments in the Secretariat for the primary purpose of executing the Secretariat duties, but for the purpose of training, for the purpose of learning, for the purpose of acquiring that insight and knowledge of administrative affairs which would qualify them hereafter for discharging those duties more efficiently. The very idea which predominates in this Resolution is an insight into larger problems of Imperial administration which my friend, the Honourable Home Secretary, has been pleased to call as the major part of the Resolution and with which he has expressed the sympathy of the Government in an unqualified manner. If that be the attitude my submission is that Government will not lose anything by accepting this Resolution.

Another matter in connection with this the Honourable Mr. Thompson has pointed out. It is true that there will be some difficulty as indicated by the figures quoted by him. I do not propose to question the accuracy of those figures, I accept them as correct; but after all the Resolution is not worded in what may be called absolutely imperative terms. It says, as far as possible, Indians may be attached to certain departments. Government may not appoint an Indian at all in any particular department—my friend Mr. Sastri was very careful in his argument and dilated upon this point and made the matter perfectly clear. My own submission is that, though the criterion of selection, as the Honourable the Home Member has put it, should primarily be ability, I think ability can only be developed and found out by giving opportunities. The amendment in terms does not materially alter the original proposition, but I do not see any objection to the original proposition, and if once Government concedes that ample opportunities should be given for the development of Indian talent and for the development of administrative ability among Indians, I think that assurance should satisfy us. My submission, therefore, is that it is wrong to place too much reliance or importance on that high standard of maximum efficiency to which my friend

[Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy.]

has referred. I quite understand that comparatively there are very few Indians in the I. O. S., but at the same time I cannot for a moment hold that you could not find a reasonable number out of these people to occupy the offices in the Secretariat with credit to themselves and advantage to the Government. I therefore submit that my friend will see his way to accept the original proposition as it stands.

The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA (Bombay: Non-Muhamadan): Sir, however much we would like to meet Government in order to bring about a compromise, I for one regret that, for the reasons which I will presently give, it is not possible for me to accept the amendment of my Honourable friend Mr. Crerar. To-day it is the Honourable Mr. Crerar who is speaking for Government. Eighteen months ago it was the Honourable Mr. Craik who spoke on Government behalf. But, it reminds one of the Biblical reference that the hand is the hand of Jacob and the voice the voice of Esau. The Honourable Mr. Craik, I believe at the request of the Honourable the Leader of the House who is always anxious to bring about a satisfactory compromise, brought forward an amendment to the Resolution of my Honourable friend Saiyid Raza Ali, in September 1921 to the effect that "Indians should be given opportunities" for becoming qualified for these appointments. To-day, Sir, it is not Mr. Craik who is speaking, but it is the Honourable Mr. Crerar who says that "Indians should be accorded wider opportunities to get an insight into the larger problems of Indian administration." As the House will see, the amendments on both occasions are on identically the same lines. If the previous amendment which the House accepted, I believe unanimously, was given effect to, I think the Government Benches would be perfectly justified in asking us to-day to accept a similar compromise as the one previously proposed. What is our experience? I think in my first speech I have given clear facts to show that absolutely nothing has been done in the matter of giving opportunities to Indians who are not members of the Indian Civil Service in the departments to which, under the exceptions to Schedule III, they are entitled to be appointed. Likewise I have shown that the position of Indian members of the Indian Civil Service is worse. Is it fair on the part of Government, after that experience, to ask us again to allow them to move that "wider opportunities" should be given in the case of all Indians, be they of the Indian Civil Service or not? I for one, therefore, Sir, certainly oppose the amendment.

Now, as to the figures which my Honourable friend Mr. Thompson gave, he said that if effect was given to the Resolution moved by the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri, it will be tantamount to selecting 9 men out of only 29 Indian I. C. S. men available for appointments as Secretaries. May I draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the Resolution which clearly says that only one Indian in each department should be appointed either as Secretary, Joint-Secretary or Deputy Secretary, and I hope my Right Honourable friend will also include Under-Secretaries.

The HONOURABLE MR. J. P. THOMPSON: May I explain, Sir? It is a question of multiplying one by nine, there being nine Departments.

The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA: I beg to differ from my Honourable friend. He explained that only 29 Members will be available.

I would like to know from the Honourable Mr. Thompson if the figures I am quoting are correct or otherwise. If I understand rightly, a civil servant must be of at least 5 years' standing to be made an Under-Secretary, and I say, Sir, that there are to-day 19 Indian members of the Indian Civil Service with service between 5 and 10 years. Civil servants between 10 and 15 years are entitled to be appointed as Deputy Secretaries, and I hold that there are 8 such Indians. Similarly to hold the posts of Joint or Deputy Secretaries, a civil servant must be of 15 to 20 years' standing, and there are 13 Indians in the same service; and finally, Sir, so far as I know, there are not 29, but 15 Indian members of the Indian Civil Service with 20 and more years of experience to entitle them to the appointment of Secretaries and Executive Councillors. These figures will show that the Right Honourable gentleman is not asking too much when he asks for only one appointment as either Secretary, or Joint Secretary or Deputy Secretary, in each Department and I would appeal to the Right Honourable Mover to include in his list Under-Secretaries also in each Department of the Government of India.

The HONOURABLE MR. LALUBHAI SAMALDAS (Bombay: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment. When the Honourable Mr. Crerar put his case before the Council, he laid so much stress on maximum efficiency that one felt that in the opinion of Government no Indian Civil servant came up or could come up to that maximum efficiency. I do not think he meant it, but he was practically defaming the Indian Members of the Service by trying to show that the Indian Members of the Indian Civil Service were so inefficient that they could not be entrusted with the work of either Secretary, Joint Secretary, Deputy Secretary or Under-Secretary. The way in which he spoke and the great emphasis he repeatedly laid every time on the words "maximum efficiency", and the words that he used—I am quoting his words "If we accept this Resolution it will mean the abrogation from the criterion of selection", all these showed that if Government appointed Indians to the Imperial Secretariat they will be abrogating their duty to the country merely to please a few members of the Indian Civil Service or a few Members of this Council. We on this side of the House do not want that efficiency should in any way be sacrificed, but we do believe that there are efficient men in the Indian Civil Service, men as efficient as the European members of the Indian Civil Service, and if Government will not find them, if they will not try to find out such men, then the fault is theirs and not of the Indian members of the Indian Civil Service who cannot reach the portals of what my Right Honourable friend said, the paradise of the Civil Service. Sir, the figures given by the Honourable Mr. Thompson do show, I think, that there may be some difficulty in carrying out fully the Resolution moved by my Right Honourable friend but the Honourable Mover has made it quite clear that he does not insist that in each case every post should be given to an Indian. In his speech and also in his Resolution the Honourable Mover clearly says "as far as possible." None of us want to take away from the European members of the Civil Service their rights. We want the rights of our countrymen to be respected and treated in the same manner as the rights of the European members of the Civil Service, and we want them to be given the same opportunities. And we want to give them same opportunities not for qualifying, because we do believe that they are as qualified as the European Members of the Civil Service, when they come here, but to be given an opportunity of working and showing their worth by being appointed either as Under-Secretaries—and I appeal to my Right Honourable friend

[Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas.]

to include the word Under-Secretaries as far as possible,—or Deputy Secretaries or Joint Secretaries, or Secretaries. Sir, it is a question not of racial discrimination. We do not want that Indians who are inferior to Britishers should be given preference but we want Indians of equal capacity, and we know that there are many of that kind—I will not refer to any by name—to be given an opportunity to do equally good work. We want this amendment to be thrown out and the Resolution to be accepted as moved by my Right Honourable friend.

The HONOURABLE RAI BAHADUR LALA RAM SARAN DAS (Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment of the Honourable Mr. Crerar. The speech of the Home Secretary seems to me to be very disappointing. He lays great stress on the word "efficiency". But what we Indians want is that opportunities be given to Indians to occupy such posts and that can only be done when Provincial Governments take them on in their Secretariats to qualify them for the appointments in the Imperial Secretariats. We have an instance in the Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee here, who was selected by His Excellency Sir Harcourt Butler to occupy the post of Chief Secretary in the United Provinces. That gentleman came to the Imperial Secretariat as Secretary and he has been so successful that the Government have now appointed him as a Member of the Executive Council of Governor General. My friend the Honourable Mr. Thompson takes into consideration the proportion of Indians in the I. C. S. To my mind, he has strengthened the argument of my friend the Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali that other Indians should also be given the same chance. And I know that in India we have a great number of Indians who are quite competent for such high posts. I can only wish that this Resolution as amended by the Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali may have better fate than my Resolution had of this morning, though the object of both the Resolutions is the same—the Indianisation of the Services. I asked for it in connection with the Subordinate Railway Traffic Services and the Right Honourable gentleman asks for it in connection with the higher services—and for the prize posts. I should say that Government will see its way to accept this Resolution in its amended form so as to give practical shape to the policy which they have accepted in the Reform Scheme.

(At this stage the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoj took the Chair.)

The HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI: Sir, at times the best way of killing a rude, crude and undigested Bill is to refer it to a Select Committee. I have been noticing of late a tendency in the front Official Benches to try to kill well-thought out Resolutions by coming forward, with amendments which are intended to served the same purpose, namely, kill those Resolutions. I, Sir, am opposed to the amendment of my Honourable friend Mr. Crerar. Now, Honourable Members know that an amendment in almost identically the same terms as that moved by my Honourable friend was brought up at Simla in September 1921. We know that my Resolution, as modified by the amendment of Mr. Craik, was unanimously passed. We also know, Sir, what has been done during the last 17 months, namely, our position in the Secretariat is worse to-day than it was in September 1921. That being so, may I ask whether the Honourable Mr. Crerar seriously wants this Council to give its acceptance to an amendment of this character? If he is prepared to have that amount of confidence in this Council, I have no doubt he is very seriously mistaken. I for one, Sir, would rather have a fair and square deal than going in for camouflage.

If Government are not prepared to listen to our recommendation let them come out with a clear proposition and let them say that they are not prepared to accept it. But to bargain and to camouflage in that way is not an attitude on which I can congratulate the Honourable Mr. Crerar. But, Sir, these things I need not repeat since my friend the Honourable Mr. Sethna has already referred to them. What struck me as particularly significant in the speech of Mr. Crerar was what amounts really to adding insult to injury.

The HONOURABLE THE CHAIRMAN: I must ask the Honourable Member not to use these expressions.

The HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI: I think, Sir, they are perfectly parliamentary expressions.

The HONOURABLE THE CHAIRMAN: I rule it otherwise. I do not think Mr. Crerar intended in any way to give any offence or insult to this House by proposing his amendment.

The HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI: No, I do not mean his amendment; I mean his speech. The point is this that he seemed to argue that we wanted to have Indians because they were Indians and he went on to dwell on the subject in such a manner as indicated that a sufficient number of competent Indians would not be forthcoming to be employed in the places mentioned in the amendment. Now, Sir, we do not want Indians to be employed in these posts because they are Indians. As a matter of fact, nobody wants that. Nobody has advocated that and that is the case of nobody. What we submit, Sir, is that Indians should not be excluded because they are Indians. That is the only proposition we have been pressing upon the attention of Government from time to time. If you find equally efficient Indians, if you find equally competent Indian officers, then don't ignore them because they are Indians. If you change that attitude I am quite sure, Sir, that you will be meeting the wishes of this Council.

Now, as to the percentages worked out by the Honourable Mr. Thompson, the only thing to which I would invite his attention is the wording of the Resolution which is before this House. Nobody wants that 9 out of 29 posts should be provided for Indians all at once or in one week or in one day. But let there be a start. Let not all the 9 posts be filled at present. Let 8 be filled, let 7 be filled. Let as many as 6 go to Indians for the present so as to reduce the disparity in the percentages brought out in the Honourable Mr. Thompson's speech. I think, Sir, that the only way in which we should deal with the Honourable Mr. Crerar's amendment is unwillingly but as in duty bound to oppose it.

The HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA (Bombay: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I am sorry to say that I cannot agree to the amendment of Mr. Crerar. Since this House was established, Sir, two and a half years ago I have heard off and on in this Chamber two shibboleths by officials on the front Bench—sympathy and efficiency. Sympathy for everything. The Government have got sympathy. They put their hands on their heart and say "The Government have sympathy." But *what* is this sympathy? It is nothing but pure lip sympathy, barren sympathy. I have never seen that that sympathy has materialised in any way. So much for "sympathy." Now, as regards "efficiency." We are all talking about efficiency, efficiency. When the Commander-in-Chief is here or his Military Secretary, they say the same thing—we must have military

[Sir Dinshaw Wacha.]

efficiency. When a Civilian Member of Government is here, he talks about civil efficiency,—we must have efficiency. What is efficiency, we do not know. They keep a standard of efficiency for themselves and consider that we Indians have got no efficiency. In old times, the Athenians and the Greeks always spoke of people of the world outside their little one as "barbarians," and it seems, Sir, that the Government also think that Indians are barbarians. They only are civilised people, having efficiency, sympathy, and everything else. They all pose as paragons of intellectualism. We, Indians, have nothing—absolutely nothing. We are mere dregs, we are leather and prunella or *kachadas* so to speak. That is the position of Government. All right. But what then is the use of Indianization? What is the meaning of Indianization? I have always said, "Let there be Indianization but let it be slow and steady, step by step." So far I am prepared to agree. But if, when we ask for the smallest of small of Indianization of the services, they say that we should have only an iota of the Indian service! Then, of course, there is what I call a *non possumus* action. If that were to go on, where may Indianization be? It may not come on for 50 years. My Honourable friend Mr. Thompson gave out some statistics. I listened to these with very great attention. But what is the upshot of it? Practically speaking, I think that if this goes on, for the next half a century, at all events we shall not have a single Indian as Secretary or Deputy Secretary. Of course, there are the largest number of European civilians, and if the Honourable Mr. Thompson's inference from his statistics was to be adopted, there shall be no Indianization at all! We shall never have any Indianization or even a single Indian Secretary to see. Is that the way in which Indianization is to proceed? Is that the spirit of Indianization? Is that the spirit in which the Chelmsford-Montagu reforms were framed? Is that the spirit in which Parliament has granted the reforms? You now say that we are not strong and efficient, and therefore we cannot be employed. Who are these people to talk of efficiency? They are the judge and jury themselves. They and a standard of their own efficiency. They are the judges of facts whether we are efficient men or not. We are nowhere. That is the position. It is all one-sided from beginning to end. And when this point is raised, if there is nothing else, the question of race is brought forward; if there is nothing else, the question of efficiency is brought forward. So that, the thing is moving in a vicious circle, and all those shibboleths which we have heard to-day have been repeated here for the last 2½ years. That is not the way in which the reforms were granted. That is not the spirit in which Parliament has given us the reforms. I am sorry to say that the Government are now really going back on their plighted word. There is no honesty or integrity in the Government; I am sorry to say.

The HONOURABLE SIR ZULFIQAR ALI KHAN (East Punjab: Muhammadan): Sir, Honourable Members when they move Resolutions in this House represent certain constituencies and it is clear that when they speak, they speak on behalf of the public, and it can never be imagined that the Resolutions which they move represent their personal or individual caprices or freaks, but they represent the sentiments which the public outside entertain. Therefore, the Resolutions carry weight and I hope that they are impressive enough to carry weight with the Government. Now, Sir, the Honourable Mr. Crerar said, as other Honourable Members have discussed that point of view, that efficiency prevents Government from appointing Indians to such high posts.

The HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAR: May I point out, as a matter of personal explanation, that I never said anything of the kind?

The HONOURABLE SIR ZULFIQAR ALI KHAN: This is a consideration which weighs with the Government in the appointments to such posts. Well, Sir, the idea of efficiency has almost become a fetish with the Government. In fact, it is so worshipped and adored that it is supposed to kill all arguments against it. For all these years we have either heard of efficiency or prestige which suffers if there is any argument against it or if there is anything against the policy of Government. The speeches of the Honourable Members here, I daresay, shown to this House that there is an overwhelming majority and a dominant idea amongst the members here that the Resolution moved by the Right Honourable Member is so mild in character that it would commend itself to the acceptance of Government. In fact, it is a great surprise to some of us that even such a mild Resolution—in which he has put the words “so far as possible”—is not acceptable to Government. Now, Sir, with regard to this idea, I think if opportunities are given not only to Indian members of the Indian Civil Service but also to the Indians at large, I think they will prove as efficient in the discharge of their duties as any British member of the Indian Civil Service. Most of the members of Executive Council are not members of the Indian Civil Service, but they have shown their mettle and I daresay that they have proved themselves efficient enough to cope with the situation and the work. What the Indians want are opportunities to show that they are able to handle the responsibilities given to them, and I think that if these posts are not confined to the civil servants only, whether they are Indian civil servants or British civil servants, there will be no blame levelled at them afterwards that they are not efficient. With regard to the Honourable Mr. Thompson's idea, that if Government advertises for candidates for these nine posts, perhaps there will not be a sufficient number coming forth to get them, I think there is a good deal of truth in that. I have known some Secretaries and Under-Secretaries, especially in the Punjab, who, when they are appointed to these posts, generally like to go back to their district and do the work there. I do not know whether they find the work too onerous that they would rather go back or whether the conditions are unfavourable. I do not know that. But this idea does exist amongst those people that they would rather go to their districts and do the work there. But if a wider scope is given in the Imperial Secretariat to the Indians, I have no doubt that Indians will be forthcoming who will show that they are able to do this work.

(As this stage, the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy vacated the Chair and the Honourable the President resumed the Chair.)

Sir, with these words, I oppose the amendment which has been proposed by the Honourable the Home Secretary.

The RIGHT HONOURABLE V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI: Sir, as regards the amendment of my Honourable friend Saiyid Raza Ali, I may at once say that I am in sympathy with it and when the time comes for voting on it I shall vote in its favour. With regard to the amendment proposed by the Honourable the Home Secretary I have got two or three words to say.

In the first place, he offers to members of the Indian Civil Service and to others alike wider opportunities of qualifying for particular posts. Does the Honourable Member wish me to understand and wish this

[Right Honourable V. S. Srinivasa Sastri.]

Council to understand that the members of his service, being Indians, having gone through the same experience as their European colleagues, passed the same tests, doing the same duties, having also served their term in the local Governments' secretariats, are still to be regarded as people requiring wider opportunities of qualifying for these services? It seems to me, Sir, that in using the word 'Indians' in his amendment freely so as to impress members of the Indian Civil Service as well as others, he casts a reflection impliedly, if not expressly, on his own colleagues. They at least are people of whom it could be said that they had established their merit and ability. I was astonished at the way in which he enunciated the doctrine that the Government of India cannot afford to pay any consideration to conditions other than efficiency. No one wished, not certainly I, no one wished that the Government of India should depart from that principle to the slightest degree, but I cannot assent to the implication that the Government of India have hitherto scrupulously adhered to that principle and have still been unable to give Indian members of the Indian Civil Service the facilities which I ask for. That is a proposition that I cannot in the good name of India agree to. Other considerations must have come in. I could, Sir, speak candidly as one man of practical affairs to other men of practical affairs. Could it be denied that some time ago at all events it was considered that an Indian, being an Indian, was to some extent as regards the innermost secrets of administration not a person quite to be trusted? No one can speak to a policy having actually actuated him or impelled him in the administration of daily duties; but there can be no doubt whatever that in the past, in the civil as in the military direction, Government's policy in filling up high appointments has to some extent been coloured by the requirement of the utmost trustworthiness in their officials, and they have held that such trustworthiness might not be found in Indians. I am here only to plead that if that suspicion has hitherto governed the conduct of Government, it ought no longer to be allowed to do so. We are here at a time when it has been accepted as the policy of the Imperial Government that India should be transferred gradually and by steps to Indians. Distrust of Indians, the wish to keep them out of secrets and trustworthy posts are considerations entirely out of place. I am here to ask in the name of the constitution of India that if such considerations still prevail in high quarters in Government they should be completely eliminated.

One word, more, Sir. It is true considering merely the numbers of Indians and Europeans in these services—I have been very happy to get from two Honourable Members on the official side an admission—that the numbers of Indians are still so low that, considering the numerical proportion only, it is not possible to provide them on equitable principles with the number of appointments that I seek. That at least will be a sufficient answer to the country at large, to the wild cry that has been raised all over the place that the Indianisation of the services is proceeding at a tremendous pace and at a pace so alarming that we must look to the extinction of the British element at an early date. Here I am met with the answer that there are not sufficient Indians in the services to choose from. I hope the country will duly appreciate the admission made here to-day on that score.

But then I am faced with a question of righteousness and honour. I am asked, if appointments are given to Indians on the ground that they

are Indians, it must operate to the exclusion of duly qualified and equally efficient Europeans. Quite so, I agree. It is further asserted that these European members will have a grievance that because of their birth they are excluded from certain offices to which but for this consideration they might have been appointed. I am very happy again that Honourable Members on the opposite side appreciate for the first time the odium of erecting a colour barrier. They see for the first time, when it threatens to be applied to them, what it is to be denied an opportunity because of one's colour. Sir, during the hundred years till now we have cried out to the world that we have been excluded on grounds of race and of colour from posts to which by every humane and righteous consideration we were entitled. The official world in the Government of India are beginning for the first time to feel the taste of racial humiliation and the bar sinister placed on the faces of people. I am glad the experience is coming home and I hope it will come home still more. Sir, this policy of Indianisation is nothing new. Ever since the great Proclamation of Queen Victoria we have been promised that in our own country there should be no governing caste and that all posts alike should be open to us. That however was long denied in practice as every one knows, and it has been abundantly admitted by all spokesmen who have spoken on the official side. Time passed. Various claims were put forward and negatived. Then came the declaration of August 1917 which put in the very van of its programme the increasing association of Indians in the public services. Not alone that. It was not merely a declaration that the Cabinet held up to the people of India long waiting for a word of that kind, but it was put into the preamble of the Act and it has therefore the force of Parliamentary enactment. There is the second promise, the third promise, the promise of the Queen and the Kings and His Grace the Duke of Connaught, and they are all promises, promises and promises. I come here to-day asking by a Resolution that in respect of one matter this hundred times iterated promise should be carried out. And what does the Honourable the Home Secretary tell me? He offers me another promise. The Honourable the Home Secretary must not be offended with me if I refuse to accept a promise after I have had abundant promises from far higher authorities. I am here, Sir, to ask for their fulfilment and not for fresh promises. We have had them till we are sick. Sir, I cannot support the amendment.

The HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAR: Sir, I do not propose to detain the House long

The HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI: Can the Honourable Member speak again, because he has moved an amendment and has already spoken?

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: He is the Government Member in charge of the Resolution, and is perfectly entitled to reply on the whole question.

The HONOURABLE MR. J. CRERAR: Sir, as I said, I do not propose to detain the House long and the first of my very few remarks will be regarding the observations which fell from my Honourable friend Saiyid Raza Ali. He said the amendment which I submitted to the House was camouflage. If I understand that term correctly, it implies something of insincerity and of stratagem. I entirely deny that I entertained any such intention, and in imputing it to me my Honourable friend has

[Mr. J. Crerar.]

shown less than his usual regard for the courtesy of debate. Every Honourable Member of this House is entitled to have any motion or amendment he may propose to the House in plain language interpreted in the plain sense which it bears, and I think I am entitled to ask that the House should grant me that measure, I will not say of indulgence, but of justice.

My Right Honourable friend opposite suggested that I have been guilty of some disparagement to my colleagues in the Indian Civil Service. 5 P.M. Though the Right Honourable Member usually gives reasons for what he says I fail to discover any reason for that particular suggestion. I do not entertain that sentiment; I did not express it, and there is nothing in the terms of my amendment which could reasonably bear that interpretation. My Right Honourable friend further, and in somewhat severe terms, referred to a certain distrust of Indians imputed to, as I understood him to say, or understood to be entertained by the Government of India and Governments in India generally. Well, Sir, I, can only appeal from a general impression of that kind to my own personal experience. I have had a fairly long experience of work in a provincial Secretariat, and a brief experience of the work in the Government of India Secretariat. In the Provincial Secretariat it was my duty to be in charge of a department which is, probably more than any other department of that Government, entrusted with matters of a confidential nature, and sometimes of the greatest secrecy. I do not know whether I was guilty of any dereliction of duty, but I may inform the House that it was my constant practice in the course of the business of my department to entrust confidential and secret matter to Indians. I have been reminded recently by my friend the Finance Secretary that there are few secrets, of a more confidential character, which could be more readily turned to pecuniary advantage than the secrets of the Finance Department, and my Honourable friend Mr. Cook assures me that he has been in the constant habit of reposing secret matter of that character to the trust of his Indian subordinates. Sir, it is difficult to disperse atmosphere which is based solely upon surmises and upon impressions, but I ask the House to rely not on surmises, but on facts and I have given the House all that I can give if the results of my own personal experience which, on the whole, has been fairly comprehensive, with the corroboration given to me in that regard by my Honourable friend Mr. Cook. I have only this further remark to make. It struck me with considerable disappointment, because I think the debates in this House have always been characterised by scrupulous impartiality,—it caused me very considerable surprise that the definite facts and figures which I gave with regard to the progress made,—I think my Right Honourable friend opposite will agree that there is no important direction of progress than that of extending our sources of selection—have not been considered, have hardly been referred to by one single Member who spoke on the opposite side. I still maintain, Sir, that that is a most important and a most significant contribution in the question before the House.

My Honourable friend Mr. Kale said this was another occasion on which Government was merely giving assurances. May I invite him to consider the fact that I did give him evidence, very substantial evidence of very substantial progress in the direction in which Government had

promised that it would be made. I regret that so many speakers should have shown a disposition not to treat my amendment precisely upon its merits. When I moved it, I thought that it did substantially preserve and embody in its integrity the substance of my Right Honourable friend's Resolution. I maintain, and I still trust that the House will admit, that that is so.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The first amendment I have to put to the House is the amendment moved by the Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali which covers in part the amendment moved by the Honourable Mr. Crerar.

The question is that for the words "Indian members of the Indian Civil Service" the word "Indians" be substituted.

The motion was adopted.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The second question I have to put to the House is that the remainder of the amendment moved by the Honourable Mr. Crerar which proposes that, for the words "he would be pleased to appoint so far as possible at least one such officer" the words "they should be afforded wider opportunities to become qualified for appointment" should be substituted. In order that the House may have an opportunity of seeing how the Resolution would run if that amendment is effected, I will read the Resolution with the amendment *in situ*. The Resolution will run as follows:

"This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that in order to give Indians an insight into the larger problems of Imperial administration and policy, they should be afforded wider opportunities to become qualified for appointment to the posts of Secretary, Joint Secretary and Deputy Secretary in all Departments of the Secretariat of the Government of India."

The question is that the amendment be made.

The Council then divided as follows:

AYES—13.

Barron, Mr. C. A.
Butler, Mr. M. S. D.
Chadwick, Mr. D. T.
Cook, Mr. E. M.
Crerar, Mr. J.
Forrest, Mr. H. T. S.
Jha, Dr. G. N.

MacWatt, Major-General R. C.
Sarma, Mr. B. N.
Shafi, Dr. Mian Sir Muhammad.
Tek Chand, Mr.
Thompson, Mr. J. P.
Zahir-ud-din, Mr.

NOES—19.

Akbar Khan, Major Nawab.
Ayyangar, Mr. K. V. R.
Dadabhoy, Sir Maneckji.
Kale, Mr. V. G.
Khaparde, Mr. G. S.
Lal Chand, Lieut.
Lalubhai Samaldas, Mr.
Moti Chand, Raja.
Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Mr.
Ram Saran Das, Mr.

Ray, Raja P. N.
Raza Ali, Mr.
Sethna, Mr. P. C.
Sinha, Mr. Sukhbir.
Srinivasa Sastri, Rt. Hon. V. S.
Umar Hayat Khan, Col. Sir.
Vasudeva Raja, Raja.
Wacha, Sir Dinshaw.
Zulfiqar Ali Khan, Sir.

The motion was negatived.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The next question I have to propose to the Council is that the Resolution, as amended, be adopted:

"That this Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that, in order to give Indians an insight into the larger problems of Imperial administration and policy, he would be pleased to appoint, so far as possible, at least one Indian as Secretary, Joint Secretary or Deputy Secretary to every Department of the Secretariat of the Government of India."

The motion was adopted.

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The HONOURABLE DR. MIAN SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI (Law Member): Sir, there will be meetings of this Council for official business to-morrow, the 1st March and on Tuesday and Wednesday, the 6th and 7th March. After the presentation of the Budget to-morrow, the Criminal Law Amendment Bill, otherwise known as the Racial Distinctions Bill, will be taken into consideration. On Monday, the 5th March, a non-official day, it is proposed, in the absence of non-official ballotted business, to put down the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri's Resolution about Indians in Kenya Colony, the Honourable Rai Bahadur Lala Ram Saran Das's Resolution, which has already been moved, regarding an export duty on benzine and petrol, and the Married Women's Property Amendment Bill, which is a private Bill in charge of the Honourable Mr. Sethna. On Tuesday, the 6th March, the amendment made by the Legislative Assembly in the Code of Criminal Procedure Amendment Bill, as passed by this House, will be taken into consideration. Wednesday, the 7th March, has already been allotted for the general discussion on the Budget.

The Council then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 1st March, 1928.
