

Thursday, 7th September, 1922

THE
COUNCIL OF STATE DEBATES

(Official Report)

VOLUME III
PART. I

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

COUNCIL OF STATE, 1922 °



SIMLA
SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS
1922

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TUESDAY, 5TH SEPTEMBER, 1922	1-9
Oaths.	
His Excellency the Viceroy's Speech.	
 WEDNESDAY, 6TH SEPTEMBER, 1922	 11-59
Questions and Answers.	
Adjournment of House.	
Nomination of Panel of Chairmen.	
Bills assented to by Governor General.	
Statement laid on the Table.	
Hindu Ceremonial Emoluments Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Reduction of Members of Governor's Executive Council.	
Postponement of Resolutions <i>re</i> : Prime Minister's Speech.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Conditions of Life and Complaint of Indian Labourers.	
Message from Assembly <i>re</i> : Cantonments (House-Accommodation) Amendment Bill.	
Date of next Meeting.	
Report of Joint Committee on Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
Programme of Government Business.	
 THURSDAY, 7TH SEPTEMBER, 1922	 61-123
Questions and Answers.	
Indian Extradition (Amendment) Bill.	
Indian Museum (Amendment) Bill.	
Cantonments (House-Accommodation) Amendment Bill.	
Nomination of Members to Joint Committee.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Prime Minister's Speech on the political future of India.	
 MONDAY, 11TH SEPTEMBER, 1922	 125-167
Honourable Mr. Sethna's absence from Meeting.	
Questions and Answers.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Colony-returned Emigrants.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Separation of Post and Telegraph Accounts.	

WEDNESDAY, 13TH SEPTEMBER, 1922 199-197

Questions and Answers.

Message from the Legislative Assembly.

Recommittal of Cantonments (House-Accommodation) Amendment Bill to Joint Committee.

Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.

Messages from the Assembly *re*: Workmen's Compensation and Indian Boilers Bills.

THURSDAY, 14TH SEPTEMBER, 1922 199-225

Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly.

Message of Condolence to His Excellency the Viceroy.

Message *re*: Joint Committee on Indian Boilers and Workmen's Compensation Bills.

Indian Boilers Bill and Constitution of Joint Committee.

Workmen's Compensation Bill and Constitution of Joint Committee.

Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.

Government Business.

FRIDAY, 15TH SEPTEMBER, 1922 227-266

Questions and Answers.

President on irregular Questions.

Indian Extradition (Amendment) Bill.

Indian Museum (Amendment) Bill.

Hindu Ceremonial Emoluments Bill.

Resolution *re*: Amendments in Electoral Rules.

Panels for Advisory Standing Committees.

Nominations for Election to Panels.

Disposal of further Business.

MONDAY, 18TH SEPTEMBER, 1922 267-303

Questions and Answers.

Communication from His Excellency the Viceroy *re*: the Message of Condolence.

Message regarding Visit of Earl Winterton.

Resolution *re*: Separation of Post and Telegraph Accounts—*concl'd.*

Resolution *re*: Salt Monopolies.

Resolution *re*: Forest Research.

TUESDAY, 19TH SEPTEMBER, 1922 305-349

- Member Sworn.
- Police (Incitement to Disaffection) Bill.
- Resolution *re* : Forest Research.
- Resolution *re* : Milch and Agricultural Cattle.
- Resolution *re* : Limitation on Hours of Work in Inland Navigation.
- Resolution *re* : Trimmers and Stokers and Children employed at Sea.
- Resolution *re* : Weekly Rest day in Commercial Establishments.
- Government Business.

WEDNESDAY, 20TH SEPTEMBER, 1922 351-400

- Questions and Answers.
- Statement laid on the Table.
- Election of Members of Delhi University Court.
- Session in November.
- Resolution *re* : Political Prisoners.
- Amendment of Standing Orders.
- Election to Panels of Standing Committees.
- Message from Legislative Assembly.
- Government Business.

SATURDAY, 23RD SEPTEMBER, 1922 401-433

- Questions and Answers.
- Messages from Legislative Assembly regarding Indian Extradition (Amendment) Bill and Indian Museum (Amendment) Bill.
- Indian Transfer of Ships Restriction (Repealing) Bill.
- Panels of Standing Advisory Committees—
 - Home, Commerce and Industries, Revenue and Agriculture and Education and Health Departments.
- Police (Incitement to Disaffection) Bill.
- Negotiable Instruments (Amendment) Bill.
- Indian Mines Bill.
- Nomination of Members of Joint Committee.
- Court-fees (Amendment) Bill.
- Parsi Marriage and Divorce (Amendment) Bill.
- Official Trustees and Administrator General's Acts (Amendment) Bill.
- Message from Legislative Assembly regarding Joint Committee on Cotton Transport Bill.

MONDAY, 25TH SEPTEMBER, 1922 435-471

- Questions and Answers.
- Statement laid on the Table.
- Messages from His Excellency the Governor General *re*: Indian States (Protection against Disaffection) Bill.
- Procedure in regard to Bill which Legislative Assembly refuses leave to introduce.
- Cotton Transport Bill.
- The Nomination of Members to Joint Committee.
- ~~Resolution *re*: Amendment of Land Acquisition Act of 1894.~~
- Resolution *re*: Reconstitution of Railway Board.
- Resolution *re*: Compilation of Statistics relating to the Economic, Social and Constitutional Progress of India.

TUESDAY, 26TH SEPTEMBER, 1922 473-521

- Messages from Legislative Assembly regarding Police (Incitement to Disaffection) Bill and Criminal Tribes (Amendment) Bill.
- Indian Transfer of Ships Restriction (Repealing) Bill.
- Indian States (Protection against Disaffection) Bill.
- Attendance in Council and Departure of Sir William Vincent.
- Adjournment of Council.

INDEX 1-40

COUNCIL OF STATE.

Thursday, the 7th September, 1922.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

LADHA LINE IN WAZIRISTAN.

61. The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA : Will Government be pleased to state if there is any truth in the report published in the English newspapers that the Home Government insist on the Government of India to carry out the permanent regular occupation of the Ladha line in Waziristan although the Government of India are strongly opposed to the same ?

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF : There is no truth in the report that the Home Government insist against the wishes of the Government of India on the Government of India carrying out the permanent regular occupation of the Ladha line in Waziristan.

PUNISHMENT OF INDIAN TROOPS IN EAST AFRICA.

62. The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA : Will Government be pleased to state :

- (a) if they are aware that there is a growing feeling in the country that because of the influence of South African Generals, punishments inflicted upon Indian troops by Military Field Court Martials in German East Africa compare very unfavourably with sentences for similar offences passed at other centres ; and
- (b) do Government intend to take steps to have such sentences reconsidered with a view to their being remitted or decreased ?

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF : (a) The Government of India have no information to shew that any such feeling exists.

(b) Unless the Honourable Member can produce some specific instances, I am afraid it will be impossible for the Government of India to take any action in the matter. I may mention that the cases of all military offenders who were tried and convicted by Court-martial under the India Army Act in a theatre of war have already been reviewed by me, and a remission of sentence has been made according to the merits of each case.

RETIREMENT OF SURPLUS BRITISH OFFICERS.

63. The HONOURABLE MR. LALUBHAI SAMALDAS : (a) Will Government be pleased to give the number of surplus British Officers retired under the orders issued by the Government of India in May (1) up to 31st July 1922, and (2) of those to be retired up to 31st March 1923, and (3) the amount of gratuity paid or payable to them under the said rules ?

(b) Will Government be pleased to say whether these officers were recruited for the Indian Army, and, if so, will they be pleased to lay on the table the terms of their recruitment ?

(c) Will Government be pleased to say whether these officers were examined before recruitment as physically fit for service in India, and whether any percentage and, if so, what percentage was found to be incapable of work in this country soon after their arrival ?

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF : (a) (1) 921.

(2) 969.

(3) The Government of India regret they are unable to furnish exact particulars at present. They will not be able to do so until all the officers to be retired as surplus to the requirements of the Indian Army have been selected and the sum admissible to each officer has been assessed, by the various Controllers of Military Accounts in India and by the India Office in the case of officers on leave in the United Kingdom. As the Honourable Member is aware, the amount of gratuity payable to these surplus officers varies according to their rank and the length of their commissioned service.

(b) The answer to the first part of this question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, all the officers on appointment to the Indian Army came under the rules for pay, pension, etc., as laid down in the Royal Warrant for Pay and Army Regulations, India. Copies of these publications may be obtained from the Superintendent, Government Printing, India, Calcutta. The terms are however the same as those applicable to all regular officers of the Indian Army.

(c) Every officer, before receiving a regular commission, has to pass a searching medical examination as to his fitness for general service in any part of the world. All the officers now in question were passed fit for service in India before receiving their Indian Army commissions, and, so far as is known, none of them was found incapable of work soon after his arrival in India.

EXPENDITURE ON WAZIRISTAN OCCUPATION.

64. The HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY : Will Government be pleased to state the total amount of expenditure incurred down to March 31st, 1922, for military occupation of Waziristan ?

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF : Prior to the year 1920-21, the expenditure on the military occupation of Waziristan was not distinguished in the accounts from the expenditure on North-West Frontier operations generally. In 1920-21, the Waziristan expenditure amounted to approximately Rs. 14,40,00,000, and in 1921-22 to approximately 3½ crores of rupees. The latter figure is provisional as the accounts for the year 1921-22 have not yet been finally closed.

TERRITORIAL FORCE IN INDIA.

65. The HONOURABLE MAHARAJA SIR MANINDRA CHANDRA NANDY : Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a report of the progress made so far in the various provinces with regard to the establishment of a Territorial Force in India ?

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF : A statement is laid upon the table, showing the authorised establishment and the actual enrolments of each of the Territorial battalions, including University Training Corps, as so far constituted in the provinces of all India,

Indian Territorial Force.

Name of Unit.	Province.	Date of Constitution.	Authorised Establishment.	Enrolled strength 1st August 1922.
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 2nd Rajput Light Infantry.	United Provinces.	5-8-21 ...	738	104
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 4th Rajputs ...	"	11-3-22 ...	738	460
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 6th Royal Jat Light Infantry.	"	11-3-22 ...	738	348
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 25th Punjabis...	Punjab ...	5-8-21 ...	738	351
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 26th Punjabis...	"	11-3-22 ...	738	738
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 27th Dogras ...	"	11-3-22 ...	738	*
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 39th Royal Garhwal Rifles.	United Provinces.	11-3-22 ...	738	60
1st (T. F.) Battalion, Merwara Infantry.	Ajmer-Merwara.	11-3-22 ...	738	173
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 51st Sikhs ...	North-West Frontier.	11-3-22 ...	738	*
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 63rd Punjabis ..	Punjab ...	5-8-21 ..	738	673
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 66th Punjabis...	" ...	11-3-22 ...	738	323
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 70th Burma Rifles.	Burma ...	5-8-21 ...	738	706
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 73rd Carnatic Infantry.	Madras ...	5-8-21 ...	738	619
1st (T. F.) Battalion, (Malabar) 75th Carnatic Infantry.	" ...	28-1-22 ...	738	672
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 79th Carnatic Infantry.	" ...	11-3-22 ...	738	*
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 83rd Light Infantry.	" ...	11-3-22 ...	738	*
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 94th Infantry...	Bengal ...	5-8-21 ...	738	215
1st (T. F.) Battalion, 103rd Mahratta Light Infantry.	Bombay ...	5-8-22 ...	738	65
*1st Bombay Pioneers ...	" ...	11-8-22 ...	738	740
*2nd Bombay Pioneers ...	" ...	15-4-22 ...	738	555
• Total	19,760	6,811

*Para Battalions.

†Excludes approved applicants not yet enrolled.

‡Enrolment not yet commenced.

University Training Corps.

Name of Unit.	Province.	Date of Constitution.	Authorised Establishment.	Enrolled Strength, 1st August, 1922.*
1st (Bombay) Battalion ..	Bombay ...	5-8-21 ..	640	667
2nd (Calcutta) ,, ...	Bengal ...	5-8-21 ..	640	195
3rd (Allahabad) ,, ...	United Provinces.	5-8-21 ..	640	206
4th (Lahore) ,, ...	Punjab ...	5-8-21 ...	640	559
5th (Madras) ,, ...	Madras ...	5-8-21 ...	640	166
6th (Burma) ,, ...	Burma ...	5-8-21 ...	640	397
Total	3,840	2,890
GRAND TOTAL	18,600	9,201

*Excludes approved applicants not yet enrolled.

†Enrolment not yet commenced.

INDIAN EXTRADITION (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The HONOURABLE MR. J. P. THOMPSON (Officiating Political Secretary) : Sir, I move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Extradition Act, 1903. I can explain the Bill in a few words. Desertion from any body of Imperial Service Troops is one of the offences which appears in the First Schedule to the Act. As a result of the experience gained in the war, the Imperial Service Troops have been reorganised, and one of the features of the new scheme is that the term 'Imperial Service Troops' has been dropped. The object of the Bill is to find an equivalent in terms applicable to the new conditions.

The motion, was adopted.

The HONOURABLE MR. J. P. THOMPSON : Sir, I introduce the Bill.

INDIAN MUSEUM (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The HONOURABLE MIAN SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI (Education Member) : Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Museum Act, 1910. Honourable Members who are familiar with this Act are no doubt aware that under its provisions the control of the Indian Museum in Calcutta, together with all its endowments and other properties, is vested in a Board of Trustees, the constitution of which is defined in section 2 of that Act. Under clause (a) of sub-section (J) of that section, six persons holding certain offices are *ex-officio* members of this Board. Certain circumstances have necessitated the amendment of this particular clause to which I have just referred, and the Bill which I ask leave to introduce is intended to carry out those amendments. In the first place, the designation of the officer who formerly was called the Superintendent of the Zoological and Anthropological

section of the Museum has been changed into that of Director of Zoological Survey in India, and this verbal amendment is therefore necessitated by this change of designation.

In the second place, the Director General of Archaeology in India, who is a member of this Board, by virtue of this sub-section, has no longer his headquarters in Calcutta since the change of Capital, his headquarters being now mainly in Simla, and therefore it is necessary that some officer of that Department, who is a permanent resident of Calcutta, should be nominated as a member of this Board. For it is obvious—it must be obvious—to all Honourable Members that Archaeology has a very important connection with the Indian Museum. Therefore, in addition to the Director General of Archaeology, it is intended to appoint the Superintendent, Archaeological Section, as an *ex-officio* member of the Board of Trustees, and there is the further consequential amendment that, instead of six persons being *ex-officio* members, henceforward seven will be *ex-officio* members. This in brief is the nature of the amending Bill which I ask for permission to introduce.

The motion was adopted.

The HONOURABLE MIAN SIR MUHAMMAD SHAFI : Sir, I introduce the Bill.

CANTONMENTS (HOUSE-ACCOMMODATION) AMENDMENT BILL.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF : Sir, I have the honour to move :

“ That this Council do agree to the recommendation of the Legislative Assembly that the Bill further to amend the Cantonments (House-Accommodation) Act, 1902, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Council of State and of the Legislative Assembly, and that the Joint Committee do consist of ten Members.”

The motion was adopted.

NOMINATION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEE.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF : Sir, I beg to move that the following Members of the Council of State be nominated to serve on the Joint Committee to consider and report on the Bill further to amend the Cantonments (House-Accommodation) Act, 1902, namely :—

The Honourable Khan Bahadur Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer,

The Honourable Sardar Jogendra Singh,

The Honourable Lala Ram Saran Dass,

The Honourable Diwan Tek Chand, and

The Honourable Khan Bahadur Saiyid Zahir-ud-din.

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION *RE* PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH ON THE POLITICAL FUTURE OF INDIA.

The HONOURABLE MR. V. G. KALE (Bombay : Non-Muhammadan) :
 Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution :

“ This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to convey to the Secretary of State for India and, through him, to the Government of His Imperial Majesty an expression of the keen sense of apprehension and disappointment created in the public mind in India by the pronouncement of the Prime Minister, in the House of Commons, regarding the present situation and the political future of this country.”

Sir, this Resolution requests the Government of India to convey an expression of the feelings which exist in the public mind in this country about the speech of the British Premier in the House of Commons, in connection with the position and the future of the Indian Civil Services. No speech of the Prime Minister—or for the matter of that, of any Minister—has given rise to such wide-spread controversy as the speech of Mr. Lloyd George in connection with the Services. Various and divergent views are, however, held with regard to the propriety or otherwise of the discussion of that speech in the Indian Legislature. There are some who say that we ought not to take the Premier very seriously. From the career of Mr. Lloyd George many people have drawn the conclusion that he did not exactly mean what he said in the course of his speech in Parliament. It is well known indeed that he is one of the finest phrase-makers that the British Parliament has at the present time, and it is said that, therefore, we ought not to trouble ourselves with regard to certain expressions which he might have used. There is no doubt about the fact that Mr. Lloyd George coined a number of phrases in his speeches in war time—I need not allude to these expressions which are too well known to require mention here. In the palmy days of his Radicalism, while he was making attacks upon the Conservative Parties, I remember he characterised the Conservative Government of the day in a very peculiar fashion. He was in those days inclined to attack the House of Lords, the Peers, and at the same time the licensing and liquor interests. He characterised the Government of the day as “ Government by Peer and Beer,” and I am quite sure that, if he had been in the Opposition at the present time, he would have characterised the Indian Government of the present time as “ Government by Threats and Assurances.” I am not, however, inclined to put Mr. Lloyd George in the category of another British Minister whom, we are told, we ought not to take seriously. My main reason for this is that we have a quarrel not only with regard to certain phrases and expressions, but the policy behind those expressions and phrases. There is another set of critics who tell us that any discussion of the subject in this House would be superfluous, in view of the explanation which has been already given in the House of Commons by Earl Winterton and also the rodding assent or the assenting nods of the Prime Minister with regard to that explanation. However, I must point out that those explanations are not calculated to give satisfaction. At this stage, I must freely and frankly acknowledge the transparent sincerity of the assurances of the Viceroy, and the deep sympathy which he has evinced in the assurances

which he has repeatedly conveyed to us, and we have not a word to say against the Viceroy's explanation or the attitude of the Government of India. On the other hand, the Government of India and the Viceroy are entitled to our confidence and respect for the manner of their dealing with this question of the Prime Minister's speech. In those explanations and assurances, as I shall presently show, there is one important question which has not been satisfactorily dealt with, and that question has direct relation to the policy underlying the reforms.

I do not propose to quarrel over certain words and expressions which have been bandied about in the course of this discussion. For example, the word "experiment" has been ridden to death in the course of this controversy. For the moment I may accept the word "experiment" when it is applied to Indian reforms. When reforms are introduced, when a departure is made in policy, there is no harm in calling that an "experiment." Is not British rule in India itself a prolonged experiment? It is an experiment—we are told a wonderful experiment. Consequently we ought not to be carried away merely by the use of such a word as "experiment." Mr. Lloyd George told us that the success of the experiment will depend upon the composition of the Legislature at the next elections. That is to say, the experiment will succeed or fail according as the electorates will return moderate men or non-co-operators. The non-co-operators are however of two kinds. There are non-co-operators in India who have kept out of these Councils and will have nothing to do with the Government and their administration. But there is another type of non-co-operators. There are non-co-operators in England,—those who are opposing the spirit of the reforms—and there are also non-co-operators that are to be found in the Civil Services. If the reforms fail, they will fail as much on account of want of co-operation on the part of these people in England and in India as for want of proper co-operation on the part of the Indian people. It is well known that at the present time an agitation is going on in the country, and it is no secret to anybody that people are trying to expedite the progress of the reforms—to accelerate the pace of the advance—and are asking for a further instalment of the reforms even before the due date which may be ten years. We know that the British Parliament can, at any time, if it chooses to do so, amend the present Government of India Act. Many have laid stress upon the fact that the reforms are a Statute and that they are not an experiment. In England, the constitution is not a written or a rigid constitution, and it can be amended by ordinary Statute. There is no distinction in existence as there is in France between what is called constitutional law and organic law, so that it is competent for the British Parliament to amend the Government of India Act, and in fact that is what is sought to be done when we want to accelerate the pace of the reforms. No doubt the Honourable the Home Member will have much to say with regard to what has been declared in the announcement of 1917 and in the preamble to the Government of India Act. He will tell us how further stages of reform are to be granted conditionally upon the co-operation of those in whom trust has been placed, how the British Parliament and the Indian Government are to be judges of the time and the rate of the progress, and how, in fact, further progress depends upon the success of the electorates, upon the co-operation of the people and so forth. I will, therefore, not enter into that question, but only point out that the Prime Minister has

[Mr. V. G. Kale.]

ranged himself on the side of those who are known to be the opponents of the reforms in India, and by his speech he has, I may say, laid the axe at the root of the reforms. I am not speaking of any particular expression that he has used. But I want Honourable Members to take into consideration the spirit of the whole speech, and with reference particularly to the position and the prospects of the services. I must guard myself against the charge of taking certain passages from the speech of the Premier, tearing them out of their context and erecting on the basis of these passages a superstructure of conclusions which are not warranted. I do not want to be frightened by shadows or pretend to show danger where none exists. I will therefore give a very brief summary of the Premier's speech, bringing into prominence its salient points. The speech is thoroughly logical. It goes from one step to another and I want to show where the Premier stops and does not proceed to the further logical conclusions which are to be drawn from the premises from which he starts. He sets out with the inauguration of the reforms, and it must be said to his credit that he says at the very outset that the reforms ought not to be prejudged. There is still time to consider whether the reforms are a success or not, and we ought not to be hasty in passing judgment on these reforms. The next point in the speech relates to British responsibility to the people of this country. He says that the British Parliament and the British Government are responsible for the safety, the good government and the well-being of the masses in this country. Consequently, the British Parliament and the British Government will do their level best to carry out the responsibility honestly and sincerely. In discharging this responsibility—that is the third point—the British Parliament and the British Government have associated Indians with the administration of the country. This analysis of Mr. Lloyd George is thoroughly in consonance with what has been said in the Joint Report. First of all, the Government was entirely autocratic. Then the autocratic Government said to itself : " Shall we not benefit by the advice of Indians ? Let us call them to advise us." Therefore, in the Legislative Councils of 1861 Indians were called to advise Governments. Then they said : " Let us have more advice." Therefore, in 1892, the constitution was modified in this way. Indians have since then been called to associate themselves in larger numbers with the government of the country in making laws and also in administering the affairs of the country. The fourth point of Mr. Lloyd George is that in spite of the increasing association—association perhaps of Indians in larger numbers and in larger proportions—the British Parliament and the British Government will never contemplate the final relinquishment of the trust. There is that responsibility, and the British Government is not prepared to relinquish that trust and that responsibility. For this purpose—here comes the next point—the existence of a nucleus of British service is necessary and necessary for all time to come—for generations to come.

(An Honourable Member : " No. ") My Honourable friend says " No." I am therefore going to quote the very words of the Premier and show what he means by the words that he has used. " We have invited " says the Premier, " the co-operation of the people of India in the discharge of this trust. We have invited them in increasing numbers and perhaps in increasing proportions. I think that that was inevitable. It was a

natural development." So far so good. Then he proceeds :

"That was an inevitable evolution but I want to make it clear, if it is not already clear, that that is not in order to lead up to a final relinquishment of our trust but with a view of bringing into partnership in the discharge of that trust within the British Empire." •

Then there is something further :

"Therefore I approach this question from the point of view of one who believes in getting Indians to assist us in discharging a very great trust and obligation which we have inherited and which I hope we shall transmit to our descendants in the generations to come."

So this trust and this obligation is going to be transmitted to generations to come. I have faith and trust in complete self-government for India which will come in the course of a few years. When that complete self-government comes, my question is, what is to happen to this perpetual obligation, this perpetual trust? What is a trust? It is something which is held for the good and the benefit of another. I cannot understand a trust which will never be handed over to the person for whose benefit it exists and who is entitled to its rights or to its property. A time must come, and if I understand the spirit of the reforms aright, they are intended to achieve one result—and this has been the substance of the declarations of the British statesmen—namely, that when Indians are fit for self-government, the British responsibility will be transferred to their hands: but here we have the Premier telling us that this is an obligation and a trust which "we have inherited and I hope we shall transmit to our descendants in the generations to come." He proceeds further •

"What I want specially to say is this that whatever their success"—that is to say, the success of the Indians :

"whether as parliamentarians or as administrators I can see no period when they can dispense with the guidance and assistance of a small nucleus of British Civil Servants, of British officials in India, this in a population of 315 millions and they only number 1,200. They are the steel frame of the whole structure. I do not care what you build on to it. If you take that steel frame out the fabric will collapse."

Lastly, one more quotation :

"There is one institution we will not interfere with, there is one institution we will not cripple, there is one institution we will not deprive of its functions or of its privileges, and that is that institution which built up the British Raj,—the British Civil Service in India."

If these passages mean anything, to my mind they mean that the Premier does not contemplate the transfer of real power to the hands of the people for generations to come. I put it to this Council and ask whether my Honourable Colleagues can contemplate a time in the distant future, one generation or two generations hence, when Indians will not be regarded as fit for discharging the functions of responsible government.

Now, look to the occasion of the Premier's speech. The occasion was provided by Sir Samuel Hoare's plea for the Civil Services regarding their pay and pensions. I must here repudiate in the name of the country certain imputations which have been cast upon the character of India when it has been said that members of the Civil Service are distrustful whether their pensions will be secured in the future or not. So far as I know, no responsible Indian has ever said that the pensions of civilians will be in any danger, and therefore it is an imputation and an allegation which ought to be warmly repudiated. Now, this request and this plea of Sir Samuel Hoare was perfectly reasonable, and I am one of those who would like our Legislature and our leaders to consider the grievances of the Indian Civil Services. If there are any grievances, if there is any improve-

[Mr V. G. Kalc.]

ment to be made, certainly let us give our best attention to them and make reasonable improvements in their prospects so long as we want them, so long as they are here, so long as their career will be in this country. Certainly it is our duty to support the services and remove any apprehensions from their minds with regard to their present position and with regard to their future. Sir Samuel Hoare was followed by Sir William Joynson Hicks, and he gave a new turn altogether to the whole debate. He referred to the rapid Indianisation of the services and he gave expression to the fear that the British position in India will be impossible to maintain if the number of Indians in the Civil Services will go on rapidly increasing. The Government of India circular about the services which has come to be known as the O'Donnell circular, has caused a flutter in the dovecots in England and in this country. Now, the Government of India have made it quite clear that the views that they have placed before the Provincial Governments in the course of that circular are not their views, and we must say that the Government have been quite frank, quite reasonable, quite far-sighted in the arguments and the pros and cons of the whole question that have been placed before the Local Governments. But many people in this country and in England have taken alarm at the prospect of an increasing number of Indians coming into the services and especially the paucity of British candidates at the recent Civil Service examinations in England. Mr. Lloyd George clearly took his cue from Sir William Joynson Hicks, and that is the reason why I say that he ranged himself on the side of those conservatives and those reactionaries in England who had been unnecessarily spreading false alarms about the attitude of Indians towards the Civil Services. Not only that, even the Viceroy has been bracketed by certain people in the English Press with Indian agitators. Now, this is the sort of work that is being done in England and I am sorry to find that Mr. Lloyd George, in his anxiety to give support to the Civil Service, fell a prey to this anti-Indian agitation,—and I may call it—the anti-reform agitation.

That is my quarrel with Mr. Lloyd George. So far as his assurances to the Civil Service are concerned, I have nothing to say against them, but he could have said all that without creating distrust and suspicion about the future of the Indian Reforms. We may ask, how is it possible for India to develop self-government, complete responsible government, in the course of a few years, if the "steel frame" is to remain intact, and if the functions, the prestige and the privileges of the Civil Service are to remain as at present? The Government of India have made it quite clear that some of the Civil Service appointments will have to be abolished, and some of the functions of the Service have already been transferred to Indians. It is futile to expect, therefore, if the reforms are to be real reforms, if they are not to be a mere show, that there will be a transfer of more control and functions from the hands of the British Civil Service to the hands of Indians. There are two alternative courses here: either keep the prestige, the power and the functions of the Civil Service undiminished and then there are no reforms worth the name, or the Civil Service will have to drop some of its functions, some of its control and some of its prestige. Practically, therefore, Mr. Lloyd George has thrown down a challenge to us and the question before us is, are we

going to take up that challenge or not? Are we not going to make our own position clear? The Premier has made an emphatic declaration about his policy and what he thinks should be the policy of every British Government with regard to the reforms for generations to come. Is it not our clear duty to make a declaration of our own policy or what we think is the right policy? So far as I am concerned, I think we shall be failing in our duty if we do not give expression to our views. We shall be helping the Government of India and even the British Government if we tell them what the feelings and sentiments of the people of this country are, and we have to show up some of those who are carrying on an agitation against the reforms misinterpreting the views of Indians, that they are misinterpreting the demands of the Indian people for further reforms and for greater power. I will not make a detailed reference to a certain memorandum sent to the Secretary of State by the Central Provinces and Berar Association of European Government servants. I would refer to it only for the purpose of showing the spirit of the agitation which is being carried on against the reforms and its connection with underlying ideas of the Premier's speech. Now, be it noted that this is an expression of views recorded in August 1922. The Association says that "It endorses the fear expressed by the Calcutta Association—and that was in 1919—that the Government of India do not realise the difference in difficulty between keeping order in the name of an all-pervading and apparently permanent British administration and keeping it in the name of a British administration which has narrowed its sphere to a very few reserved subjects, and is understood to be pasting labels 'to London' on its baggage".

Now that is the kind of views which are being circulated with regard to the reforms, and it is our duty to combat such views and make a clear declaration of our policy. These Civil Servants have not stopped only with giving expression to their own grievances. They are welcome to form their trade unions and demand more privileges or seek redress of their grievances. I have nothing to say against that, but they go beyond this, and they want to teach the Government of India, even the Secretary of State and the British Parliament what their duties are and what their attitude should be. And in this memorandum to which I have made reference, the Civil Servants have waxed eloquent over the civilization and the political history of India, and they have said that they cannot see any prospect in the immediate or the distant future of an autonomous India. They have given a long history of India, much of which is irrelevant. Now, it is for this reason that I venture to submit my Resolution to the Council, and in view of the arguments which I have advanced in favour of it, I feel assured that the Council will give me its hearty support.

The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA (Bombay : Non-Muhamadan) : Sir, it is more than five weeks since the Premier made his very ill-conceived speech on the subject of the Indian Civil Service in the House of Commons, a speech which has raised, and rightly raised, a storm of indignation in this country. In what he said the Premier has introduced an element of instability and uncertainty in the whole scheme of reforms, and which amounts to a direct negation of the principles and policy laid down in the formal declarations announced by Government. All honour to His Excellency the Viceroy for seizing

[Mr. Phiroze Sethna.]

two distinct opportunities to allay the Indian mind, and I may assure the House that the country at large has every confidence in the Viceroy himself and in the Government of India composed as it is to-day that in so far as lies with them they are determined to make the Reforms a great success. But it is speeches of the kind made by Mr. Lloyd George that give them a distinct set-back. After the reply which His Excellency the Viceroy gave to the deputation that waited on him on the 19th August, it was argued in some sections of the press that it will be useless to discuss the Premier's speech any further in the two Houses of the Legislature, and I believe that the same opinion is held by many after the further speech made by His Excellency the Viceroy only two days ago. But, Sir, the speech of Mr. Lloyd George has caused such a great sensation in the country, and the issues involved are so great, that it would be a serious dereliction of duty on the part of the Central Legislature if it did not voice the feelings and sentiments of the Indian public. It is absolutely necessary that the Premier himself, the British Parliament, as well as the British public, should know what India and Indians think of the Premier's speech and of the views expressed therein. Sir, in the reply which the Viceroy gave to the deputation he conveyed the 'assurance' of the Premier that in what he said there was nothing which would conflict with or indicate any departure from what was laid down in the famous declaration of 1917. With all respect to the Premier, I make bold to say that this is a clear after-thought, and it is perhaps the outcome of the insistence on the part of the Viceroy to appease the Indian public. The speech of the Premier was not delivered on the spur of the moment or without due consideration and thought as I hope I will be able to convince the Council. Some months ago when Mr. Winston Churchill made certain observations against Indians on the subject of Kenya Colony and India was greatly excited, we were told not to attach any great importance to the speech, which after all was only an effort of post-prandial oratory on his part. Such a defence or a similar defence cannot be put up on behalf of the Premier on the present occasion. The Premier's speech was made on Wednesday, the 2nd August. Only five days previous to that, it was publicly announced in the press. On Friday, the 28th July, in the Westminster Gazette, which is known to be a Government organ and in the confidence of the Premier, there appeared a paragraph with the headline in letters $\frac{3}{4}$ th of an inch in size reading "BIG SPEECHES TO COME", and in the body of the paragraph it was stated that the Premier was to make an important speech on India on the Wednesday following at the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill. After this, I hope the Council will see that the Premier went that afternoon to the House of Commons with the determined idea of expressing his own views, whatever they may be, and unmistakably, on the question of Indian Reforms. There is no mistake about his intentions, and in the reply to the Deputation His Excellency Lord Reading told his hearers that Mr. Lloyd George enjoyed the reputation of being able to express the meaning of his words more lucidly and forcibly than any other member of the House.

We certainly endorse this testimony and we say that on this occasion the Premier certainly gave very lucid and very forcible expression to what he intended to convey, and consequently no other interpretation can be

put on his words than the interpretation that is placed upon them by all India. It is not that this interpretation is put upon it by all India alone, for, as my Honourable friend the Mover just now observed, there is a section of the British public whom he called Non-Co-operators, who also put on it identically the same interpretation. Again, His Excellency reminded his hearers that they should attach some importance to the nod of assent which the Premier gave, when later in the afternoon, both Earl Winterton and Sir Donald Maclean observed that there was no intention of departing from the policy laid down. Surely, Sir, history is not to be made up by gestures of assent or dissent, but by the spoken words of statesmen which will live long after them.

We had a foretaste of this speech in what fell from the Under Secretary of State on the 17th June last when he introduced the India Office Estimates in the House of Commons in a speech that he made on that occasion. When Mr. Montagu resigned, we were informed, when Lord Peel and Earl Winterton assumed office, that there was to be no reversal of policy, and yet on the 17th June Earl Winterton in the speech that he made offered an apology for the European members of the Indian Civil Service and administered a very stern rebuke to those Indian leaders and patriots who asked for further immediate constitutional advancement, and characterised it as 'absurd.' I think, Sir, it was in the same speech that he observed that the present military expenditure was irreducible. That speech of Earl Winterton was evidently a prelude to the speech which followed from the Premier only six weeks later.

One more argument, Sir, to convince the House that this was not a speech delivered on the spur of the moment. What was the occasion of the speech? Sir Samuel Hoare enjoys the reputation of being at the beck and call of the Coalition Whip to put inconvenient questions to enable Ministers to reply and satisfy the public at large. On the present occasion, two points that Sir Samuel Hoare raised were in regard, first, to the feeling of insecurity felt by the members of the Indian Civil Service on account of the constitutional reforms, and, secondly, to their concrete financial grievances. Now, Sir, one would have thought that the Premier in his speech would have referred, and referred very particularly, to these two points. But a very close perusal of the speech will show one that he never came to close grips with either of these points, but flew off at a tangent and thundered forth his great eulogy,—an eulogy according to which in the history of no nation at any period of time there has ever flourished any body of men who have rendered so conspicuous a service as have the British members of the Indian Civil Service. Sir, he also took the occasion to warn India that at no period of its political advancement was it ever to rise to a status, even 50 or a hundred years hence, when it could decide that it would have no more Britishers in the Indian Services. That is the interpretation which the Premier has put upon complete responsible self-government as promised to us. Now, we Moderates, recognize the need of the presence of Britishers in the different Indian Services for a long time to come, and particularly during the transition period. We want them to stay as long as they desire to, and as long as we want them, but we certainly will not subscribe to the dictum of the Premier that the entire fabric will collapse if what he calls 'the steel frame' is removed. I have no hesitation in repeating once more what I have said in this House before that, if the Indian Civil Service is the best paid Civil Service

[Mr. Phiroze Sethna.]

in the world, it is also perhaps the most efficient. But I also hold that, given the same conditions of service, the Indian Civil Service of the future, whether it has in it a partial element of Britishers or none whatever, will continue to give the same fair account of itself as it has done in the past, whether the 'steel frame' be there or not. I entirely agree with the Honourable Mover—I think many of my Honourable Indian colleagues may differ from us—that the legitimate grievances of the Indian Civil Service must certainly be looked into. Sir, I said just now that the Indian Civil Service was the best paid Civil Service in the world,—I said advisedly 'it was', for it no longer is. Times have changed; Government themselves have recognized that, and consequently in 1920 they introduced what was called a time-scale pay. The time-scale pay seems to have helped the Civil Servants only in the earlier years of their career, and not later. When Government framed this time-scale pay instead of grade pay, Government thought that the artificial rate of exchange as laid down by them, namely, 2 shillings to the rupee, would continue, but unfortunately, as we know, it has not, with the result that in the remittances which the Civil Servants have to make, which I suppose amount to a large percentage of their income, they have got to pay 33 per cent. more than what Government calculated when fixing the new scale. Again, the cost of living has increased since the pre-war days from 60 to 90 per cent. But there is one particular item of cost in the Civilian's budget in which the increase is very high, and that, Sir, is the passage money of himself and his family from here to England and back. Knowing, as those of us do who travel beyond India, the increase is not 10, 20 or 50 per cent., but 200 per cent. and more. These, therefore, are legitimate grievances and require to be looked into. Sir Samuel Hoare was perfectly reasonable in this connection when he said that he did not wish to dictate what India should do or should not do. He felt that the question could only be amicably settled with Indian co-operation. He added that "after all, the Indian Civil Service existed not for the benefit of a few Englishmen, but for the good of the whole of India". British officials, I readily admit, have played a glorious part in the history of modern India; it is given to them yet to play a still more glorious part in the development of India into one other unit enjoying complete self-government in the British Commonwealth of nations. It is true that the old glamour has gone, or will soon go. In fact, "Servants" as they were called,—the members of the Indian Civil Service—was a misnomer; they were not servants in the sense in which Civil Servants elsewhere are understood to be; they lorded it over the people. The Civil Servants' work hereafter will not be spectacular; the members of the Indian Civil Service will discharge their duties in this country hereafter in the same manner as their namesakes in the United Kingdom or elsewhere. Either by a coincidence or out of sheer indignation at the Premier's speech, on the very next day after he spoke in the House of Commons, a retired eminent Indian Civil Servant, Sir Hamilton Grant, speaking to a very large gathering at the Labour Summer School at Oxford, presided over by a former Secretary of State, the Marquess of Creve, observed as follows:—"Let us not resent our loss of privilege, but let us face the position in good humour and drop all talk of holding India by the sword." The same Civil Servant at the same meeting expressed his wonder that there has been comparatively speaking so little

unrest in India, and equally wonderful in his opinion was the patience with which Indians were waiting for complete self-government.

I, like my Honourable friend, Mr. Kale, will not take up any single isolated passage from the Premier's speech and complain against it.

There is an under-current in paragraph after paragraph which clearly explains his own mind in regard to the reforms, and according to which India is never to attain self-government to the same extent as is given to Canada, to South Africa, Australia or to New Zealand. He referred to the reforms as an experiment; if he referred to Diarchy and called it an experiment, he would be perfectly right. I do not agree with the Honourable Mr. Kale when he says that the reformed constitution can also be called an experiment. I emphatically deny that. My contention is that the present reforms are but the evolution of the policy that has been pursued in this country for years and years, and are also an evolution of the institutions that have existed amongst us. It is therefore, I say, that it cannot be called an experiment by any stretch of imagination.

The Premier maintains that at no time in the history of India can we do without Britishers. My Honourable friend has quoted many extracts from his speech. I will not repeat them, but I will quote one. The Premier's exact words are :

"I can see no period when they can dispense with the guidance and assistance of a small nucleus of British Civil Servants and of British officials in India."

and he goes on by saying,

"There is no idea of winding up the British Civil Service and that we consider it not merely as an integral part of the system but as essential to the very life of the system."

I ask this Honourable House, after hearing these passages, how they can possibly reconcile the 'assurance' which the Premier has now chosen to convey through the Viceroy with his actual words which my Honourable friend the Mover and myself have quoted.

The Premier's speech is a great political blunder, and I am sure no one knows it better than the Government of India themselves, although they will not publicly acknowledge it; for, it is a blunder committed at a time when, owing to the collapse of the non-co-operation movement, the present was a better time for constitutionalism than ever before. The Premier's speech is nothing else but a tissue of platitudes, of old-world notions no longer existent or true, of extraordinary and extravagant praise of the British members of the Indian Civil Service, of undue exaltation of their proper sphere and functions in the scheme of Indian Government, and of statements absolutely inconsistent with the realization of the ideals of complete self-government.

Sir, some one has well said before that, when a politician makes a bad promise it takes a gentleman to keep it. Much of Indian politics turn round a promise. A promise was given to India in the dark days of the war to keep her quiet and given by the Premier, who, as His Excellency the Viceroy reminded us two days ago, was himself at the head of the Cabinet when the famous declaration was made. Perhaps the Premier in his greater wisdom thinks to-day that it was a bad promise; but it was a promise foreseen decades ago. Political advancement to Indians has been administered only in tiny homeopathic doses and very reluctantly with the deliberate idea of protracting the wardship. As far back as

[Mr. Phiroze Sethna.]

1823, a famous Governor of Bombay, Mountstuart Elphinstone, writing to the Court of Directors, observed :

“ If we raise the natives to an equality with ourselves by education and at the same time admit them to a share in their government, it is not likely that they will be content with the position assigned to them or will ever rest until they have made good their title to the whole.”

And India and the Indians now desire the British Premier, the British Parliament and the British public to know that this is exactly what we are determined to do, no matter how many more speeches the Premier or others of his kidney may choose to make, now or hereafter.

The HONOURABLE SIR ALEXANDER MURRAY (Bengal Chamber of Commerce) : Sir, I sympathise with the feelings that prompted my Honourable friend to give notice of this Resolution. For undoubtedly the first garbled report of the Prime Minister's speech came so slowly to us over the wires did lend itself to the creation of what my friend describes as feelings of apprehension and disappointment. And, speaking quite frankly, though the full text of the speech received some days later did much to dispel the misunderstandings and doubts inspired by the first messages, I must confess it did not entirely remove my feelings of surprise that the Prime Minister should have taken advantage of the Debates in the House of Commons on the Appropriation Bill to deliver himself of a speech on Indian affairs so liable to misinterpretation and so capable of mischief-making in this country. I was therefore very pleased to read His Excellency the Viceroy's explanation of the speech, and had no hesitation in accepting the Prime Minister's assurance that nothing in his statement to the House of Commons was intended to conflict with, or to indicate any departure from, the policy announced in the formal declarations and His Majesty's Proclamations. In view of this explanation and assurance and after hearing His Excellency's very decided pronouncement on the subject in his Address to both Houses on Tuesday, I am disappointed still to find on to-day's List of Business this Resolution of which I observe notice was actually given before His Excellency replied to the Deputation on 16th August. I have listened with great interest to the speech of the Honourable Mr. Kale in order to learn what good purpose, if any, can be served by pursuing this matter further, and am glad to say that I have heard nothing to influence me in forming any other opinion than that the sooner this unfortunate speech of the Prime Minister is allowed to sink into oblivion the better it will be for all concerned. I use the word “unfortunate” advisedly, for I do believe the particular debate in which this speech was delivered was raised with the best intentions, and that Mr. Lloyd George's well-known “gift of the gab,” as we say in Scotland, led him far beyond the specific point raised in the debate and indeed beyond his knowledge of the actual effects of the recent changes in India. May I quote the Prime Minister own words ? He said :

“ I should like to say one or two words with regard to the working of those changes before I come to the specific point raised by my Honourable and gallant friend because they have a bearing upon the problem which is suggested for our consideration.”

As we all know, these “one or two words” expanded into a speech filling four columns of the newspapers. Is it any wonder the Right Honourable gentleman wandered from his brief and made statements

which some people even yet evidently find it difficult to reconcile with his assurance to the Viceroy ? All the same I accept that assurance and am prepared to stand by it.

In the Resolution before us the Honourable Mr. Kale objects to the pronouncement of the Prime Minister in the House of Commons, in so far as it affects the present situation and the political future of this country. Whatever grounds my Honourable friend had for his objection at the time he gave notice of his Resolution, and I do not say that then he had not good grounds for wishing to discuss this matter on the floor of this House, I maintain these grounds no longer exist. The Prime Minister's pronouncement consists no longer of his statement in the House of Commons as originally wired out to us, but of that statement as qualified by his special message to the Viceroy. The Honourable Mr. Sethna says he stands by the Prime Minister's speech and refuses to accept the subsequent assurance. But why stand by the one and not by the other ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA : Because they are contradictory.

THE HONOURABLE SIR ALEXANDER MURRAY : Is the second not a retraction of the first ? Is that contradictory ? I cannot understand why Mr. Sethna refuses to accept the assurance given in the Prime Minister's special message on the subject. That message contains the deliberate pronouncement that nothing in his statement to the House of Commons was intended to conflict with, or to indicate any departure from, the policy announced in the formal declarations and His Majesty's Proclamations.

What that policy is we all know. No longer is it a pious expression of opinion, but a statutory enactment incorporated in the Government of India Act of 1919, and I am prepared to discuss that policy—I hope I shall be given an opportunity to do so—when the amendments to this Resolution printed in to-day's List of Business come before us.

Meantime let us consider the special circumstances under which the Prime Minister's speech was delivered. It was made during the debates on the Civil Estimates in reply to a speech of Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Samuel Hoare who desired to draw attention "to certain very urgent questions connected with the present position and the prospects in the Indian Civil Service." Now what was this position to which attention was drawn ? In reply to a question asked by Mr. Joshi in another place when we were last up here in Simla, the Honourable the Home Member stated that the percentage of Indians to the total strength of the Indian Civil Service was 13 per cent. only, (that was last year—I believe now it is over 15 per cent.)—but that according to existing orders, it was proposed to bring that percentage up to 48 per cent. You will remember the Islington Commission recommended that 25 per cent. of the superior posts of the Indian Civil Service should be recruited for in India. Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford in their Report on Indian Constitutional reforms (paragraph 317) suggested that this percentage should be 33 per cent., increasing by $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. annually until the periodic Commission is appointed which will re-examine the whole question, and that suggestion, I presume, has been accepted and is being acted on by the Government of India. In any event the Honourable the Home Member this time last year indicated 34 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. (being 33 plus $1\frac{1}{2}$), as the ratio at which the

[Sir Alexander Murray.]

appointments then being filled by Indians bore to the total number of appointments filled. On this basis 36 per cent. of this year's appointments should be filled by Indians. Now, what do we find? At the annual open examination which began on the 1st of last month, (one day before the Prime Minister's speech) only 20 out of 80 entrants were British. I use the word "British" in its most limited sense. That is to say, 60 were Indians or say 75 per cent. Another instance of where "the best laid plans of mice and men gang aft agley" as we say in Scotland! According to the Montagu-Chelmsford Report and the orders issued under the Government of India Act, Indians this year should be getting only 36 per cent. of the Indian Civil Service appointments and the British 64 per cent. How can this policy be carried out if sufficient British young men refuse to come forward? With only 25 per cent. of the entrants at the last examination British, is it any wonder that Sir Samuel Hoare and other friends of India should be growing anxious as to the future of the Indian Civil Service on whom they consider, and in my opinion rightly consider, the successful working of the Reform Scheme must depend for many years to come? I say, no wonder Sir Samuel, on the day following the opening of this Indian Civil Service examination, raised the question in Parliament, and to my mind his speech was a model of what a speech on such an occasion ought to be. May I quote his opening remarks? He said:

"At the very outset, let me make my position clear. I approach this problem with no sort of desire to question or criticise the policy of Parliament as expressed in the Government of India Act. I believe that policy was a right one, and nothing that I wish to say in connection with the Indian Civil Service is in any way intended to question that policy or to suggest that we were wrong in setting up the political Councils and Assemblies which were then set up. Indeed I go so far as to say that I raise this question expressly for the purpose of helping to make the Government of India Act a success, for I am certain one of the most important factors for success in the policy embodied in the Government of India Act is an efficient and contented Indian Civil Service."

These were some of the opening remarks in the debate, and I wish I had time to read more, as for instance where Sir Samuel said:

"I am very anxious that this House (of Commons) should not dictate as to what India should or should not do"

and again—

"After all, the Indian Civil Service exists not for the benefit of a few Englishmen, but for the good of the whole of India"

and again—

"If the grievances that I have put before the House (of Commons) were put practically and fairly to moderate Indian public opinion you would have it behind you in the improvements that, I think, ought to be made."

I make these quotations to satisfy Honourable Members that the Member of Parliament who raised this discussion in the House of Commons did so with no ill-will to India, but with every desire to be of practical assistance. I have no doubt some of you are thinking "Yes, that is all right, but what did the Prime Minister say in reply." That is quite true, it is not what a private Member of Parliament says, but what the Premier says that we are worrying about. The Honourable Mr. Kale wishes us to deal with the speech as a whole, and he has placed his interpretation of the speech before the House. May I now remark on the speech as I read it? Sir, what did the Prime Minister say? Let

us first take some of his remarks "regarding the present situation," to use the words of the Resolution. He says there is a great deal of uneasiness with regard to the future among our British Civil Servants and British officials in India; they feel their position is precarious and are uneasy with regard to their pay and pensions generally; and they want and need reassurances. All perfectly true, isn't it? Haven't the Indian Civil Service had good grounds for uneasiness? And although, as the Premier goes on to say, it is but natural that the great constitutional changes which took place should provoke some uneasiness in the minds of those who worked the old system. I for one do not believe this uneasiness is due half so much to the actual nature of the Reforms as to the reception accorded to them by certain sections of educated Indians, who, in my opinion, ought to and in fact do know better.

So far I am sure we all agree with the Prime Minister and with his further statement that the changes are in the nature of an experiment, and most of us probably agree with his conclusion that on the whole the experiment has achieved a very considerable measure of success. It is at this point that the Prime Minister breaks off to deal with the political future of this country—to use again the closing words of the Resolution—but before touching on that, I wish to lay stress on the portion of the speech in which emphasis is laid on the fact that the difficulty is not one of finding places in India to put Britishers into but, to use the Premier's own words, "the difficulty is to get men to go there." And it is from that point of view he is talking. He says so himself and I am thoroughly satisfied in my own mind that this is the key to the whole speech. He finds fault with Sir William Joynson-Hicks for making a statement which taken from its context and read by parents would have the effect of discouraging them from sending their children to the Indian Civil Service. He thinks it discouraging that this statement should be made at a moment when great difficulty is being experienced in getting recruits. He treats lightly the difficulty in regard to the Medical Service which he thinks will right itself; he puts the Indian Civil Service in a different category and says "it is essential that we should keep this Service." He promises to go into the questions of higher cost of living and of dear passages to Europe "because it is essential that young men should not be discouraged from entering the Service." In fact, for the time being, the mind of the Prime Minister is filled with the necessity for maintaining the high character of the Indian Civil Service. He can see no period when Indians can dispense with the guidance and assistance of a small nucleus of British Civil Servants—of British officials in India. To this statement, in particular, I notice considerable objection has been taken both inside and outside this House, but Honourable Members will please remember that here the Prime Minister is only paraphrasing what Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford said in paragraph 324 of their Report, viz. :—"We believe then that so far in the future as any man can foresee a strong element of Europeans will be required in India's public service." It is immediately after this statement, and in my opinion from this point of view, that the Prime Minister says that British officials in India are the steel frame of the whole structure, and if you take that steel frame out the fabric will collapse. Here again objection has been taken both inside and outside this House. But what are the actual facts? Is it not the

[Sir Alexander Murray.]

case that the whole structure of the Reform Scheme is being slowly but surely built up—on what? On foundations laid and maintained chiefly by generations of British Officials. Does any Member of this House doubt that if all these officials were withdrawn this year or next year, the fabric, as we know it, would collapse? And he is a bold man who looks ahead and indicates within what period of years the services of the British Officer in India may be entirely dispensed with! It is for this reason that the Prime Minister refuses to contemplate any idea of winding up the British Civil Service, and insists on considering it not merely as an integral part of the system, but as essential to the very life of the system. It is for this reason, too, and because he considers the most serious and most trying time is yet to come, that the Prime Minister endeavours to make it clear Britain will in no circumstances relinquish her responsibility to India,—that responsibility being, in the words of the Preamble of the Government of India Act of 1919, the increasing association of Indians in every branch of administration, and the gradual development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government in British India as an integral part of the Empire. To that end, the Prime Minister says the British stand by their responsibilities and will take whatever steps are necessary to discharge or to enforce them. To that end and in the discharge of that trust, the British Parliament has invited the co-operation of the people of India. For the Prime Minister believes in getting the co-operation of India in the government of the country, believes it strengthens the Empire and the hold which the Empire has upon them.

Sir, I have spoken at considerable length. I have endeavoured to lay before the House the pronouncement of the Prime Minister—in the terms of the Resolution—as I see it and as I would have my fellow Members see it. And having done so, I would now appeal to them, and in particular to my Honourable friend Mr. Kale, for whose political sense and judgment I have the highest regard, to accept the assurances of the Prime Minister of Great Britain and of the Viceroy of India—two of the most powerful factors for good in the life of India to-day. I beg of them to accept these assurances and to allow this unfortunate episode in India's politics to be forgotten.

THE HONOURABLE SIE BENODE CHANDRA MITTER (West Bengal: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, at the very outset I must say that there was every justification for the notice of the Resolution which the Honourable Mover gave, and but for the later pronouncements of His Excellency the Viceroy which conveyed to us what the Prime Minister really meant to say, I would have given this motion my whole-hearted support. I do think and I join with my Honourable friend Sir Alexander Murray in stating that the speech of the Premier was, to say the least of it, somewhat unfortunate and disappointing. Sir, before I proceed very shortly to analyse that speech I must refer to one point to which my Honourable friend Mr. Sethna has alluded. He has assured this House that the Prime Minister's assurances conveyed through His Excellency the Viceroy were mere afterthoughts. It is not for me to take exception to the words

he has used. But let us analyse and see what they convey. What is meant by saying that they are afterthoughts? Does it not mean that they are retractions? Does it not mean that it is a public disavowal of the interpretation which has been put upon them? If that is so, is it not a great gain to us? Does that not really take away the very basis of further discussion? I heard my Honourable friend Mr. Sethna say to my Honourable colleague Sir Alexander Murray that it has not been retracted in Parliament. I do not know whether any further occasion has yet arisen or will arise in Parliament when the Prime Minister can appropriately refer to this matter. For my part I am satisfied with his Excellency's assurances, and the sooner this unfortunate controversy is forgotten the better it is for all parties concerned in it.

Having said so much, I will now proceed, Sir, with the leave of the House, to analyse that speech very shortly. The Premier begins by referring to the great changes which have been brought about in the constitution by the Reform Act. I will just read two lines with regard to that. He says: "The constitutional changes have a bearing on the problem suggested for our consideration. These changes were of the nature of an experiment and they must be tried as a very great and important experiment." Now, exception has been taken to the word "experiment." It is no doubt an ambiguous word. But speaking for myself I do not see any very great objection to that expression. That was the expression which I find was used by Mr. Montagu, the sponsor of the reforms—by Mr. Montagu whom I think the moderate section of Indian opinion considers as one of the most liberal Secretaries of State that India ever possessed. That expression, I find, was used in the debates in the House of Lords by our distinguished countryman whose ill health we all so deeply deplore to-day. I mean Lord Sinha. If no exception was taken to that expression when these two distinguished and undoubted champions of our legitimate aspirations used them, is there any real occasion to-day to cavil at these words?

I now pass on to the next portion of his speech. The Prime Minister pays a tribute, and I think a handsome tribute, to what we, the Members of the present Legislature, have been doing. I do not think, Sir, there is any one here who will take exception to that. Then the Prime Minister proceeds to refer to what would happen if the non-co-operators were to get into power. What he says upon that point can shortly be summarised as follows. He says: "If there was a change of that kind, (that is, if the non-co-operators got the upper hand in the Legislative Council), if there was a change in the design of the responsible and chosen leaders of the Indian people, that would constitute a serious situation and His Majesty's Government would have to take it into account. Britain can under no circumstances relinquish her trust." Here again I say that you cannot divorce the expression from its context, nor is it the suggestion of the Honourable Mover or Mr. Sethna that you should do so. He then says:

"If Britain withdrew her strong hand nothing but strife, conflict and anarchy will ensue. If we are to withdraw, it would be one of the greatest betrayals in the history of any country. We have invited their co-operation not with a view to a final relinquishment of our trust, but with the view of bringing Indians into a partnership in the discharge of that trust within the British Empire."

[Sir Benode Chandra Mitter.]

Speaking for myself, I do not find anything very dreadful in these utterances or anything of a menacing character. Then he proceeds to say :

“ That he was one of those who believe in getting the co-operation of India in the good government of the country. He was anxious to make India feel that she was a part of the Empire. He was one of those who believe in getting Indians to assist in discharging that very great trust and obligation which he hoped we shall transmit to our descendants and generations. The success of this depends mainly on Indians being good Civil Servants.”

That, in short, is the first portion of his speech. Then comes a portion to which we do take exception, and that is the portion which is headed in the report of the “ Times ” as the “ STEEL FRAME.” Now, let us see exactly what it comes to. This is the portion :

“ Whatever their success whether as parliamentarians or as administrators he could conceive no period when they, that is, the Indians, could dispense with the guidance and assistance of a small nucleus of British Civil Servants. They were the steel frame of the whole structure. He did not care what they built on it, but if they took the steel frame out the fabric would collapse.”

We won't quarrel about the exact words, but what is it that the Prime Minister means there ? He says that he could conceive of no period when they could dispense with the guidance and assistance of some nucleus of British Civil Servants. If by that he means that there could be no period when by far the vast majority of the higher Civil Service should be Indians I for my part enter my most emphatic protest against that. If by that the Prime Minister simply refers to the fact that for many years yet to come, there must be a substantial element of British officials to guide us in our onward march towards our goal, viz., the complete dominion form of government, I have no objection to that expression. Taking the expression as it stands, he merely says, “ small nucleus.” Why should we put the worst construction upon that ? He has not said “ a preponderance of British element ” there at all. If he did say that, I for my part certainly would enter my respectful but very firm protest against that.

Then, Sir, comes the portion, the last portion of that speech which I cannot for my part explain or even understand. I proceed to read it :

“ Therefore it was inevitable that they should be strengthened, but whatever they do in the way of strengthening, there was one institution they would not interfere with or cripple, there was one institution they were not in the least going to deprive of any of its functions or its privileges, and that is the institution which built up the British Raj, namely, the British Civil Service.”

Now, Sir, speaking for myself, I take strong exception to this portion of the speech. To start with, it is not an accurate representation of facts as they stand to-day. The British Civilian has been deprived of many of his functions and of many of his powers. Therefore to say that at no time should he be deprived of his functions and privileges is going against existing facts and the Act of Parliament. If from the concluding portion of his speech we are to understand that no power of the Civil Service is ever to be crippled, I think the whole House will be with me in condemning that portion of the speech, because that is against the Government of India Act of 1919. But the question is, is that what he really meant to say ?

Now, let us come very shortly to the two subsequent events which are of importance. In the first place, His Excellency the Viceroy on the 19th August told the Deputation that there was no intention on the part of the Premier to go back upon the pronouncement of the 20th August 1917 upon the Reform Act which was passed in 1919, and His Excellency added that he had the authority of the Prime Minister to make that statement. Then comes another important incident, namely, His Excellency's speech on the 5th September. I will now read only one portion because to my mind it is of the utmost importance in this connection. After repeating the assurances which he had given to the Deputation that waited upon him on the 19th August, His Excellency proceeds to quote from his own Instructions :

" For above all things it is Our will and pleasure that the plans laid by the Parliament for the progressive realisation of responsible government in British India as an integral part of Our Empire may come to fruition to the end that British India may attain its due place among Our Dominions."

When His Excellency gives us that assurance on two solemn occasions and repeated that he had the authority of the Premier at his back, is there really any further necessity of any further discussion over this matter ? I for my part congratulate the Mover for having given notice of this Resolution. I for my part welcome the debate and thank the speakers who have preceded me for their speeches, for that has cleared the atmosphere, but the question that now remains for further consideration is, whether there is any further necessity to press this Resolution to a vote ? I have no doubt that when my Honourable Friend, the Honourable the Home Member speaks, he will give us further assurances that the pronouncements of 1917 and 1919 remain unaffected.

Sir, it appears that the Civil Service is somewhat unnecessarily nervous. I for my part feel confident that they will by their work in the future testify to their great utility and ability to which many of us bear testimony for their great work in the past. They will shew that they can adapt themselves to changing circumstances.

It will be impossible really to reach our goal, *viz.*, the attainment of the fullest responsible government without their assistance and co-operation. I quite appreciate that they may have legitimate grievances, and I am sure many of us here are at one with them in thinking that if they have any legitimate grievances, the same ought certainly to be considered but they must realise, and I have no doubt they do realise, that their functions, privileges and powers are bound to change as we advance more and more to complete responsible government.

Sir, I can quite understand the great feeling that has been roused by the Premier's speech, for we do regard the rights conferred upon us by the Reform Act as our *Magna Charta* ; we do guard the rights and privileges conferred by the Act with scrupulous and jealous care. We consider that that Act has placed an instrument into our hands by which we can work our own salvation. We consider that that Act has placed us on the high road to responsible government. We consider that that Act has enabled us to be in sight of the winning post. Therefore, if there is any attack on any of our rights and privileges conferred by that Act, it is no wonder that great feeling would be roused amongst us. But I ask

[Sir Benode Chandra Mitter.]

this House to consider dispassionately whether, having regard to the two occasions on which His Excellency the Viceroy has given us the assurance of what the Premier intended to say, *viz.*, that there was no intention whatsoever of going back upon that liberal policy formulated in the great declaration of August 1917, and in the Reform Act of 1919, is there any occasion now to carry this discussion further to its bitter end ? I venture to say that the position is the same as it would have been if the Prime Minister had sent a direct message to the Indian Legislature affirming the declaration of 1917 and the Act of 1919, for the Viceroy, as his accredited agent, has said so in a joint meeting of the two Houses. Is there any real danger to our rights ? I feel confident that, although there is a provision in the Act that if after 10 years the Statutory Commission considers that it is necessary to restrict or abridge or enlarge our rights the authorities may do so, it is not within the bounds of practical politics that we are ever going to lose those valued rights which have been conferred upon us, unless we, by our failure to cripple the non-co-operation movement, allow the country to be plunged into anarchy and confusion. Of course, if such a state of thing happens, action may be taken ; but such a catastrophe is most unlikely. Therefore, Sir, having regard to the assurances, I would suggest to the Honourable Mover that he should not press this Resolution to a vote.

The HONOURABLE SIR WILLIAM VINCENT (Home Member): Sir, I confess that when I entered this Council I was rather surprised to see this Resolution placed on the list to-day. I quite realise, as others have said before me, that when first the Premier's speech was published in this country it occasioned great misgivings in the minds of many. Since then two notable events have happened. On two occasions India has had the assurance of the Viceroy as to the meaning and intention of the Premier in making this speech, and I am quite sure that no member of this Council would wish to cast any doubt whatever on the solemn speeches and assurances of the Viceroy (Hear, hear). I want the Council to remember quite clearly that if they pass this Resolution, if indeed my Honourable friend Mr. Kale presses it, an impression might be created in the country that they are not only unwilling to accept the assurances of the Prime Minister, but also the solemn words which His Excellency the Viceroy addressed to the Legislature but a few days ago.

Sir, while I am speaking of the Premier, may I say I regret also that language should have been used about the Prime Minister of Great Britain which, to my mind, showed some disrespect, language indeed which has seldom been heard in this Chamber. I congratulate all the speakers, perhaps except one, on the moderation of their language and on the careful way in which their speeches have been worded ; but I feel some of the language used by one speaker was open to objection, in that it might mar the reputation of this Assembly, it might further create a false impression of its character.

Sir, if there is one thing that is essential for the future progress of this country, it is the good-will of the British people, and the sympathy, help and assistance of His Majesty's Government. It is from that point of view that I want this Council to consider the present Resolution. The

very basis of the constitution of this Council is that it consists of men of weight and authority, of sobriety of judgment, men who exercise a restraining influence on public opinion. It is from that aspect particularly that I want the Members of this Council to consider this Resolution, for any speech here expressing illwill towards Great Britain cannot but have mischievous effects.

Now, Sir, I want to proceed to the Prime Minister's speech. A great many people have discussed it, I am sure, more effectively than I can, but I do want to put before the Council the meaning of the speech as it appeared to me. In the first place, we have a clear warning. There is no threat—I have heard that word used in India—but there is a warning to a party hostile to the Government, a party that has really openly said that it desires, or many members of which have openly stated that they want, to sever the ties that bind this country to Great Britain and create an independent Republic here. I say that in the circumstances there was great justification for the warning. Can any one say that it was uncalled for? I want the Members of this Council to put themselves for a moment in the position of English citizens, in the position of the ordinary man in the street at Home who gets information by reading news which occasionally appears in the papers and from letters. What does he hear? We have had this country disturbed for over two years by one of the most mischievous political movements that have existed here for many years. We have had grave outbursts of violence, we have had serious rioting. In one part of the country at least people rose against the Government necessitating this prolonged use of His Majesty's troops, and that area has even now been hardly restored to tranquillity. We have had systematic attempts made to sap the loyalty of the troops. We have had endeavours made to boycott all British trade. Lastly,—no, there is one more thing, we have had this racial hostility, promoted I am afraid with great success, in many parts of the country. Lastly, we have had in some places despicable, though happily unsuccessful, attempts to insult the Heir to the Throne last year (Hear, hear). I do not think that perhaps it is realized in India what an idol of the people the Prince of Wales is throughout His Majesty's Dominions, where he has endeared himself and secured the affection and respect of all, and this is true not only of Great Britain, but of Australia, or wherever you may go in the Empire. Sir, what has been the effect on public opinion of this action of some despicable, disloyal Indians in the matter of the visit of the Prince of Wales? What do you think has been the effect in Great Britain? Remember too that all this was done in spite of very great patience and forbearance on the part of the Government of India. It was done in the face of the gravest warnings from His Excellency. Everyone was told what would be the result of any attempts to treat the Prince of Wales with disrespect. What was foretold has now come to pass. Sir, we here in India, with first-hand knowledge of the conditions, had gloomy forebodings as to the future. If any Member of this Council will look back into February or March and recall what his opinion was, he will admit that our minds were much exercised as to the future. Indeed, was there not justification for this? Now let me turn to one other aspect of this movement, and that is the power of the non-co-operation party. I do not want to exaggerate it; but if we are to judge from the paucity of the electors who went to

[Sir William Vincent.]

the polls last election and the numbers who were kept away by the extremists, if we are to judge from the ease with which Extremists are able to break up political meetings convened by Moderates, then indeed the non-co-operators must have a considerable following. Further, you have members of this party with a large following proposing in one part of the country a Moplah raj, in another a Sikh raj, and at another time separation from the Empire. We have had clear statements that if and when they come into this Council or into the Assembly, their sole object will be to destroy Reforms, to make the administration of this country impossible. Now if all this caused anxiety out here, if we were perturbed, what does this Council think must have been the feelings of those, 6,000 miles away, hearing the gloomiest reports, getting inaccurate, alarmist information on the condition of India? Is it not natural that they should be more alarmed and more exercised over the future of this country? And, in the circumstances, was not the Prime Minister perfectly justified in warning these Extremists of the danger of the course they were pursuing—a course that can lead only to ruin? I want to make this point clear, because it has been suggested, not I am glad to say in this Chamber, that this warning of the Prime Minister was addressed to all Indians including those who have helped to make the reforms a success. I believe that to be an entirely unfair interpretation of the speech. His Excellency in his speech recalled the words of the Premier to the Members of the Legislature,—words of hearty appreciation of the good work which they had done in promoting the cause of the reforms. But, surely, something, some indication of the dangers of the future, was necessary to those who persisted in opposing not only the British Government, but this Government and all the Members of this Council. To them the warning was addressed. Sir, if it is a mistake to overestimate the effect which the entry into the Councils of the Extremists would have, at the same time it is a factor which no one can afford entirely to overlook. I myself have always believed that in present conditions they would not be so successful in getting seats as they anticipate; I believe that the Moderate party in this country has made a great deal of ground in the last year or two. I believe also that if these gentlemen come into the Assembly, then they will find it impossible to disregard that solemn sense of responsibility which the holding of office necessarily involves (Hear, hear). I am not therefore myself afraid of any Extremist coming into the Council; but at the same time when men make the threats which they are making now, I put it to this Council, no Prime Minister of England, with the great responsibilities of his office, the guiding spirit of the British Empire, could safely disregard them (Hear, hear). I have said repeatedly, and I say it again, that the greatest enemy of progress in this country,—political progress, industrial progress, every other form of progress—is Mr. Gandhi. Who can blame the Prime Minister for putting to his party the dangers into which they are leading this country? I am told that he is a visionary, a man with the best intentions. That does not affect my opinion at all,—because there are errors of opinion, as was said by a great Pope which are more dangerous than sin. At the same time I do not take myself a despondent view of the situation; I believe that it is brighter, that the prospects are more promising than they have been for many years. I

believe that the non-co-operation party have lost much of their power; that their influence is waning; I do not say that this is due solely to the so-called repressive measures. I believe it is due more to the returning sanity of the people of this country (Hear, hear), to the fact that they have seen that the programme which the non-co-operators put forward is hopelessly unsound; that the goal which they have in view is one which can never be achieved by the measures which they suggest, and, in fact, that they were leading the whole of this country to ruin and disaster; and I know that that view is shared by many Members of this Council here (Hear, hear). At the same time an important factor in the situation has been the enforcement of law and order,—the protection of peaceful citizens, in their liberty, and in the exercise of their normal rights; and I am sure the Government will continue to receive the support of this Council in enforcing law and maintaining order in this country.

And here, Sir, I want to turn for a moment to the language of the speech. Let me begin with the word "experiment." I believe some—I was going to say 'unfortunate'—Member has put in an amendment about it, objecting to the use of the word. So perhaps I had better wait and deal with him when he puts it up.

Next, I want to turn to another term to which much attention has been drawn, the word "trust". There is one authority which I think no one in this Chamber will refuse to accept, and that is the words of His Majesty, and a clear reference to his position of trust is to be found in the announcement in which His Majesty gave his assent to the Government of India Act. I will quote the words:

"Ever since the welfare of India was given to us, it has been hold as a sacred trust."

There, on the highest authority, you have the use of this word. Mr. Montagu, whom it is the delight of this Council to honour, has repeatedly used the word in speeches in Parliament. And, in truth, has not a great trust been imposed upon Great Britain in this land? Is there not a subsisting trust, a trust to see that those who are settled here, that those who have served and are serving His Majesty here, those minorities whose rights may at any time be interfered with, are safeguarded in the exercise of their rights and liberties; that those who have lived here in peace and quiet, those who have stood for loyalty and the Empire in the past, should be protected in the enjoyment of their rights, in the following of their peaceful and lawful avocations? Are not their interests to be safeguarded, and has not His Majesty's Government a great trust in this respect? And what about the Indian States, and the relations of British India with those States? Is there not a trust there too? Surely, no one will deny that His Majesty's Government has a great trust, a trust of the most onerous character in regard to this country. But to say that His Majesty's Government has a trust is no negation of the coming of responsible government, and I venture to suggest that any such interpretation is based on a misconception of the position of His Majesty's Government. Here I want to make one thing clear, because it has been challenged. What is the meaning of 'responsible government'.....

(A Voice. "The Duke of Connaught gave it.....")

The HONOURABLE SIR WILLIAM VINCENT: I want to make clear what I believe to be the meaning of responsible government. It is a

✓ [Sir William Vincent.]

Government responsible to the elected representatives of the people, and that is the only form of responsible government that I can understand.

• May I now turn to the question of the Services. I believe there is great truth in the statement that the Services are the framework of the administration of this country. I do not care whether you use the word 'steel framework' or not. They are the people who have built up the whole of the administration here now; they are the basis on which it is being built; and they have, in my opinion, been great benefactors to India in the past. Nor is it surprising that they are disquieted. If you think for a moment of the attitude that is adopted towards them by many Indians, then I say that there is ground indeed for their anxiety. I am very grateful to many Members of this Council for the sympathetic way in which they have treated the work done by the Services, and on this occasion I am glad to include one to whose language I took exception just before. It has been said that when responsible government comes, their functions must change. Well, my belief is that with the advent of responsible government, these questions will solve themselves. If you once have an assurance that the goal of His Majesty's Government is the progressive realization of responsible government, then everything else must follow as a matter of course; and it has always been recognized that when the development of self-governing institutions is the declared goal of British policy in India, the tendency must be for the functions of the Services to adjust themselves to the new conditions and to approximate more closely to those of other permanent Civil Services. That is the answer to these charges that are made regarding the Services. But what the Prime Minister meant, and what many of us feel, is that the continued assistance of the British Services will be necessary in this country for many years. I do not say this in the interests of the Services, nor is that the intention of those who speak in England. In fact, the very suggestion is a very ignoble one. It is because we believe that Britishers will be necessary to assist in promoting the welfare of India and in forwarding the very cause you all have at heart, that I say that the continued employment of Britishers in this country will be necessary. If you take them away suddenly, if you remove this framework—steel framework if you like—what would be the result? I say this could not but lead to disorder, if not to worse. It is the policy of His Majesty's Government further that there should be a substantial British element in the Services, and on this we have a perfectly clear statement of the Prime Minister's. That does not conflict with the policy of the increasing association of Indians in the Government. You have only to look at the orders issued in 1920, which have been put before you by Sir Alexander Murray. Year by year the number of Indians recruited to the different Services increases very rapidly indeed. In the Civil Service, 33 per cent. rising to 48 per cent. of Indians are recruited annually. If you will look at the figures for this year, for the Indian Civil Service examination, you will see that there were 99 candidates, of whom 80 were Indians and 19 Europeans. Does that look as if the people in England were so anxious to retain the privilege of coming out here? I tell you the real difficulty is not a question of

increasing recruitment, but in securing recruits for the percentages already prescribed.

As to the Services however the real question before this Council is a very simple one. Do they want to abolish European recruitment outright? If so, let them say so.....

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA : No, no ; no one has said so.

THE HONOURABLE SIR WILLIAM VINCENT : One member says, 'no one has said so'—that true friend of the Britisher in this country, who, whenever any opportunity has been offered to him of attacking the British Services, of maligning the Prime Minister and of maligning the British, has been the first to seize it. If my Honourable friend poses as a friend of the British Services, then God save me from such friends, for I would sooner have an open enemy.

The question, as I said, is whether you want to do away with recruitment altogether. Now, the real object of the Prime Minister was, as you have been assured repeatedly, not to go back in any way on the promise of an increasing association of Indians, not to modify or change the policy enunciated in the solemn declarations to which reference has been made—the Declaration of August 1917 and the Preamble to the Act—or in the Announcement of His Majesty. His intention was three-fold. First, to warn those who are really hostile to the British Government in this country. Secondly, to emphasise His Majesty's Government's responsibility for the welfare of this country. Thirdly, to encourage the recruitment of British officers for India—recruitment which it is now difficult to secure. I know that many Members of the Services—I am not including myself—but many members of the Services sometimes wish that the inducements had been of a more material character. [*The Honourable Mr. E. M. Cook :* "Hear, hear."] I am glad to have confirmation from one who is one of the custodians of the finances of this country—I will remind him of this when the time comes. But I don't want this Council to believe that I think that pecuniary attractions are the sole inducement to Englishmen to come to this country. Nor do I believe that the idea of exercising power and authority is. There is, in addition to these, a desire to do some real work for the Empire, to serve His Majesty and to help this country on. If it is hypocritical to deny the more material motives, then it is cynicism to deny the nobler one ; and as has been said by a great writer of these cynicism is the greater sin for it emphasises the lower motives and destroys the higher ones. I have now explained to you my interpretation of the speech of the Prime Minister, the objects that he had in view, the fact that there is no intention of going back on any solemn promises made. And, in these circumstances, I want to ask where lies the duty of this Council? But, before I proceed to that point, I want to emphasise one aspect which is, to my mind, of paramount importance, and that is the effect of the decision of this Council on English public opinion. I believe that seldom, if ever, has there been a time when the assistance of Great Britain was more needed in this country than at present. British capital is essential for the development of industrial enterprise. Every year, both on Government account and on private account, large sums of money come out to India from Great Britain. The benefit which this country derives from

[Sir William Vincent.]

the investment of such capital is, I believe, incalculable. I believe that the continued assistance of Britain in Commercial and industrial projects is equally urgently required. It is indeed the very foundation upon which the whole commercial and industrial prosperity of at least one province is based. I believe that the association of British officers in the administration of this country is equally imperative for the good government, peace and tranquillity of the land. Lastly, I believe the protection and the help of the British Empire, of British officers in the Indian Army, is essential to the very existence of this country. It is in that view I ask this Council not to take any action here, or to approve anything which can only antagonize His Majesty's Government and still further harden the feeling in Great Britain against this country. Where does the duty of the Council lie? Where is the wiser course, where is the more statesmanlike course—the one most likely to promote the welfare of India? Does it lie in further exacerbating feeling, in alienating His Majesty's Government, in encouraging those who are hostile to Great Britain and the Government. Does not it lie rather in the other direction? Is it wise to make a pure dispute about words, now that the intention of His Majesty's Government is clear? Does not the wiser course lie in the direction of making renewed efforts to prove the wisdom and capacity of the people of India, to show that India is worthy of the great trust that has been imposed in it to justify the hopes that have been expressed by those who have the welfare of India at heart—by the continued and steady furtherance of constitutional reforms, showing that this Council is undeterred either by any extremist or reactionary influence. Sir, the success of these new Legislatures—these two Chambers and other Chambers too—has been frequently admitted. Mistakes, I dare say, have been committed by Government. Mistakes, I dare say, have at times been committed by the Legislature. That is inevitable. But I say that it speaks volumes for the character of the two Chambers that a scheme such as the present Reforms Scheme, so dependent on mutual forbearance, mutual co-operation, on patience and toleration, has succeeded at all. This Chamber has now before it a unique opportunity of answering the question whether it is going to proceed on the wise course hitherto pursued on the course of mutual co-operation and forbearance which it has hitherto followed with such success, or whether it is now going to abandon that wise attitude—give up that patience and forbearance and co-operation, and embark on a course which cannot but lead to mischievous results, and to renewed and increased bitterness in England.

Sir, numbers of charges and attacks on the Prime Minister's speech have been based on particular words and expressions chosen from it. It is not fair, I submit, to weigh the words of an orator in that way. It is not fair to concentrate on particular expressions, to examine the words as meticulously as if they were a Statute. You should really see what his intention was. Is this Council going to say that it will not accept as sincere the Prime Minister's assurance that there is no intention of going back on the promises made? Why should Members say that the one statement is sincere and the other is not? But, Sir, the whole of these attacks really resolve themselves into one charge, namely, that the speech indicates some

intention of modifying the policy of the Reforms as laid down in the Act. The Prime Minister has given an assurance that nothing of this kind is intended. The documents stand where they stood and only need examination. They have the same significance. These solemn documents, the Preamble to the Act, the Announcement of His Majesty's Government as to the increasing association of Indians in the administration, and the gradual development of self-governing institutions, speak for themselves. But the time and manner of each advance towards this goal is to be determined by Parliament. Further the intention of the Prime Minister is now clear, if it was doubtful before : you have received a full assurance from the highest authority as to his intention and meaning. In such circumstances, while realising that many Members may regret particular expressions I trust that this Chamber will definitely refuse to endorse a Resolution which can do no good and may do great harm and which will in fact impair the good feeling between Great Britain and India so essential to the welfare of this country.

The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA (Bombay : Non-Muhammadan) : May I offer a personal explanation, Sir ?

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Does it arise out of the speech of the Honourable the Home Member ?

The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA : It does. The Honourable the Home Member has chosen to refer to me sarcastically as the true friend of the Britisher, and he has added that I have always opposed everything with regard to the British in this country. I challenge that statement, Sir. The Honourable the Home Member may find fault with the language I used with regard to the Premier this morning, but I am glad, Sir, that there are others around me whom I have already consulted who find no fault with the language. I challenge the statement made by the Honourable the Home Member that I have consistently opposed British interests. On the contrary, Sir . . .

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Order, I will allow the Honourable Member to make a personal explanation, but it must not degenerate into a speech.

The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE SETHNA : All right, Sir. I only want to end by saying that both in my public and private career there has been nothing which the Home Member or any one else can point out to show that I have at any time opposed British interests in this country. On the contrary, I have always been in favour of the British connection, and I hold that the British connection is for the good of India.

The HONOURABLE SARDAR JOGENDRA SINGH (Punjab : Sikh) : Sir, I think I will begin by speaking on the Resolution first. Possibly the amendment will never come—that is, if the Resolution is lost.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : If the Honourable Member desires to make any motion which is in order, he can make it in his speech. In other words, if he desires to move his amendment, he must move it in the course of his speech or at its conclusion.

The HONOURABLE SARDAR JOGENDRA SINGH : In the first place I will deal with the Resolution and then take up my amendment. The arguments of the opponents to this Resolution, which was led by the Honourable Sir Alexander Murray, amounts to a kind of special pleading.

[Sardar Jogendra Singh.]

We have a strange sight. In the first place we have the Viceroy speaking out and saying that the Prime Minister knows what he is talking about. We have that affirmation from the Viceroy himself. Now we have Sir Alexander Murray coming on the scene explaining the speech of the Viceroy, followed by Sir Benode Mitter citing quotations as if he was citing rulings to prove that there was nothing in the speech which could be misconstrued. Then of course we have the moving speech from the Honourable the Home Member explaining the speech and appealing to the better sense of the House not to press the Resolution. He cannot define "Swaraj." And yet it was His Royal Highness The Duke of Connaught in the solemn opening of these two Legislatures who proclaimed that the aim of the British Government was ultimate grant of Swaraj to India.

What do these apologists mean? They say that the Prime Minister did not mean what he said. I think he meant what he said, and as the Honourable Sir William Vincent pointed out, he had three things in his mind,—a warning to those who were hostile to the British Government, a promise of hope to the Civil Service and I did not hear his second point and I do not know what it was. But in any case, the Prime Minister, speaking in the name of the British Government, did not use meaningless words. I think it is for this House, representing as it does 300 million people, to assert that it has a voice, and the Prime Minister of England, though not directly responsible, is at least indirectly responsible to these two Houses; that is why our two Houses should stand firm in their resolve and affirm in no hostile spirit without critical carping their determination to work for "Swaraj." We do not wish to impugn the assurance given by His Excellency the Viceroy. But we, at the same time, wish to assert that our ultimate goal is Swaraj based on the will and the wishes of the people of India. Without that will to achieve, I am sorry to say, Sir, that Swaraj will never be attained. Sir William Vincent in his very moving speech appealed to this House to accept the assurance that has been given. I am quite sure the House is assured. It is moving this Resolution not in any other sense, but to make it clear that India has a voice and hopes to attain responsible government within the Empire. Last year, when Mr. Sethna moved his Resolution asking for a small pittance from South Africa, Sir Arthur Froom stood out for the honour of India. I beg him again to speak in this House to-day and stand for the honour of India proving the partnership which is linking us all together. We are not offending anybody in speaking out the mind of India and making it clear that India will not rest till she attains self-government which has been proclaimed by His Majesty's Government as the ultimate goal of British connection. Prime Ministers may come and go, Councillors may come and go, but the King's word remains and we will stand by it. The King's word was put in the simplest possible language. In times of old, when the Government was not conducted by lawyers, they used plain language, and that plain language is used even to-day in the King's speech; and no misconstruction can be placed on it. Sir William Vincent again spoke of the splendid work done by the Civil Servants, and I am one with him in applauding their work.

I go further and say that they have a splendid future before them. There are great dreams to be dreamt about India. Let us dream them together and work in complete comradeship towards their realisation. I do not know whether the Prime Minister was happy in using the metaphor "the steel structure." The Civil Service is a living organism; and I am sure it will respond to the needs of the times and will not crack in the process. I regret more than anybody else the opposition which was offered here to the Heir of the Throne, but I think Sir William Vincent was not quite justified in ignoring entirely the welcome offered by the Princes and people of India to His Majesty's son and heir. It may be that a small section opposed it, but the entire population of India welcomed the Prince in no uncertain terms wherever he went.

Then again, Sir, a strong point has been made that if the Moderates fail, the non-co-operators will fill the Councils. There can be no doubt that the danger is real, but the danger would be still more real if the Members of these Councils fail in their duties, if they fail to give the service which the country demands, if they fail to secure what the country demands, and if they take their places here and become merely talking machines, dancing to the tunes which are set elsewhere. We represent the people of India, and if we prove ourselves fit to perform our duties, we have no apprehension that when the new elections come, people will trust those who carry out their wishes. But if we abdicate our powers, if we fail in carrying out the wishes of the people, there is no doubt other people will be elected who will respect the will of their electorates. It is only by performing our duty that we can secure the confidence of the people on whose will our elections will depend. To my mind the question of Civil Servants which has been brought into this Resolution does not arise at all. We all want Civil Servants. Any Government or any Legislature that comes here, will always require the best men that can be got, and when you get your best permanent officials, you are bound to meet their demands in order that they may do their work satisfactorily. It is not a question which needs any debate in this House or anywhere else. Sir William Vincent said again that passing of the Resolution will be considered an attack on the British people. I do not know how to meet the suggestion that in case this Resolution is passed, we will be acting in a kind of hostile manner to the wishes of His Majesty's Government.

I do not think that the Mover of this Resolution, or those who are supporting it, have any feelings of hostility in their hearts. All that they want to do is to show that India is not satisfied with the speech of the Prime Minister or with the meanings that have been ascribed to it, which require half a dozen men to explain it. When the Prime Minister of England speaks in the name of England he must speak clearly. Go back twenty-five years and it was then said that an Englishman's word was like letters cut in granite. To-day we have Mr. Keynes writing about the Prime Minister, telling us that he is in the habit of talking a good deal of folly and then trying to explain it. I think we shall be failing in our duty if we do not state that the word of His Majesty's Prime Minister has been brought to this pass that other people have to explain it. There was a day when the words of an English Deputy Commissioner were heard with great respect.

[Sardar Jogendra Singh.]

Why should not India state what she needs? Why should she not state in this House what she wants? Why should India close her lips and say, we are quite satisfied with the assurances that have been given to us? Why arouse a need for assurances at all? His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught gave assurances in his opening the two Chambers, and these assurances were quite enough for us. It was in that hope that we were working towards responsible government. What has the Prime Minister done in shattering these hopes? You ask us to believe that because he nodded his head he did not mean what he said, and that because the Viceroy has explained and because my Honourable friends, Sir Alexander Murray and Sir Benode Mitter, have given their support, we are to believe that the speech was meaningless. Who is going to believe that in this country or outside or anywhere else that the Prime Minister spoke at random and was carried away by eloquence?

Having dealt with the Resolution, Sir, I will now move my amendment.....

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : May I remind the Honourable Member that he must be within the time limit in moving his amendment.

The HONOURABLE SARDAR JOGENDRA SINGH : What time, Sir?

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Fifteen minutes. Ten minutes have gone, and you have five minutes left.

The HONOURABLE SARDAR JOGENDRA SINGH : The amendment is :
That at the end of the Resolution the following be added :

“ and that this Council affirms India's determination to attain Swaraj and to declare that the Reformed constitution is the law of the land and not an experiment as the Prime Minister seemed to imply.”

The meaning of my amendment is that India can only attain responsible government, if she is fit for it, and works for it. I feel that the Members of this House would be failing in their duty if they fail to affirm India's right to self-government as promised by His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught in his memorable speech in Delhi. What is more, Sir? It has been said that India needs England. I entirely agree that India needs England, but I would go further and say that England needs India also. Look back and see when has India ever failed. It was to India that England turned when it was necessary to rescue the Pekin Legations from massacre, when war broke out in East Africa Indian troops were found most effective for the task. Indian troops were flung into the battlefields of France and Flanders, and Indian troops are to-day ready to fight the battles of the Empire. If we claim partnership, we claim it on the strength of services which our Armies have rendered, which our men have done. The men who sacrificed their lives in the far-flung battlefields of the Empire are to-day asking and seeking self-government. These are the men who would be ready to pay the price to secure self-government in India. I am quite sure that the Prime Minister was carried away by the feelings of the moment when he spoke, but it is for India to assert that India is not altogether lifeless, that in spite of many castes and creeds it is

now expressing its will into one common focus and attaining a clear unity of purpose in the political plane, eager to share the perils and the advantages to the full in the Imperial partnership. It is this hope that should inspire the Indian Civil Service in the future. It is this hope which should animate the Government in India and in England. In moving this amendment, Sir, I call upon this House to realise what India wants, not what the Honourable Sir William Vincent said about injuring the feelings of the Prime Minister or anybody else. The Prime Minister and the Viceroy both are public men used to hear what people feel, and plain speaking has never done anybody any harm when it is based on good and sound motives, and that motive at present is none other than to take our stand upon the declaration made by His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught at the opening of the Legislature.

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

That at the end of the Resolution the following be added :

“ and that this Council affirms India's determination to attain Swaraj and to declare that the Reformed constitution is the law of the land and not an experiment as the Prime Minister seemed to imply.”

That amendment is now before the Council, and until it is disposed of, the speeches of Honourable Members must be confined to the sole question of the advisability of adding those words or not.

The Council will now adjourn till 3 O'clock.

The Council re-assembled after lunch at 3 P.M. The Honourable the President was in the Chair.

The HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI (United Provinces East : Muhammadan) : May I ask you, Sir, to give us a ruling on a point ? The position is that a certain amendment stands in my name, but I also wish to speak to the substantive Resolution. What I should like to know is whether I can move my amendment, and after that is disposed of, I can also speak to the substantive proposition or I should take up both at the same time.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Before the Council was adjourned, I know I explained to Honourable Members the point now before the Council. The matter for consideration is the amendment moved by the Honourable Sardar Jogendra Singh. On that amendment any Member may speak. When that amendment is disposed of, it will be time to consider whether the amendment which stands in the Honourable Member's name can still be moved ; but should I so decide it will be open to him also to speak on that amendment. Then when the Council is back on the original Resolution, it will equally be open to him to speak on that. The matter at present before the House is the further consideration of the amendment moved by the Honourable Sardar Jogendra Singh.

The HONOURABLE COLONEL SIR UMAR HAYAT KHAN (West Punjab : Muhammadan) : Sir, I will only speak on the amendment now before the Council. In this amendment reference is made to Swaraj. We have been hearing a lot about Swaraj, but every man has got a different meaning about it. As long as we do not know what this

[Colonel Sir Umar Hayat Khan.]

Swaraj is, we would not try and jump into the dark as it is very dangerous. As far as we know, this Swaraj, if it comes, is perhaps going to be an oligarchy of politically-minded people. If that is the case, we of course do not want that Swaraj. It has been repeatedly said 'cut short the army,' but it is the army which has won all these reforms. On the other hand, it is also urged to cut short the Civil Service. Why? because the members of the Civil Service are well paid and all the nice appointments, i.e., the loaves and fishes, go to them. How can we ask for such a Swaraj in which the best posts would go to those politically-minded people? We are already being disbanded, because some of them say that so much money is being spent on the army. We have been disbanded during the last two or three years and we are very dissatisfied. There is another thing about the experiment. Yesterday one of my friends was speaking about the experiment, and he said that it was Diarchy which was on its trial, and pointed out that these Reforms have Diarchy in them. If as regards Diarchy it is said that it is an experiment, naturally the whole thing is an experiment. I need not say this, but it was already said by one of my friends here about Lord Sinha how he used the word "experiment." If in the next election all those who want to make the smooth running of Government impossible, and, if they come into the Council, how would the work go on? Some Honourable Members of the Council will probably remember—I do not call them the extreme wing—some of them said that they were not going to bring forward any Resolutions, and though the next day's Agenda was full of Resolutions only one Resolution was brought forward. So if such men come in, naturally the Reforms will be an experiment and a very bad experiment too. I have only spoken on these two points, and I do oppose this amendment. I will speak on the substantive proposition later.

The HONOURABLE SIR ALEXANDER MURRAY (Bengal Chamber of Commerce) : Sir, I must apologise for rising again so soon, but the terms of this amendment are so different to those of the Resolution that I do feel justified in taking up more of the time of the House. There are three points in particular I wish to draw attention to. The first is that the Honourable Mover of this amendment invites us to declare that the reformed constitution is not an experiment as the Prime Minister seemed to imply. I have no doubt, when my Honourable friend, Saiyid Raza Ali, rises to speak, he will, judging from his remarks in this House yesterday, make short work of this declaration, but all the same I would like to say something. Reading through the Debates in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords when the Bill of 1919 was under discussion, one cannot help being struck by the unanimity with which every speaker agreed that the Reform Scheme was an experiment. To mention only the names of a few supporters of the measure—Colonel Wedgewood—to whose remarks following the Prime Minister's speech I think much of the present excitement is due—Colonel Wedgewood not merely referred to the scheme as an experiment, he described it as a "wonderful experiment." Mr. Ben Spoor more than once spoke of the "great experiment" and "the tremendous experiment that this scheme really is." I am quoting his own words. Sir J. D. Rees said : "This Bill is, of course, a great experiment." Mr. Fisher, one of the backers

of the Bill said : " We are starting a great new experiment " and Captain Elliot said. " There is no doubt that this is a tremendous experiment * * * an experiment which this democratic Parliament of Great Britain will need to supervise with very great closeness." These are extracts from speeches in the House of Commons.

In the House of Lords, Lord Sinha, in opening the Debate on the third reading referred to the " experiment which this Bill proposes." So did Lord Meston and Lord Carmichael, while Earl Curzon of Kedleston, Lord Islington and Viscount Midleton described the measure as a " great experiment." Indeed I would like to further quote Viscount Midleton where he says :

" I would therefore adopt the language of Lord Sinha in his admirable speech—I hope others in India will take the broad view that he took—and say that this is a great experiment which will depend on the manner in which those who are to have the working of it will work it out."

Need I go on quoting further, Sir, to justify the use of the word " experiment " by Mr. Lloyd George ? I may just mention that I remember a speech in another place to which I listened last September. In the Debate on Indian Autonomy, an undoubted champion of " Swaraj " within the Empire more than once used the word " experiment " and actually described the Reform Scheme as " a unique experiment." And may I add in that same Debate, the Honourable the Home Member, said " this scheme of Government is a new experiment."

Is there any longer any doubt in the minds of Honourable Members that the Reform Scheme was framed as an experiment, exists as an experiment and must continue an experiment until such time as we of the Indian Legislature, our fellow Councillors in the Provinces and the people of India generally make the scheme a success ?

That is my first point. My next is with reference to the suggestion that this Council should declare that the reformed constitution is the law of the land. Now, Sir, there is more in this than catches the eye. I have heard it said that the Council of State corresponds to the House of Lords at Home, but, so far as I am aware, none of the Honourable Members of this Council—until now—have ever thought of usurping any of the powers of the House of Lords, in particular the powers of the portion of that noble House which forms the ultimate Court of appeal and the last word in interpreting the laws of the land. I would beg of my Honourable friend to refrain from giving our detractors any reason for saying that this Council aspires to an importance out of all proportion to its constitution. Whatever the future may bring, Sir, it is not yet one of the functions of this Honourable House to declare what is or what is not the law of the land.

My third point is with reference to the suggestion that this Council should affirm India's determination to attain Swaraj. Sir, I can understand this Council affirming its own determination should Honourable Members so desire. But why take it upon ourselves to affirm India's determination. Speaking for myself, I am satisfied with the promise of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire as contained in the Declaration of 20th August 1917, in the Government

[Sir Alexander Murray.]

of India Act of 1919, in the King Emperor's Proclamations, in His Majesty's Instrument of Instructions to the Governor General of India and in His Excellency's latest announcement. Any suggestion that the British Parliament or the British people should desire to go back on the promise so oft repeated and confirmed is a reflection on the British that I as a humble Britisher indignantly repudiate.

I appeal to my Honourable friend to ask leave to withdraw this amendment, an appeal which this House I feel certain will not refuse.

The HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI (United Provinces East : Muhammadan) : Sir, I rise to make a very few observations on the amendment that is before this House. The points that are involved in fact in the amendment are two in number, first, a determination to get Swaraj, secondly, a declaration that the scheme of reforms that has been put into force is not an experiment, but an accomplished fact which is going to stay. I thought, Sir, that there would be no dissentient note sounded in this Council over these terms. But I find that objection has been taken to this form of the amendment by my Honourable friend, Sir Alexander Murray. Now I do not think my Honourable friend is right in reading into the word "Swaraj" more than it means. The Mover of the amendment made it quite clear in an interjection when the Honourable Home Member was making his speech that his Swaraj was identical with our more approved word 'responsible government for India.' He made it quite clear. If that is so, I entirely fail to see why any objection should be taken to the word "Swaraj." I do not think we need seriously be afraid of the word "Swaraj." After all it really means the same thing as responsible government, and I am utterly unable to see why this word should have been challenged. We are all agreed, I believe, more or less that responsible government is the goal of this country ; this country is already on the high road to responsible government and will in the fulness of time reach that goal. If that is so—and I think, Sir, we are all agreed about it—then I entirely fail to see why any objection should be taken to the first part of the amendment.

The HONOURABLE SIR ALEXANDER MURRAY : Sir, I do not take exception to the word "Swaraj" nor to the interpretation that my Honourable friend places on it ; what I take exception to is, why discuss it at the present moment, in view of the various declarations, proclamations, etc., that have already been made on the subject.

The HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI : That is not my own interpretation of Swaraj ; that was the interpretation put upon that word by the Honourable Mover of the amendment ; I simply repeat it. Then we come to the second part, that has given us more trouble, and on which I believe a stand is going to be made by those who do not see eye to eye with some of us. Chapter and verse have been quoted, and it has been sought to be made out that after all this word 'experiment' is by no means a new word in the English dictionary, it is a very old word and has the sanction of having been constantly used in the House of Commons when the Government of India Bill was under discussion in 1919.

I do not think I should agree with the Honourable Sir Alexander Murray in his exposition of the speeches and the interpretation that he

puts on this word as used in 1919. It is true that the word was used, but it was not used in the sense in which it was used by the Prime Minister on the 2nd of August ; in fact it is just that which has given rise to all the trouble. I do not wish to take up much time, but the Preamble to the Statute announces clearly what the goal of India is and what the declared intention of Parliament and the Sovereign was. Every one of us knows it, and it is not necessary for me to read it. It starts by saying :

“ Whereas it is the declared policy of Parliament to provide for the increasing association of Indians in the administration.....”

and so on. I want to make it quite clear that that is the declared policy. Let us face facts as they are and not quibble over words. It is the declared policy of the British Government in a certain manner to reach a certain goal. What is the goal ? Self-government. Then, in order to reach that goal you have to travel along a certain road. What is the road ? That road, fortunately or unfortunately, is Diarchy. I entirely agree that the road we have to take in order to reach the goal may be an experiment, and, as a matter of fact, is an experiment. It so happens that Diarchy commended itself to the authorities here and in England to Parliament ; instead of Diarchy some other device might have been adopted, and that device no doubt would have been equally an experiment. But is it fair to call the whole declared policy of the British Government, as embodied in the Preamble to the Statute, an experiment ? In that respect, I submit it is not. It cannot bear that interpretation in the light of the Preamble ; of the Declaration of the 20th of August 1917, and also of the King-Emperor's Declaration with which His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught opened the Session of the Legislature in the early part of last year. Assuming for a moment that the Honourable Sir Alexander Murray is right in his interpretation of the word “ experiment,” I put it to you, Sir, and to the House, is it fair, is it right, is it real statesmanship to give unnecessary offence to the people by reminding them that this is an experiment ? It is an experiment which has been in force for the past 18 months, and at the same time it is an experiment which, according to the speech of the Prime Minister himself, has very largely succeeded. If these are the facts, I put it to you, Sir, is it any use to provoke people by saying, “ you have to remember that this is after all an experiment.” To do so is to wound feelings for nothing. With these remarks I safely leave this amendment to the care of this House.

The HONOURABLE MR. E. L. L. HAMMOND (Bihar and Orissa : Nominated) : We have just listened to an interesting dissertation from the Honourable Mr. Raza Ali as to when an experiment is not an experiment, and that is when the word is used by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister. I ask the House quite seriously, when you endow the *chamar* and the *dhobi* with a vote, is that or is it not an experiment ? It may be successful or it may be unsuccessful, but it is obviously an experiment.

The HONOURABLE SIR LESLIE MILLER (Madras : Nominated non-official) : Sir, there are two small points upon which I oppose this amendment. One of them is this matter of “ experiment.” I am convinced that, if the Honourable Mover had been here just now, he would also have been convinced by the weight of authority against him that the reformed constitution is an experiment. His amendment suggests to us to declare, in

[Sir Leslie Miller.]

the face of the Prime Minister's assertion to the contrary, that it is not an experiment. This is somewhat rude to the Prime Minister, but apart from that, there is no doubt in my mind whatever that it is an experiment, and that the weight of authority is in favour of that interpretation. I quite agree—or perhaps I almost agree with the Honourable Mr. Saiyid Raza Ali that the policy of the British Government cannot properly be described as an experiment. But that is not the amendment. The amendment asks us to declare that the reformed constitution is not an experiment, and therefore it asks us to declare what is not true. I am quite sure that the Honourable Mover does not want us to do that, and I have very little doubt, had he been in his place when Sir Alexander Murray was speaking, he would have by this time asked your leave, Sir, to withdraw the amendment.

The other point is perhaps more important. The Honourable Mover in the course of his speech asked us, as I understood him, to accept his amendment as an invitation to us to assure the Prime Minister of the co-operation of the people of India in the work of accelerating their progress towards responsible government. I am afraid it is difficult to do that. If that be the true meaning of the amendment, then I take it that it is entirely superfluous, and on that ground I should oppose it. But I venture to say with confidence that not one single Member who read that amendment on the paper ever had the slightest idea that it represented an assurance to the Prime Minister of the co-operation of the people of India. On the contrary, I myself have read it over and over again, and I am convinced that it contains, not an assurance of co-operation, but rather a threat of non-co-operation. It amounts to this, as any ordinary person would read it, "Let us tell the Prime Minister that if he will not give us Swaraj we will take it." Sir, I am clear on that point; that is I believe what it means to those of us who have ordinary intelligence sufficient to enable us to understand the English language. It is undoubtedly a language which lends itself to ambiguity, but I cannot conceive that if my Honourable friend had intended to convey an assurance of co-operation to the Prime Minister, he would have couched his amendment in the words in which he has couched it. Now, Sir, it has been very recently pointed out, and it is a matter which is plain from the Act of 1919, on which the Honourable Member relies as the law of the land, that according to that Act he cannot obtain what he calls Swaraj for British India without the concurrence and without the sympathy and good-will of the British Parliament.

That is our constitution, experimental, tentative, temporary, what you like. It is our constitution at present. If, then, we tell the Prime Minister or anybody else that, if the British Parliament will not give us Swaraj, we will take it, we will make what appears to me to be the most senseless kind of a threat—a futile threat which we cannot by any possibility under our constitution carry into effect. That such a threat should emanate from this House to the British Parliament seems to me to be inconceivable, and, if any Member agrees with me that that is the effect of the amendment, I have no doubt that he will do his best to oppose it. We have all heard that curses come home to roost. We have also heard of "bloody instructions which being taught return to plague the inventor." I confess, Sir, that I am under some apprehension that the powers which regulate these matters of destiny may apply similar or analogous methods of reprisal

to futile menaces. It is hinted in the speech, I think, of the Honourable Sir William Vincent, that that might be the effect of our passing even a comparatively harmless Resolution like the one which we are now asked to amend. Sir, if this House desires to alienate the sympathy and the goodwill of the British people, if that is its desire, I find it difficult to conceive any better means of accomplishing that object than by threatening it as this amendment threatens it. That it will have that effect I have not the slightest doubt, and I venture to hope that no Member of this House will go so far as to support an amendment which has that effect.

Sir, I have one word more. The declaration which we are asked to make is really a declaration that we are prepared to throw over the constitution,—a declaration that the law of the land—what is admitted by the Honourable Mover to be the law of the land—is not binding upon the people of India. Sir, let that declaration be made outside this House. Surely it cannot be made here ?

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : If the Honourable Sardar Jogendra Singh now desires to make a personal explanation, he is at liberty to do so. It must be a *personal* explanation.

THE HONOURABLE SARDAR JOGENDRA SINGH : I have just one word to say, Sir. I must have expressed myself very clumsily if my amendment can be treated as a threat. I merely made a statement of fact, that this House should slowly win Swaraj, and it cannot come from outside.

THE HONOURABLE SIR WILLIAM VINCENT : Sir, I should hardly have troubled the Council on this amendment if I had not said that I would deal with it at a later stage when I spoke this morning. Now, let us take this word, "experiment." It means testing, proving the capacity of the people. In that sense, Reforms certainly are an experiment. It is assumed in the Honourable Member's amendment that the fact that the reformed constitution is an experiment is inconsistent with the fact that it is the law of the land. There is no true inconsistency at all. There is no question about the fact that the reformed constitution is a part of the law of the land and it is also, as has been said by dozens of people, an experiment. An experiment of the very greatest moment. So many authorities have been cited about this that I am really loth—I hardly feel I ought—to add to them. But one great authority I will add. And that is Lord Bryce. I suppose he is a man who knows more about democracies than almost anyone in Europe—(did know.—I should have said). And he speaks of this Act in 1919 as a most interesting experiment. He did not mean something derogatory to India or to the East. That is not so at all. Why, Honourable Members who will read the speech which the Prime Minister delivered in February will find, when speaking of western countries, he said, "Democracy is a western experiment and in the full sense it is only a recent experiment in the West." Now, is not it idle on these circumstances to attack a speech on the ground that a word of this character is used ? I think what really lies at the bottom of this attack is what was put by Mr. Kale in the earlier part of the debate, when he suggested that there was a threat in the Prime Minister's speech that, if at the next election, the composition of the Chamber altered, then there would necessarily follow some change in the

[Sir William Vincent.]

constitution. Now, I do not believe that anyone who reads the Prime Minister's words on that point can possibly support the interpretation which the Honourable Member puts on them. What he did say was that, if certain persons (as I interpret it) came into the Council, simply in order to attain some purpose which is detrimental to British rule and subversive of the whole system upon which India has been governed—if there was a change of that character in the Legislature, in the purpose and in the design of the chosen responsible leaders, that it would create a serious situation which His Majesty's Government would have to take into account. Now, really, when all is said and done, is that a very unjust thing to say? Would it not be a very serious position? If the people did come in and with the purpose of ruining the whole reform scheme, would not every man have to take it very seriously in regard? Well, that is really all I have to say on this question of experiment—it is a dead bird. There is nothing in it. I am not going to waste the time of the Council any more over it. But I want to go on to another part, and that is another part of the Resolution which seeks to affirm India's determination to attain Swaraj. The Honourable Mr. Raza Ali has to-day told us what Swaraj is. He has stepped in where many angels have feared to tread. I have seen a good many questions asked in vain in the press to various people as to what exactly they mean by Swaraj. Why, it was only a few days ago that a very able man—a great opponent of Government—Mr. C. R. Dass—was put up to define Swaraj. I don't think that he put the same interpretation on it that the Honourable Member does. I myself have often been asked what exactly Extremists mean by Swaraj. If however Swaraj means self-government—responsible government, if the object of this Resolution merely is to re-affirm the policy stated in the Preamble of the Act—and that is really what I believe is the Honourable Member's desire—namely, to re-assert that it is the aim of India to secure the gradual development of self-governing institutions, with a view to the realisation of responsible government in British India as an integral part of the British Empire, then indeed Mr. Raza Ali is quite right, and there is very little between us on this point. But the amendment is so unfortunately worded and so superfluous, that I cannot believe the Honourable Member will press it on the Council any further.

The HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY (Central Provinces: General) : Sir, I wish to add only one word to what has fallen from the Honourable the Home Member in connection with this amendment. The Honourable Member has quoted the authority of Lord Bryce for the purpose of proving that the reformed constitutions is not the law of the land but an experiment. We need not go so far in search of authorities. The very constitution that gave the reforms has made the matter absolutely clear. I draw the Honourable Member's attention to section 41 of the Government of India Act, 1919, sanctioning the reforms. I shall read the section as it has a bearing in this connection, and I am sure my Honourable friend will withdraw his amendment after he hears this section. Section 41 says :—

“(1) At the expiration of ten years after the passing of this Act the Secretary of State, with the concurrence of both Houses of Parliament, shall submit for the approval of His Majesty the names of persons to act as a commission for the purposes of this section.

(2) The persons whose names are so submitted, if approved by His Majesty, shall be a Commission for the purpose of inquiring into the working of the system of government, the growth of education and the development of representative institutions in British India and matters connected therewith, and the Commission shall report (my Honourable friend will mark these words) as to whether and to what extent it is desirable to establish the principle of responsible government, or to extend modify or restrict the degree of responsible government then existing therein.*

I think the law is perfectly clear. The Reformed Constitution is the law of the land only for the period of ten years. The Imperial Parliament has the right to modify, restrict or alter it, which absolutely proves the experimental and provisional character of the reforms.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : I think the Council is now in a position to come to a decision on this amendment. The Question is that at the end of the Resolution the following be added :

“ and that this Council affirms India's determination to attain Swaraj and to declare that the Reformed constitution is the law of the land and not an experiment as the Prime Minister seemed to imply.”

The motion was negatived.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The Council is now back on the Resolution.

The HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI : I think, Sir, that so far as my amendment* is concerned, being almost identical in terms with the Honourable Sardar Jogendra Singh's amendment, it need not be taken.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The Honourable Member has confirmed me in my own opinion.

The HONOURABLE SIR ARTHUR FROMM (Bombay Chamber of Commerce) : Sir, in common with several other Members of this House, I must confess that, when I received from the Honourable Secretary of this Council a list of the Resolutions set down for discussion, I was considerably amazed to find amongst them Resolutions framed round the speech made by the Prime Minister of Great Britain in the House of Commons on the 2nd August this year. No one, I think, will be more astonished than the Prime Minister himself at the outcry which his speech has created. I should however like to bring back the House to a calm realisation of what Mr. Lloyd George's speech actually was about.

Unfortunately this speech aroused a feeling of distrust in certain Indian political circles that there would be a change of policy on the part of the Home Government with regard to the scheme of reforms for the governing of this country. With this feeling of uneasiness, as we all know, a number of members of the Legislative Assembly and of other Councils formed themselves with others into a deputation and took their troubles to His Excellency the Viceroy. I think that the Honourable Members of this Council will agree with me that this action was at once wise and prudent. The accessibility of the Viceroy to all is well recognised throughout India, and those who were uneasy in their minds did well

* That for the words “ in the House of Commons regarding the present situation and the political future of the country ” the following be substituted :

“ and this Council's determination to secure full responsible government for India at the earliest possible opportunity.”

[Sir Arthur Froom.]

and rightly to seek his advice and help. Well, Sir, those who have read with care the reply of the Viceroy to the address of the deputation will at once have recognised that the advice, good advice, they sought for was tendered without stint and that the help they desired was given sympathetically. The questions asked were clearly and definitely answered and the doubts in the minds of many were shown to be groundless. What more could be desired then? What more could be desired now?

Therefore, Sir, as I have said, I was considerably amazed to find among the Resolutions set down for discussion in this Council one of the nature of that brought forward by the Honourable Mr. Kale, and I was still further astounded to find on the list of business for to-day the amendments which we have just disposed of.

Again, but two days ago we listened to the clear, wise and statesman-like utterances of the Viceroy dealing with the very subject under debate now, and I must admit that I anticipated the withdrawal of this Resolution would follow. However, if there are still doubts, if there is still uneasiness in the minds of any and the doubts and uneasiness are dispelled by this discussion, then, Sir, I consider the debate will not have been in vain.

Now, Sir, we in this Council deal with facts, not with fancies. We have established a reputation for some success in that respect, and that makes me hope that we shall not depart from the good rule on the present occasion. The facts in this case are those to which our attention was forcibly directed last Tuesday. They are guarantees, laid down in one of the most binding documents that could possibly be offered, of the security of the constitutional position here in India, guarantees which my Honourable colleagues accepted as sound and good when they consented to sit in this House and took the oath. The fancies from which some of us are suffering are figments of the imagination arising from consideration of isolated passages in the Premier's speech without relation to their context or to the special circumstances under which the speech was delivered.

The Premier spoke as the representative of the British Government, not to throw down a challenge to the reforms as suggested by my Honourable friends Mr. Kale and Mr. Sethna, and here, Sir, I should like to express the hope—and I am sure that the Honourable Members of this House are with me in this—the hope that when this debate closes, there will remain no feeling of bitterness between those who have taken part in this discussion. I mention this in connection with some criticisms which have been levelled at the Honourable Member who sits very nearly directly behind me.

I have known the Honourable Member for many years and I am sure that he at no time has entertained any feelings of animosity against the British in India whether in the Services or in the commercial walk of life. (Hear, hear). My Honourable Friend as we all know is an eloquent speaker and perhaps when soaring into the realms of eloquence he has at times conveyed a wrongful impression of his real feelings towards the British. When any speaker soars into the realms of eloquence, and his eloquence is criticised afterwards, incorrect conclusions are apt to be

arrived at. (*The Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali* :—Like Mr. Lloyd George). I am just coming to that. The Honourable Member has anticipated me, and it was this eloquence, if I may be allowed to continue,—it was this eloquence on the part of the Premier which has led to this debate to-day. I should like to tell the House, Sir, that I was in London when this memorable speech was made, and the day before I happened to meet one who is in close contact with the Premier and he told me that on the morrow the Premier was going to make a speech concerning the Services in India. The realms of eloquence perhaps led Mr. Lloyd George further afield and led, as I said before, to this extensive debate to-day in this Council.

The Premier spoke to re-assure the British Members of the public services in this land, and I make bold to say that no right-minded man can deny that there was reason for such a re-assurance. The principle of the Indianisation of the Services has been conceded in the plainest possible and liberal terms, yet members of the Legislature have over and over again raked up this question and have addressed themselves to it in a manner which not unnaturally has caused in the minds of many devoted British Officials in this country the impression that the power which has been handed over to the unofficial majority in the Legislature is a power hostile to them and might at some time be used for the curtailment of their legitimate advancement if not for their ejection from their posts altogether.

This attitude of the Legislature has had its counterpart in an intensely embittered form in the agitation which the non-co-operators are leading against the British members of the public services in many a city, town and village throughout India. Is it surprising therefore that many British members entertain an apprehension of their future? What wonder can there be at a reluctance on the part of British lads to offer themselves for service in this country?

I ask my Colleagues in this House what has been done to allay this atmosphere of doubt and uncertainty in the public services? In the many Resolutions that have been passed in the Legislature on the question of Indianisation, there have been but few expressions of appreciation of what the British members of the services have done for India in the past and yet fewer acknowledgments that there is still need for their continued service in this country.

Yet I believe there is not a reasonable politician in India who does not recognise both the good work that the British services have done for India and the necessity for the continuance of their help for very many years to come. I believe more. I believe that if the Extremists won the next general election, obtained a majority in the Legislature and attempted to use it for turning every Englishman out of the services, there would be an outburst of protest by the great majority of Indian public men throughout India. But I confess that the Moderate or Liberal politicians of the country have yet shown little inclination to face the Extremists in open fight and begin a campaign to turn them out of the dominating position that they are still able to claim they hold in various parts of the country.

[Sir Arthur Froom.]

I say that since the reform scheme was inaugurated the British member of the Indian public services has received little encouragement from the Indian Legislature which shares the position of employer in regard to him. I say that the Premier had to speak because the Legislature would not. And I say that, while many words of praise have been said about the work of the Indian Legislature since it was inaugurated in the present form, this fact is a weighty consideration on the other side of the account.

I have the constitutional progress of India sincerely at heart. I believe that there are in India constructive elements which justify firm hope in that direction. But I appeal to my Honourable friends in this House to recognise that the encouragement of an important section—the British section—of their public services is a matter in which there has been some neglect in the past and to express warmly their friendly feeling to the British servants in this country and their determination to consider their rights and claims for justice and support in the most cordial manner. If that change can evolve out of the present commotion great good will have been done. The present not-unreasonable apprehension will be allayed. More—an impression will be made in England that will stand the Legislature in good stead when next the development of the constitutional position in India comes before Parliament for consideration.

The HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI : Sir, I feel that I would be failing in my duty if I refrained from giving expression to the deep feelings of resentment that have been caused from end to end in this country by the speech made by the Prime Minister on the 2nd of last month. Sir, my idea was to say a few words in support of the Resolution on the merits, but since the Honourable the Home Member spoke on the subject on behalf of Government, I must say that a different aspect has been put on the Resolution inasmuch as in the remarks by which the Home Member prefaced his speech he, without making any serious attempt to justify the lengths to which the Prime Minister had gone, tried to soften down the rigour of the words used by the Prime Minister and wanted to make out that after all, having regard to what had been happening in this country during the last eighteen months or more it was not such an unnatural thing for the British Prime Minister to speak in the vein in which he had actually spoken.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent tried to point out vigorously, that the speech was in the first instance meant to convey a warning to those incorrigible people known as the non-co-operators ; that if at the next election they tried to swamp the polls and enter the Councils, and if they endeavoured to further their own designs, a very serious situation would be created. Now, Sir, accepting broadly the proposition stated by the Honourable the Home Member, am I not entitled to ask whether the method adopted by the Prime Minister is the correct one, whether that is the way to disarm the hostility of the non-co-operators ? One thing however is clear from the speech of the Honourable the Home Member, namely, that the pronouncement of the Prime Minister did contain a threat but that threat was not meant for those who are co-operating with the Government, rather it was intended for those who have been acting the other way. Sir, with great respect I submit that

threats are always unavailing especially when used to a class of people like the non-co-operators who, according to the Honourable Sir William Vincent, disperse every meeting and carry before them almost everything in this country and can use the present situation in any manner they like. I submit, Sir, that if that was the real object of the Prime Minister, then he has hopelessly failed in that. Threats always stiffen the back of your adversary. The Honourable Sir William Vincent says that these non-co-operators are the adversaries of Government. I do not want to express any opinion on this subject, but if they are the real adversaries of Government, then these threats will be of little avail.

A further argument used by the Honourable the Home Member in this connection was that racial hostility has very much come to the forefront and the Prime Minister could not but take cognisance of that. In this connection the Honourable the Home Member went on to mention the name of one who, whatever his political opinions may be, is respected by a very large section of the people of this country, I mean Mr. Gandhi. Sir, I for one am not disinclined to weigh people according to their merits and pass judgment upon them as they deserve. But is it again fair for the Honourable the Home Member to condemn Mr. Gandhi in the terms in which he did without mentioning a word about people like Sir Michael O'Dwyer and Lord Sydenham? I submit, Sir, that it is not quite fair. I admit that unfortunately there is racial hostility, and it is the duty of every one of us to remove that racial hostility by employing all the means we have; but all the same, so far as racial hostility is concerned, if there are two parties responsible for it, I do not think it is fair play to condemn one without condemning the other.

A third point that was taken up by the Honourable Sir William Vincent was that unfortunately a certain section of the people behaved in a very objectionable manner during the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. I for one entirely agree with the Honourable Sir William Vincent on this point. It is really very painful to find that a certain section of our people should have behaved in the manner in which they did during the Prince's visit. Nobody can say a word of justification for the attitude adopted by those people; on the other hand, all right-thinking people would unite in condemning their attitude on that occasion. But, Sir, again may I put a query? Did not the Government of India, did not the Secretary of State, did not His Majesty's Government know the depth of feeling that obtained in this country about the time when the visit of His Royal Highness took place? Was it not the duty of the Indian Government to place those facts before the British Cabinet? I do not know what the Government of India did, but I take it that the Government of India must in their turn have communicated to His Majesty's Government how matters stood at the time in India. When I say that, I do not by any means try to justify the conduct of those misguided people who really have prejudiced the cause of their countrymen before the British public and the British Parliament. What I do mean simply is that if you complain that those people acted in a very objectionable manner, the complaint is quite correct; but after all the Honourable the Home Member himself to a certain extent, as he forms part of the Government of India, is responsible for the visit of

[Saiyid Raza Ali.]

His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales at a time at which the visit was not desirable.

Speaking in this connection, the Honourable Sir William Vincent further went on to say that there was a lot of insecurity and apprehension of breach of the peace in February and March last, and it is natural that the minds of the British public must have been considerably exercised when they came to know of all that had taken place in this country, and therefore the same must have reflected in the mind of the Prime Minister when he made that speech. Since the Honourable Sir William Vincent is shaking his head I think I must quote his words which nearly were "when people here were alarmed what must have been the feelings of those who are at a distance of 6,000 miles, what must have been the feelings of Mr. Lloyd George"? Sir, I entirely agree that the unfortunate state of affairs in India must have reflected itself in England, but at the same time what was the Government of India doing in the meantime? Had they informed His Majesty's Government of the tremendous improvement that has been effected in the situation in India since March last? We know that the speech was made in August last, and it is undeniable that a very great improvement had taken place in the situation at that time, whatever may have been its causes. Well, Sir, if that is so, what were the Government of India and the Honourable the Home Member—if I am not personal—doing? Did they not inform His Majesty's Government and the Prime Minister that the situation had much improved and there was no serious apprehension of any untoward event taking place in India, and that therefore it was highly undesirable to make a speech like the one which the Prime Minister did make?

Now, Sir, on the actual Resolution I shall say just a few words. The Prime Minister's speech can fairly be divided into two portions. The first part is the one in which he deals with the reformed era that was introduced in the beginning of last year, and the second portion of his speech is devoted to the public services in India. I do not think, Sir, that after the pronouncement that was made by His Excellency the Viceroy last month and also after the speech with which he opened the Session of the Legislature on Tuesday last, I will be justified in taking up much time of this Council with a discussion of this subject.

There is no doubt, as I said in the beginning, that the Prime Minister's speech is highly objectionable. All the same, we have no reason to doubt that the Prime Minister, after all, did not perhaps mean what he said, inasmuch as so illustrious an authority as His Excellency the Viceroy, who is well known in the legal world, puts a different interpretation upon it, and as His Excellency has further said that the statement which was made had been made after consultation with the Prime Minister. That being so, Sir, I do not think that, objectionable as the speech is, we would be justified in not accepting the interpretation put, as I have submitted, by so high an authority as our own Viceroy and the late Lord Chief Justice of England. But when we come to the second aspect of the question we find that no attempt has so far been made to explain that away. I for one, Sir, was eagerly expecting the Honourable the Home Member to make a pronouncement on that subject, I mean the Indian Civil Service or rather

to quote the Prime Minister, the British Civil Service in India. I took very great pains to read more than once His Excellency the Viceroy's speech made last month ; I again went through the speech that was made by His Excellency last Tuesday—though I had listened to it attentively—but there is no reassuring statement that has been made by His Excellency on either of these two occasions. As I submitted, the Honourable Sir William Vincent also, though he has very skilfully referred to the subject and has tried not to give us any cause of bitterness, has not explained Government's attitude on the subject. The question is this, Sir. We all appreciate, very highly appreciate, the services that have been rendered by the Civil Service,—I mean the British element of the Service because at one time there was no other element than the British in that service. I appreciate, and I think it is my duty to say publicly, that we all of us appreciate, most Indians appreciate, the services that have been rendered to this country by that illustrious Service. But having said that, Sir, I am far from accepting the proposition that the Civil Service should be perpetuated in this country for all time to come. That of course is a point on which a statement is really needed by some authority who is in a position to make that statement. A lot has been said about the complaints of the members of the Indian Civil Service ; I do not propose to go into that. But I would say that after all there is no reason to suspect that this country, when it gets responsible government, would treat the British members of the Civil Service shabbily. Look at what has happened in independent Egypt. The latest papers bring out the news that the Cabinet there has decided to treat the British members of the Civil Service very, very fairly and to give them 25 per cent. in addition to what would be the pay of the Egyptian members of the same Service. In the same way, Sir, I believe India would be willing to do justice to the British element as long as that element remains. But we do not want the ' steel frame ' to be perpetuated in our mud huts ; and therefore I submit, Sir, that a statement on this subject is necessary by the Honourable the Home Member. I support the Resolution of the Honourable mover.

The HONOURABLE MR. LALUBHAI SAMALDAS (Bombay : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, the Honourable Mr. Kale's Resolution, as it is worded, seems to me to be so mild and harmless that I cannot understand why it has created so much disturbance in this Honourable House. What he wants to be done is this, Sir. He merely wants that we should convey to the Secretary of State, and through him to the Government of His Imperial Majesty, an expression of the keen sense of apprehension and disappointment created by the Prime Minister's speech. I think those who have been looking at the papers of all sections of opinion—I am talking of Indian papers at present, whether they be moderate, whether they be extremist, whether they are conducted by co-operators or by non-co-operators, they all must have seen that till the reply of His Excellency the Viceroy to the deputation was given, all were united in expressing—I won't say, as the Honourable Mr. Kale has put it, apprehension—but resentment at the Premier's speech. It is true that when His Excellency the Viceroy, after getting permission from the Premier, was good enough to explain to the deputation that waited on him the meaning of the speech, some papers have thought that the Viceroy's speech has made the position clear, while the majority, the big majority including some of the liberal papers, have thought that the position was still not quite clear, and that an expression

[Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas.]

of opinion in the House should be communicated to the Secretary of State. It has been said by my Honourable friend, Sir Binode Chandra Mitter, that he hoped that the Resolution would not be carried to the bitter end. I do not know where the bitterness comes in ; it is merely an expression of opinion which is sought to be communicated to the British Government ; it merely requests the Governor General in Council to communicate this view to the Secretary of State so that he and the British Cabinet, of whom the Prime Minister is the head, may know what feelings have been engendered in this country by the Prime Minister's speech. The Honourable the Home Member said, if I remember aright, that the effect of the Resolution on the British public would be harmful. Why should it be harmful if we merely express in as general terms as possible that we feel a sort of disappointment and apprehension at what has fallen from the Prime Minister. We do not want to fight with the Prime Minister. We do not want to use any strong language. What we want the Honourable the Home Member,—the Government of India—to convey to the Secretary of State is that there is a feeling of apprehension and disappointment in the minds not only of one section of Indians, but almost of all sections of Indians. That should not in any way create a bad feeling in the minds of the British public or a loss of sympathy of the British Parliament. We are as anxious, as the Honourable Home Member, to keep the good-will of the British public and to have the sympathy of both the Houses of Parliament ; we do not want to lose it. I do not see any reason why the passing of this Resolution will lose us that sympathy. I hope the Honourable Member will make this quite clear in his reply. Personally, I do not believe that a mere communication of our expression of apprehension or disappointment would lead to that result. Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Sethna perhaps, as my Honourable friend Sir Arthur Froom said, on account of his elocutionary powers may have said certain things which may have been misunderstood. Sir, if the Prime Minister's speech is liable to be misunderstood by us, it is just possible that the speech of my Honourable friend may be misunderstood by the Honourable the Home Member, because, knowing as I do, and I have known him for years in Bombay, I can say that you can seldom find a better friend for the British connection and for British services than my Honourable friend, Mr. Sethna.

It is rather unfair to him if, because of a few words that he has used in the heat of debate, he is always to be looked upon as an enemy, either of the British connection or the British Services. I may mention, Sir, that it was he who was Honorary Treasurer of the Prince of Wales' Reception Fund. And if my Honourable friend will look up the files of the "Bombay Chronicle," he will see how often Mr. Sethna has been abused for supporting British candidates and British officials. I mention these matters so that when the Home Member speaks he will try to see our point of view that the Honourable Mr. Sethna has been done, I believe, some injustice because of his heat in debate.

Now, Sir, coming to the Resolution proper, the Honourable the Home Member tried to explain it on the ground that the Prime Minister and the British public were angered at the treatment that was meted out to His Royal Highness. We all look upon that with the same indignation as the Home Member or the Government of India does. We all feel

that it was one of the greatest mistakes that the non-co-operators at that time made, and possibly that may have something to do with the temper of the Prime Minister. But we all expect Sir, that the Prime Minister ought to restrain his temper, as the Home Member asks us to restrain our tempers. Sir, His Excellency the Viceroy, who was good enough to get the assurance from the Prime Minister, said that there was nothing in the speech which could be taken to mean any departure from the policy of 1917 or 1919. It would have been perhaps a little more graceful if such an explanation or pronouncement had been made by the Prime Minister himself in England. Even if the House was not sitting Politicians in England, as in India, know how to get up meetings when they want to make an announcement. If he had done that it would have been more gracefully received in this country than a mere interpretation by however high an authority here. His Excellency the Viceroy said that he concluded that there were two grounds for the Prime Minister making this speech, and these were firstly that it was meant as a warning—I won't use the word "threat" which some of my Honourable friends have called it—to the non-co-operators that if they tried to wreck the constitution, then the Parliament would have to reconsider the whole situation as it was a serious matter. May I remind the Home Member that in India at present there are not two but three parties. There is one party of strong co-operators, who, at a sacrifice of time and of money and in some cases of health, come here to co-operate with Government to make the reforms a success. They have cut themselves off from many of their friends to work the constitution. That party will always stand with Government so long as they are not forced to go out. There is another party, a party in which I think I may include the Poona and Central Provinces Maharashtras, which has decided to contest the elections and come into the Councils. I think, Sir, that they do not want to wreck the constitution; and even if they did, I agree with the Honourable the Home Member in thinking that when once they enter the portals of the Councils, they will become saner, as that will teach them their responsibilities, and both the Government and those of us who have the honour to be returned to the Councils will find in them support and not opposition. I believe Mr. Khaparde has used the words "responsive co-operation" in connection with the Maharashtra party of Poona, Bombay and the Central Provinces. They want responsive co-operation; for them the warning or threat was not necessary. If anything it was rather tactless, because we want them to come in; I would like any day to make room for any of those bigger men. But the third party is in existence and they do not want to help or to come into the constitution. So for them, the real non-co-operators, there was no necessity for this warning. They do not care what happens to the constitution. I hope I will be permitted, whatever views we may have about non-co-operation, to quote from the leading non-co-operation paper, "Young India":

"The Premier's speech has created a great agitation among the co-operators. This is natural. The co-operators made a tremendous sacrifice in cutting themselves off from the bulk of their countrymen. They made themselves the object of general condemnation and willingly paid the penalty for their faith in the Reform Scheme. They ignored or forgave every wrong which the Government committed and when almost the entire body of Indian people revolted and declared non-co-operation, they co-operated with the Government. At the parting of the ways from the bulk of their countrymen, they trusted themselves to British faith. They now find that their boat has sprung a leak. It is no wonder they are greatly perturbed."

[Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas.]

This is what we hear in season and out of season from our non-co-operating friends, and we who have sacrificed, as even they admit, a great deal in cutting ourselves off from our countrymen to make the reforms a success, need greater sympathy than has been given to us by the Prime Minister.

As regards the Services, which is the second point to which His Excellency the Viceroy referred as to what the Prime Minister had in mind, I may support the remarks which have fallen from some of the Members as to appreciation of the good work done by the Civil Service and other Services in this country. We do not want, and I say it as emphatically as I can—and I have the support of all my colleagues on this side—we do not want the British element to go out of the country. We want their co-operation; but what we want—and there is a 'but'—is gradual Indianisation such as the Preamble to the Act says will be done. If the Prime Minister's speech meant that 1,200 was an irreducible minimum, then the policy outlined in the Government of India Act cannot be carried out. The Honourable the Home Member has made the position clearer, and Sir Alexander Murray has given figures. I believe, Sir, that the Premier's speech is partly due to what is well known as the O'Donnell Circular. The Home Member or the Home Secretary put the whole case from the Indian point of view much better than any Indian could have put it; and may I congratulate them on putting the Indian point of view before the Local Governments.

I believe it is this circular that has enraged some of the Members—either of the Civil Service here or else what are called the Die-Hards in England. Because Lord Sydenham in yesterday's papers in the *Morning Post* said that the Indianisation Circular is entirely opposed to the Prime Minister's utterances. So that the impression that the Premier's speech is opposed to the Indianisation Circular is general and is shared by Lord Sydenham and others who ought to know what the English language means better than we do and whose interpretation supports us.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. S. KHAPARDE (Berar : Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I speak rather late in the day on this Resolution, but I am very glad that I am speaking late, for this reason that there appears to me to be a misunderstanding about the whole affair on nearly all sides of the House and that is what makes me rather look awkward. In former times, it is said, the Badshah or the Reigning Prince used to propose two or three questions and Birbal was supposed to give one answer which would meet all the questions. That used to be in the old days. Something similar has happened in these democratic days. The Prime Minister was approached by the Civil Service for the redress of their grievances. I am sure he heard about these non-co-operation people and information was also given to him about them probably. The non-co-operators went on saying that the reforms had failed and there was nothing in them and so on. So all these conflicting things went to the Prime Minister, and he propounded only one answer to the three and found out for himself what he wanted to find out. That is what happened actually, Sir. He wanted to find out for himself whether the

Reforms had succeeded or not. Of course, there were reports. We said that they had succeeded, and these people said that they had not. He did not give a threat at all. He merely said that, if such a contingency arises, there will be a serious position. He does not say what he would do. But he merely says, "I will consider the matter." The Civil Service people went and made all their representations—and he has given them nothing by that speech. He said, "You are very good people, you are essentially necessary for the maintenance of the British Empire, and you are to serve in India for the good of England, but there is no promise at all." That is the first consideration. Now, you take the non-co-operators, who were jumping about. He said, "All right, I will take it into consideration." But he does not say that he would prosecute them. He does not say that he would put them down. He says that it will create a serious situation and he will consider the matter. I suppose all these three parties have been answered. Some Honourable Members think that much has been given to the Civil Service. I think that nothing has been given. They think that the reforms have been threatened. I say not in the least. It is only a matter for consideration. The non-co-operators are afraid that there may be repression. Nothing of the kind. So by one answer he has answered all these people. It reminds me very much of what took place at one time. Probably Honourable Members know that there is a State called the Jamnagar State. Well, a *charan*—that is a person corresponding to the itinerant minstrels who used to visit the castles of Barons and sing their praises and describe battles and get something for his pains—a *charan* went to the Jam State and stood before the gate of the Prince and he sang his songs and brought out his beautiful things. And the King used to sit on the balcony there and he was immensely delighted. He said, "You came to my Court and sang such beautiful songs." And he ordered his store-keeper to carry two thousand tons of wheat to the house of this man. So this man was very pleased. He went home, and the King had given his orders, but not a grain arrived. So he came again next day. And he sang his songs again. And he told the King that nothing had been given him. And the King said, "All right. Give him twenty thousand tons of grain." But this too never arrived. So he came a third time. And each time, the King was seen, the man used to complain. Ultimately, the bard grew desperate. "Look here," he said, "I come and see you every day and sing to you, but nothing ever reaches me." "Oh," he said, "so you want to argue it out? This is a business proposition. Now, what did you do for me that I should give you all this you ask?" "Well, Sir," he said, "I sang those songs and pleased you." "All right," said the King, "you had to sing for five hours to please me. I pleased you by a single sentence—'give him that.' And what do you want further?" That actually happened. Well, something like that has happened here. Everyone made his representations. The non-co-operators were putting obstructions and making great demonstrations. And the Civil Service thought they would make their representations. The Prime Minister has answered by one answer. "I will consider." And that is where the whole thing stands. And about this we have been arguing nearly the whole of the day. I am immensely amused by it. What is all this about? That is what

[Mr. G. S. Khaparde.]

I thought. I told a friend of mine yesterday that it looks to me like a huge joke. And he said, "You always see jokes." I said, "All right, you please yourself. But I think this is a joke and I am going to propound this theory in the proper place." I have been trying to propound this theory all day but did not get my opportunity. I am glad to put it before this House so that Honourable Members will all feel as those Knights of old who disputed as to whether a shield was red or white. It was painted red on one side and white on the other, and those who saw the red, said it was red, and those who stood on the other side, said it was white. And so they fought over the question and probably broke each other's heads. But there was nothing at all there to fight about. All colour is after all merely reflection of the light and according as the reflection varies the colour changes. The whole thing here is in the words, "I will take it into consideration."

And that is all he promises and that is all that has happened. And why this tremendous noise about the matter? I think it is a huge joke and six months hence Honourable Members here—all of us will meet and we will agree that the Prime Minister is a very clever, clever person indeed. He has got his answer. He wanted to know whether the non-co-operators had succeeded. The non-co-operators have not succeeded and the reforms are so popular and so much wanted that every section of the community desires to have them and every community is very angry when you threaten to take it away. That does not require any arguing at all. The Civil Service have also got their answer. Of course, when people speak of eternity, it always makes me suspicious. Nobody knows about eternity. It is no good talking about it. Even the near future is hidden from us. So all these apprehensions on the ground that the present state of things may be perpetuated for ever and ever are groundless. I say that is only a figure of speech. As the lover says: "I will go on loving you for ever and ever." Similarly, declarations of politicians when they come to "ever and ever" are suspicious. It means nothing for circumstances will change. But the Prime Minister wanted to encourage English boys to come out and serve in India and maintain the glorious British Empire. Then he wanted to pat the Civil Service on the back. They were threatening to resign. He said, "You are the life of the country, the light of the country." That is the usual way in our country. We have got 33 crores of gods. And in each god's praise you will find that he is the glory of the universe. Each one of these gods is the creator of the universe.

What is the meaning of it and how do you take it? There is a Hindu rule of interpretation and that a very useful one. I want to speak to you about it because this speech has been variously interpreted and learnedly discussed, though there was no necessity for it. When you want to determine the meaning of a Puranic statement you have got to see the occasion on which it is made, how it begins and how it ends. What is the thought that is often and often repeated during the course of the speech or writing? And then you have to put all these things together and then put yourself the question as to what is the net result of it? After having put these five things together then you find out what the *tatpariyam* or the real meaning of the passage is. Now, in this case I

applied the rule for my own benefit. What was the occasion of the Premier's speech? It was some discussion about the Civilians. How did it begin? He began by saying that the Civil Service had rendered great services to India. How did it end? He ended by saying that he would like English parents to be encouraged to send boys to India. He would do everything for them. He promised a new age and country fit for heroes to live in and all that. By these he meant to say that he would do his best for them. If you take it in that way, the speech was entirely made for the benefit of the Civilians. What is the thought that is repeated all through? It is that the British Government or the British Empire is a great structure, which requires to be looked after, propped up and supported. That is the burden of the song. He chose to call them the "steel frame," but that does not matter. If I am a pillar, I shall have to bear the whole burden. All through the thought that is repeated is that the Empire is to be preserved, it has to be maintained and it has to be supported. To each person he will say "You are the pillar of the Empire." To the Civilians he will say "You are the pillar of the Empire" and to the public people also he will say, "Of course you are the pillar of the Empire." What does it cost him? It costs nothing, it leads to nothing, it ends in nothing. What is the net result of it? He says, "I shall do my best, take everything very carefully into consideration and I will arrive at results which I hope will be satisfactory to you." That is where it ends. So, from my point of view, the whole thing is a huge joke, and the Prime Minister has succeeded. He has got his answer about the reforms, he has got his answer about the Civilians, he has got his answer about the public people, and so forth. He is no doubt a clever person. There is no doubt about it. But I had not the slightest notion that he was so clever as to sit six thousand miles away and make a joke and make all these people jump about it. After all there is nothing in it. I pay a very great compliment to the Prime Minister. I am glad this Resolution was brought because it has brought out all the answers that the Prime Minister wanted. Whether it succeeds or fails is a matter of secondary importance. The Prime Minister has got what he wanted out of it. We may pass this Resolution or we may not, but that is a very different thing altogether. With these words, Sir, I resume my seat.

The HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA (Bombay : Nominated Non-official) : Sir, time is passing and I will therefore only say a very few words. Whatever had to be said on the subject either *pro* or *con* has been said. Of course, everybody admits—and it would, perhaps, be an affectation to deny it—that the Premier has made a mistake. But we must also remember that every great statesman in the history of the world has made mistakes. There have been lapses by such personages times out of number. There have been indeed lapses which have led to great tragedies of a far reaching character. But I think that every one of these lapses of the greatest statesmen of the past have their end and their limitations. Some times they have led to portentous events; sometimes they have led to appalling tragedies, one of which in modern times was the American War of Independence. Mr. Pitt made a great mistake which led to that memorable war. From the days of Pitt and Peel to those of Gladstone,

[Sir Dinshaw Wacha.]

and now to the days of Mr. Lloyd George, colossal mistakes of grave mischief have undoubtedly arisen. Some mistakes have been of an inconsequential character. The Premier's speech has created a great but unnecessary hubbub. I can understand that hubbub. We are a young nationality—a struggling nationality—trying to become a great nation. And every struggling nationality not only in India, not only in the East, but also in the West, has been such that when some imprudent and thoughtless words are spoken, a state of alarm seizes them and a sense of distrust and ill-feeling obsesses them. But all these alarms and sentiments have to be measured with a due sense of proportion. That sense of proportion, I regret to have to say, has been lacking in this discussion. There ought to be no magnification of the Premier's unwise utterance. If you only exercise a little patience and a little sobriety of judgment, and discuss the question as to how far the Premier has made a mistake and how far by his mistake the country is going to be deprived of the free and inestimable boon which the great Charter Act has conferred upon us, if everything in relation thereto was considered from different points of view and in a calm but no stern spirit in these times of commotion, I believe you could discuss it with a due sense of proportion, and arrive at some commonsense judgment thereon. Of course, in a matter of this kind you cannot repress, as I say, a young nationality which feels alarmed. My friend, the Honourable Mr. Kale, has of course not done anything wrong in bringing his Resolution before this House. Possibly he is quite justified in doing so. I do not think that he was not justified in bringing it. But having brought that question what is the next best thing to be done? To-day, we have had ample discussion of the subject. Ample discussion has been going on for the last three weeks outside the House. I think my two friends the Honourable Sir Alexander Murray and the Honourable Sir Benode Mitter have admirably put the question in a nutshell. They have compressed or focussed as it were all the facts in excellent array. They have also analysed those facts. They have further put these facts to the test in their crucible of right reasoning and argument, and they have come to the conclusion that there is not much to be said on the subject which can be said with profit, and that the sooner we forget the unfortunate utterance the better. Great statesmen are apt to make mistakes and a struggling nationality is apt to go into hysterics over it. Let us clear our mind of all hysteria. Let us reflect on it calmly and with the insight of practical politicians. My advice is to say nothing more about it. If I can venture to offer a few words—words of a very modest appeal—to my two friends I would say that whatever had to be said on the subject has been said. Criticism for and against has been made, and whether Mr. Kale's Resolution is conveyed, if passed, to His Majesty or the Premier or not, it would amount to nothing. Before it is so conveyed, the whole discussion will appear to-morrow in London and, perhaps, in all the papers of the world. Mr. Lloyd George will have known of it also and will introspect himself how far he has made a mistake, and possibly he may repent it although perhaps he may not declare that he has made a mistake. Human nature is such. Suppose any one of us is put in the position of Mr. Lloyd George. Don't you think

that we are liable to commit a similar mistake ? Other people would resent it just as our friends here resent it or as outside people have resented. We must not forget our own human nature and its verities ; also we must not forget certain psychological times when something is said which everybody afterwards repents as a mistake, but which everybody is not willing to confess at once that it was a mistake. That being the case, I modestly appeal to my Honourable friend Mr. Kale, that inasmuch as everything that had to be said has been said, that Mr. Lloyd George will know without even an official conveyance of expression through the Viceroy what has been the feeling of India on the subject, might not the matter be allowed to rest here ?

It will do no good whatever to further pursue it. There is no use going outside the House saying " We have done our great act of heroism in bringing forward this matter and having it passed." What matters it ? When you go home, sit quiet for an hour, and try to calmly think what after all is this mistake to lead to ? I consider that it would lead to nothing alarming or appalling or cataclysmic. Whatever the Prime Minister may say, whatever even a President of the United States may say, what is it ? There is the Act in black and white. The Preamble of the Act is clear and definite. No Prime Minister or President can override that Act. No Prime Minister can alter the letter or spirit of the Act by even a word until Parliament comes forward and alters it. Has that been done ? I think His Excellency the Viceroy could not have made it clearer and more emphatic than even before that there was nothing to be alarmed at. He said, " I have been burdened with far greater responsibilities than were ever put before on another Viceroy or predecessor." This is absolutely true for the reason he himself urged. " Here, in my Letters Patent, His Majesty's Government have given me certain definite Instructions to carry out. What are they ? That I should firmly bear in mind the spirit of the Proclamation of 1917 ; and also the Reform Act of 1919 which has received the King's assent, and I as His Viceroy and Governor General am bound to carry out those solemn injunctions and abide them faithfully." Is not the Viceroy nobly carrying out those injunctions ? Has not the Viceroy in his speech the day before yesterday told you exactly what is the position ? It is he who is responsible. It is he who tells us that " all that has to be done will be done and that we need not be alarmed ", can we not rely on the Viceroy who is fully imbued with the spirit of our legitimate aspirations ? Did he not by implication suggest that after his assurance there should be rest on the subject ? I believe that it is best to rest after what we have done. I say to my good friend, here, Mr. Kale,— " Rest, perturbed spirit, rest " and I say further, " Let us all rest and put an end to this discussion."

The HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY (Central Provinces : General) : Sir, my work has been considerably lightened by the very sagacious and timely speech of warning of our veteran statesman Sir Dinshaw Wacha. The Resolution has been discussed threadbare, and I would not be justified in detaining this Council any further, but my excuse in intervening in this debate at this stage is that a Resolution not in the identical terms but in terms somewhat parallel to the Resolution of my Honourable Friend Mr. Kale stands against my name. Sir, it is only right and proper that I should explain to this Council my reasons for bringing the Resolution in the form in which I have put it. When the

[Sir Mañeckji Dadabhoy.]

full text of the Prime Minister's speech was telegraphed to India I at once saw the difficulty in which we in India were placed. I thought that it was a very unfortunate utterance coming on after a few months of peace and tranquillity which India was enjoying and after the spirit of restlessness that was slowly subsiding. I found the next day papers clamouring vigorously at the speech of the Premier and putting interpretations on that speech which were neither justified by the context nor by the character of reforms that have been conceded to India, and I was gravely apprehensive that the non-co-operators and the enemies of reform would take advantage of that speech in disseminating further sedition all over the country and in causing and instigating fresh agitation in India. I, therefore, thought it necessary to take some action and I despatched immediately on the 16th August my Resolution asking nothing but a mere affirmation in Parliament of the policy enunciated by the Imperial Parliament in 1919. Honourable Members must have perceived already that my Resolution is in no way intended as a censure on the Prime Minister's speech or as a reflection or criticism of any sort on that great statesman. Sir, it cannot be gainsaid that the Premier's speech was inopportune, was impolitic, was unwise and might have been avoided in the present temper of the Indian people. But when all that is said, when this much is said, all is said and done. I disagree with my Honourable colleagues here in ascribing sinister motives to the Premier, in ascribing to that utterance a wrong meaning—a reversal of the policy solemnly laid down by the Imperial Parliament for the amelioration and the political advancement of this country. I repudiate any such suggestion. I am very sorry to notice that my Honourable Friend Mr. Kale has remarked this morning that the Premier has fallen a victim to the anti-reform agitation and that he has ranged himself on the side of the opponents of the reform. I would bring to his attention one simple fact. These reforms which have been conceded to India, these reforms under whose auspices we are working to-day are due to the Prime Minister Mr. Lloyd George. Mr. Montagu conceived the reforms, but without the co-operation of the Premier Mr. Montagu would not have been in a position to launch these reforms in Parliament, nor would India have secured them but for the devoted co-operation of Mr. Lloyd George. It would therefore be unfair that we should criticise his speech to that inconceivable extent and say that he has fallen a victim to the anti-reform agitation. Sir, likewise, I contend that there ought to be no apprehension about the correct interpretation of the reforms. Unfortunately, a feeling has been engendered in this country and the speech has been grossly misinterpreted. There cannot possibly be any reversal of policy. The Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha has pointed out that the solemn Act of Parliament cannot be set at naught by a mere utterance. A probationary period has been given to India within which to prove its administrative competence and efficiency, and no power on earth I contend can take away from India what has been solemnly granted to it. I therefore submit that our fears are groundless, and the apprehensions of my friends are baseless. I am as anxious and as solicitous as many of you to see India acquiring full dominion government.

I say that in this connection we have the assurance of His Excellency the Viceroy who not only referred to this matter in his brilliant speech but has expressly pointed out that in his Royal Warrant of Appointment

there is a special command given to him by His Majesty the King-Emperor to see that the reforms are brought to fruition. His Excellency the Viceroy has not only given personal assurances, but rather he has given a pledge to India that as long as he is the Viceroy he will see that the reforms are carried out sympathetically and in their full integrity. Is it necessary after that, gentlemen..... ?

The HONOURABLE SAYID RAZA ALI : Sir, the Honourable Member is not addressing the Chair.

The HONOURABLE SIE MANECKJI DADABHOY : Is it necessary after that to have a Resolution of this character ? Sir, let me make a final appeal to my Honourable colleagues here. You have now all had your say. Whether this Resolution is passed or not, the country will know your feelings and your sentiments, and England will know that you have taken exception to that speech. I agree with Sir Dinshaw Wacha that it would be well to allow the matter to rest at that stage. Sir, I may tell my Honourable friends that there ought to be no apprehension about the reversal of the reforms. No country has won its freedom by mere declarations in Parliament, by mere Statutes and by Charters. Political freedom, if you examine the history of every country, has been won, has been achieved, by the work of its own people. Let us prove in the tentative and probationary period before us that we have justified the reforms, that we have earned our title to the continuance of these reforms, and I feel certain that no power on earth can take away from us what we have earned by our merit and exertion.

I think I may now make a final appeal in these circumstances to my Honourable friend Mr. Kale to consider the wisdom and propriety of allowing the matter to rest where it is, especially after the remarks of His Excellency the Viceroy. We must remember that our future progress, our future growth, will depend on the good-will of the British people. The British people are not in a mood, they are not in a temper at present, to be troubled with Resolutions of this nature. We shall not be serving the best interests of India, we shall be doing a distinct disservice to the country, if this Resolution is passed to-day and telegraphed to England. It will set the backs of the people at Home against us. It is entirely by their good-will that we will get all that we want in this country, and I therefore exhort the Honourable Member not to press his Resolution to a vote.

The HONOURABLE MR. V. G. KALE : Sir, after the very prolonged debate which has taken place on this Resolution, I will not be entitled to make a lengthy speech in offering my remarks with reference to the criticisms which have been made on the Resolution. So far as I have been able to judge, the whole debate reduced itself to one issue, and it is this. Has the Prime Minister's speech raised any question which, in any manner, will prejudice the cause of the Reforms ? If it is not calculated to do any harm to the cause of the Reforms, certainly we ought to allow the matter to rest where it is. If, on the other hand, we think that there is something in that speech which has not been satisfactorily explained or accounted for, then I do not think that, in spite of the very kind appeal which has been made to me, I shall be justified in withdrawing the Resolution. My Resolution merely requests the Government of India to convey to His Majesty's Government an expression of the views of this

[Mr. V. G. Kale.]

House. At least some members feel that such an expression is desirable. Some of the critics of the Resolution have admitted that the Prime Minister committed a piece of indiscretion ; others have said that a mistake has been committed. I have no desire at all to rub it in merely for the sake of rubbing in. If a mistake has been committed, it is our duty to point out that mistake so that it may not occur again in future. If we are not going to take action upon our discussions, if we are not going to pass any Resolution in this House, I do not think there will be much work left for this Council to do (Hear, hear). I have been told that there has been so much discussion and that the debate will be wired to England. These things will happen with regard to every motion. I know that my Honourable friend Sir Maneckji Dadabhoj will not accept this principle when a question affecting the interests of the mercantile community is under consideration (Hear, hear) ; he will be prepared even to non-co-operate with the Government for the time being so far as that question is concerned. If under these circumstances not only the necessity of discussing the question in this House but even of placing the whole discussion through the proper channel before His Majesty's Government and the Secretary of State is felt, I do not think that there is any point in withdrawing this Resolution.

I do not wish to comment upon many of the side issues which have been raised in the course of the discussion and prolong the debate, but I wish to make only one or two observations. So far as I have seen, the assurances and explanations which have been given, have not touched that most important point, namely, the conflict between the interests of the reforms and the interests of the Civil Service. It is in that light of that conflict that the whole question has been placed in the Prime Minister's speech so far as I have been able to understand it. No satisfactory explanation has been given in connection with it. It has been clearly stated in the speech and I have read extracts from it which are eloquent enough and leave no doubt as to the principle enunciated—it has been clearly stated by the Premier that the Civil Service will continue for an indefinite period to possess and exercise all its functions, powers and privileges. If these words mean anything, they mean that for an indefinitely long period of time, the reforms will not come to fruition ; so that that is the cause of apprehension and of disappointment. In my Resolution I have stated that there is a feeling of apprehension and disappointment and that feeling is to be conveyed to His Majesty's Government.....

THE HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY : That is not inconsistent with paragraph 323 of the Chelmsford Report.

THE HONOURABLE MR. V. G. KALE : I listened with great attention to the exposition of that particular clause, but I am afraid it was absolutely irrelevant.

THE HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY : I am not referring to clause 41.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Order, order.

The HONOURABLE MR. V. G. KALE : I know that there are many clauses in the Act which tell us that the whole question will be reviewed at the end of 10 years and so forth, but that has nothing to do with my motion.

Then it is said that nothing concrete is going to happen, and that no harm is going to result from the speech. Why then fight about words, and why not let the matter rest where it is ? I am not quite sure whether that is going to be the case. I think, on the contrary, that this is the psychological moment when a word of protest must be uttered. Certain things may have happened behind the back of the Government of India, and certain questions may be decided with regard to the salaries, promotions, pensions and privileges of the Indian Civil Service behind the back of the Indian Legislature. We do not know what is happening behind our backs, and therefore this is just the psychological moment when a word of protest must be uttered, and that is the reason why I am urging that the Government of India should condescend to accept this request which is, after all, a very moderate and humble request, only to convey what we have been saying and what our attitude is on the question to His Majesty's Government ; and if the Resolution were to be withdrawn, I do not think that the impression which we seek to create on the public mind in England will have a prejudicial effect.

It has been pointed out that we shall be alienating the sympathies of the public in England. Perhaps it may be so, but most probably it will not. My reason for this is that the public in England will also expect us to state exactly what we feel and what we think about the Premier's speech. Protests have been uttered in the press and on the platform, but what have the Houses of the Indian Legislature to say on this question ?

The Houses of the Indian Legislature should speak authoritatively on this question ; if you do not say authoritatively what you want to say, certainly there will be a gap left, and the gap will have to be filled. I, therefore, on my own part make an appeal to the Members of this Council ; if they feel convinced that there is nothing left in the Prime Minister's speech which requires explanation, then certainly they may vote against the Resolution ; but if they feel that no harm is going to be done by simply conveying an expression of our views to His Majesty's Government, certainly I expect them to support the Resolution. I do not want to take any more time on this point, but I will simply make the request again that they should look at this Resolution from the point of view from which I have placed it before them (Applause).

The HONOURABLE SIR WILLIAM VINCENT (Home Member) : Sir, before I proceed to the subject of the Resolution I want to make a personal statement on one point. I spoke with some severity of one of the Members of this Council this morning. He got up immediately afterwards to offer an explanation, and assured me that he was in no way hostile either to the British services or to the British public generally. This has been confirmed by a speaker, an old friend of this Council, the Honourable Mr. Samaldas, and I think that the Honourable Sir Arthur Froom in a part of his speech intended also to convey the same impression. I am perfectly prepared to accept the assurance ; and as I have, in the circumstances,

[Sir William Vincent.]

made these statements, I ought I think to withdraw those imputations which I made against the Honourable Member (Applause).

I want to turn just to the Resolution itself. I will begin by refuting the particular statement of my Honourable friend, Sardar Jogendra Singh when he suggested.....

The HONOURABLE SARDAR JOGENDRA SINGH : The Honourable Member is not speaking to the Chair.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The Honourable Member has not given way.

The HONOURABLE SARDAR JOGENDRA SINGH : I mean the Honourable Member is not speaking to the Chair but to the audience.

The HONOURABLE SIR WILLIAM VINCENT : If I turn my back on the Council, then they cannot hear me. I wish to refute the suggestion of the Honourable Member that I did not appreciate the efforts made by loyal India in welcoming the Prince of Wales ; or that I have not expressed it ; I believe that this is not a fair representation of what I said. I did refer to the disapprobation of a certain section of the people. If however I failed in expressing my feelings in regard to loyal subjects who did welcome him, I can only express my regret and say that it was not my intention in any way to depreciate those efforts. Outside that, there is very little indeed to add to what I have said before. The real points which have arisen in the debate since I spoke relate mainly to the functions of the Indian Civil Service. That I think is the point on which the Mover feels most apprehension. I can only say that, to my mind, once the question of responsible government being the goal is settled, then I believe that all other points are necessarily secondary ; all these questions will resolve themselves, there will be no room for any dispute. Now then this question of the goal being the development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of self-government has been repeatedly answered here. You have had an assurance but a few days ago given by the Viceroy and fortified by the words contained in his Instrument of Instructions. You have also the assurance of the Prime Minister conveyed through His Excellency : and I know of no better channel to convey to the people of India that he intended no departure from the declared policy of Government. As to the functions of the Civil Service, I said that what I believe the Prime Minister intended to ensure was the protection, the safeguarding of the legitimate, financial and other rights of the Services. I myself never doubted, and I believe no one doubts, that, as constitutional government develops in India, the position of the Services will be adjusted to the new conditions. I cannot conceive of anything else being possible. Then it is said that the question of time is of importance. To those who say this the answer is contained in the Act itself :

“Whereas the action of Parliament in such matters must be guided by the co-operation received from those on whom new opportunities of service have been conferred.”

The time of any advance must therefore in every case depend on the co-operation which His Majesty's Government receives from the people.

of India. It has again been suggested that there is something sinister in the language of the Prime Minister when he was speaking of the British element in the service. I have seen nothing in that which conflicts at all with the language that His Excellency used as to the increasing association of Indians in the Services, and I do not believe it was intended in any way to conflict with that statement. Whatever happens, whether Indians are here or Europeans I can say one thing, that they will always work, as they have in the past, loyally to promote the welfare of this country,—to promote the reformed constitution and the working of the administration under that system (Hear, hear). I want the Council in a matter of this kind to take a long view to consider really what is good for the welfare of India—whether it is right now, at this juncture, further to antagonize His Majesty's Government, further to alienate feeling at Home. This Resolution may secure for its supporters some cheap popularity here, but that is not what this Chamber should look to ; that is not the deciding factor to a wise statesman-like Member of a second Chamber of this character. I want Members to consider, to answer, the following questions, each man to himself, before he votes. Does he seek to embitter feeling at Home against India ? Does he seek to antagonize His Majesty's Government ? Does he seek to convey the impression that certain words of His Excellency are not accepted as sincere and honest ? Does he seek to encourage the enemies of Government in this country ? Does he not seek to maintain the character, the great reputation, if I may say so, of this Chamber for sobriety of judgment and wisdom ? (Applause).

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The question is that the following Resolution be adopted :

“ This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to convey to the Secretary of State for India, and through him to the Government of His Imperial Majesty, an expression of the keen sense of apprehension and disappointment created in the public mind in India by the pronouncement of the Prime Minister in the House of Commons regarding the present situation and the political future of this country.”

The motion was negatived.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The next Resolution* on the List of Business standing in the name of the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy is disposed of by the vote of the Council on the last Resolution.

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

* “ This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that this Government do move forthwith the Secretary of State for India for an immediate, clear and definite declaration in Parliament of the determination of His Majesty's Government to carry out fully and faithfully the policy embodied in the declaration of the 20th August 1917, and to grant India Dominion Self-Government at the earliest possible opportunity.”