

Monday, 16th March, 1931

THE  
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES  
(Official Report)

Volume III, 1931

*(12th March to 25th March, 1931)*

---

FIRST SESSION  
OF THE  
FOURTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,  
1931



SIMLA  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS  
1931  
13

# Legislative Assembly.

## *President :*

THE HONOURABLE SIR IBRAHIM RAHIMTOOLA, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.

## *Deputy President :*

MR. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTY, M.L.A.

## *Panel of Chairmen :*

DIWAN BAHADUR T. RANGACHARIAR, C.I.E., M.L.A.

SIR HUGH COCKE, KT., M.L.A.

MAULVI MUHAMMAD YAKUB, M.L.A.

RAI SAHIB HARBILAS SARDA, M.L.A.

## *Secretary :*

MR. S. C. GUPTA, BAR.-AT-LAW.

## *Assistant of the Secretary :*

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

## *Marshal :*

CAPTAIN NUR AHMAD KHAN, M.C., I.O.M.

## *Committee on Public Petitions :*

MR. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTY, M.L.A., *Chairman.*

SIR HUGH COCKE, KT., M.L.A.

SIR ABDUR RAHIM, K.C.S.I., KT., M.L.A.

RAJA BAHADUR G. KRISHNAMACHARIAR, M.L.A.

MIAN MUHAMMAD SHAH NAWAZ, C.I.E., M.L.A.

## CONTENTS.

VOLUME III.—12th March to 25th March, 1931.

	PAGES.
<b>THURSDAY, 12TH MARCH, 1931.—</b>	
Statement of Business .. .. .	1905
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	
Demand No. 78—North-West Frontier Province— <i>concl'd</i> ..	1905—08
Demand No. 16—Customs— .. .. .	1908
Reduction of Salaries on account of lower level of prices and to cope with deficit Budget .. .. .	1909—12
Retrenchment and Uniformity of Basis for Expenditure ..	1913—15
Inadequate Representation of Muslims in the Customs Ser- vices .. .. .	1915—30
Failure of the Government to prevent Dumping of wheat and sugar on the Indian Market .. .. .	1930—37
Sikh Representation .. .. .	1937—48
Duty on Sugar .. .. .	1948—51
Duty on Kerosene, Petrol, Betel-nuts .. .. .	1951—55
Not taking steps to raise the Price of Agricultural Produce	1955—56
Demand No. 18—Salt—	
Retrenchment .. .. .	1957
Loss of Interest arising from the Credit System .. .. .	1957—59
Pay of General Managers .. .. .	1959
<b>FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1931.—</b>	
Questions and Answers .. .. .	1961—65
Unstarred Questions and Answers .. .. .	1965—69
Statement laid on the Table—	
Report of the Committee on Salt .. .. .	1996—2004
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i> .. .. .	
	1969—96, 2004—37
Demand No. 1—Opium— <i>concl'd.</i>	
Retrenchment .. .. .	1969—71
Demand No. 20—Stamps .. .. .	1971
Demand No. 21—Forest—	
Administration of the Forest Department .. .. .	1971—72
Demand No. 22—Irrigation, Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works (Including Working Expenses) .. .. .	1973—76
Supply of Water to Cultivators .. .. .	1973
Want of a River Canal from Bikhtiarpore on the Ganges to Nawadah via Bihar .. .. .	1973—74
Interest charged on Canals in Orissa and Ganjam .. .. .	1974—76
Demand No. 33—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (In- cluding Working Expenses) .. .. .	1976—89
Retrenchment .. .. .	1977—82
Representation of Depressed Classes in the Posts and Tele- graphs Services .. .. .	1982—87
Denial of Calcutta and Delhi Transfer Concessions to certain Clerks of the Director General's Office .. .. .	1987—89

FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1931.—*contd.*The General Budget—List of Demands—*contd.*

Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (Including Working Expenses)— <i>contd.</i>	1939
Demand No. 24—Indo-European Telegraph Department (Including Working Expenses)	1990—96, 2004—15
Demand No. 25—Interest on Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt	1990—92 1993—96, 2004—15
Appointment of a National Investment Board	2015—17
Debt Position	2015—17
Demand No. 26—Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations	2015—17
Policy and Principle underlying Expenditure for Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations	2015—17
Demand No. 27—Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General	2017—33
Room for Considerable Reduction	2017—21
Hill Journey Allowances and Reduction of Extent of the Simla Exodus	2021—31
Request to the Viceroy for some Voluntary Surrender of Emoluments for the Needed Retrenchment	2031—33
Demand No. 29—Council of State	2033
Demand No. 30—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department	2033—34
Quarters for Members not free	2033—34
Demand No. 31—Foreign and Political Department	2034—37
Practical Exclusion of Indian from the Foreign and Political Department	2034—37
Demand No. 32—Home Department	2037
Demand No. 33—Public Service Commission	2037
Demand No. 34—Legislative Department	2037
Demand No. 35—Department of Education, Health and Lands	2037
Demand No. 36—Finance Department	2038
Demand No. 37—Separation of Accounts from Audit	2038
Demand No. 38—Commerce Department	2038
Demand No. 40—Department of Industries and Labour	2038
Demand No. 41—Central Board of Revenue	2038
Demand No. 42—Payments to Provincial Governments on account of Administration of Agency Subjects	2038
Demand No. 43—Audit	2039
Demand No. 44—Administration of Justice	2039
Demand No. 45—Police	2039
Demand No. 46—Ports and Pilotage	2039
Demand No. 47—Lighthouses and Lightships	2039
Demand No. 48—Survey of India	2039
Demand No. 49—Meteorology	2040
Demand No. 50—Geological Survey	2040
Demand No. 51—Botanical Survey	2040
Demand No. 52—Zoological Survey	2040
Demand No. 53—Archæology	2040
Demand No. 54—Mines	2040

FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1931—*concl'd.*The General Budget—List of Demands—*concl'd.*

Demand No. 55—Other Scientific Departments .. .. .	2041
Demand No. 56—Education .. .. .	2041
Demand No. 57—Medical Services .. .. .	2041
Demand No. 58—Public Health .. .. .	2041
Demand No. 59—Agriculture .. .. .	2041
Demand No. 60—Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department .. .. .	2041
Demand No. 61—Civil Veterinary Services .. .. .	2042
Demand No. 62—Industries .. .. .	2042
Demand No. 63—Aviation .. .. .	2042
Demand No. 64—Commercial Intelligence and Statistics .. .. .	2042
Demand No. 65—Census .. .. .	2042
Demand No. 66—Emigration—Internal .. .. .	2042
Demand No. 67—Emigration—External .. .. .	2043
Demand No. 68—Joint Stock Companies .. .. .	2043
Demand No. 69—Miscellaneous Departments .. .. .	2043
Demand No. 70—Indian Stores Department .. .. .	2043
Demand No. 71—Currency .. .. .	2043
Demand No. 72—Mint .. .. .	2043
Demand No. 73—Civil Works .. .. .	2044
Demand No. 74—Superannuation Allowances and Pensions .. .. .	2044
Demand No. 75—Stationery and Printing .. .. .	2044
Demand No. 76—Miscellaneous .. .. .	2044
Demand No. 77—Refunds .. .. .	2044
Demand No. 79—Baluchistan .. .. .	2044
Demand No. 80—Delhi .. .. .	2045
Demand No. 81—Ajmer-Merwara .. .. .	2045
Demand No. 82—Andamans and Nicobar Islands .. .. .	2045
Demand No. 83—Rajputana .. .. .	2045
Demand No. 84—Central India .. .. .	2045
Demand No. 85—Hyderabad .. .. .	2045
Demand No. 86—Expenditure in England—Secretary of State for India .. .. .	2046
Demand No. 87—Expenditure in England—High Commissioner for India .. .. .	2046
Demand No. 88—Capital Outlay on Security Printing .. .. .	2046
Demand No. 89—Forest Capital Outlay .. .. .	2046
Demand No. 90—Irrigation .. .. .	2046
Demand No. 91—Indian Posts and Telegraphs .. .. .	2046
Demand No. 92—Indo-European Telegraphs .. .. .	2047
Demand No. 93—Capital Outlay on Currency Note Press .. .. .	2047
Demand No. 94—Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour .. .. .	2047
Demand No. 95—Capital Outlay on Lighthouses and Lightships .. .. .	2047
Demand No. 96—Commuted Value of Pensions .. .. .	2047
Demand No. 97—New Capital at Delhi .. .. .	2048
Demand No. 98—Interest Free Advances .. .. .	2048
Demand No. 99—Loans and Advances Bearing Interest .. .. .	2048

MONDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1931—

Questions and Answers .. .. . 2049—73

	PAGES.
<b>MONDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1931—contd.</b>	
Unstarred Questions and Answers .. .. .	2073—75
Statements laid on the Table .. .. .	2076—77
Election of Members to the Standing Committee on Roads .. .. .	2078
Election of Members to the Committee on Public Accounts .. .. .	2078
Election of Members to the Governing Body of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research .. .. .	2078
The Indian Income-tax (Second Amendment) Bill—Introduced .. .. .	2078—81
The Indian Factories (Amendment) Bill—Introduced .. .. .	2081
The Indian Finance Bill—Consideration postponed for one day (Separation of Burma from India) .. .. .	2081—2122
<b>TUESDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1931—</b>	
Member Sworn .. .. .	2123
Questions and Answers .. .. .	2123—37
Election of Members to the Public Accounts Committee .. .. .	2137
Election of Members to the Governing Body of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research .. .. .	2137
Election of Members to the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association .. .. .	2138
The Salt (Additional Import Duty) Bill—Introduced .. .. .	2138—40
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion of the Motion to consider, not concluded .. .. .	2140—91
<b>WEDNESDAY, 18TH MARCH, 1931—</b>	
Questions and Answers .. .. .	2193—2207
Unstarred Questions and Answers .. .. .	2208—14
Short Notice Question and Answer .. .. .	2214—15
Election of Members to the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association .. .. .	2215
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Depart- ment of Commerce .. .. .	2216
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the Motion to consider not concluded .. .. .	2216—60
<b>THURSDAY, 19TH MARCH, 1931—</b>	
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the Motion to consider not concluded .. .. .	2261—2318
<b>FRIDAY, 20TH MARCH, 1931—</b>	
Questions and Answers .. .. .	2319—38
Unstarred Questions and Answers .. .. .	2338—54
Statements laid on the Table .. .. .	2354—58
Statement of Business .. .. .	2358—59
Election of Members to the Standing Committee on Indians Overseas Emigration and Haj Pilgrimage .. .. .	2359
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Depart- ment of Education, Health and Lands .. .. .	2359
Election of Members to the Standing Committee on Roads .. .. .	2359—60
The Wheat (Import Duty) Bill—Introduced .. .. .	2360—63
The Indian Finance Bill—Motion to consider adopted .. .. .	2363—2411

## SATURDAY, 21ST MARCH, 1931—

Questions and Answers .. .. .	2413—19
Unstarred Questions and Answers .. .. .	2419—33
Motion for Adjournment—Murder of Muslims at Mochi in the Mirzapur District—Leave refused .. .. .	2433—34
Statement <i>re</i> Proposed Confidential Meeting with H. E. the Com- mander-in-Chief .. .. .	2434—38
Election of Members to the Standing Committee on Roads .. .. .	2438
Election of the Standing Finance Committee .. .. .	2438
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Depart- ment of Commerce .. .. .	2439
The Indian Finance Bill— <i>contd.</i> .. .. .	2439—83

## MONDAY, 23RD MARCH, 1931—

Member Sworn .. .. .	2485
Questions and Answers .. .. .	2485—2513
Unstarred Questions and Answers .. .. .	2513—24
Short Notice Question and Answer .. .. .	2524
Allegations of Partiality on the part of the Chair .. .. .	2525—35
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Depart- ment of Commerce .. .. .	2535
Statements laid on the Table—	
Stores purchased by the High Commissioner for India .. .. .	2535—39
Review of the Civil Expenditure of the Government of India .. .. .	2540
Note on the Difference between Non-voted and Voted Expendi- ture .. .. .	2540—41
Demand for Supplementary Grant in respect of Railways .. .. .	2542
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the consideration of Clause not concluded .. .. .	2542—84

## TUESDAY, 24TH MARCH, 1931—

Questions and Answers .. .. .	2685—96
Unstarred Questions and Answers .. .. .	2600—04
Protest against the Execution of Bhagat Singh and others .. .. .	2604—06
Disposal of Public Business after the Walk Out of a Section of the House .. .. .	2606—22
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the consideration of Clauses not concluded .. .. .	2622—26

## WEDNESDAY, 25TH MARCH, 1931—

Questions and Answers .. .. .	2627—34
Unstarred Questions and Answers .. .. .	2634—38
Short Notice Question and Answer .. .. .	2639—40
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the Consideration of Clauses not concluded .. .. .	2640—2700
Apology to the Chair .. .. .	2701—03

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 16th March, 1931.

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

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

### RETRENCHMENT OF A MUSLIM FROM THE RAILWAY AUDIT DEPARTMENT, MULTAN.

931. \*Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan (on behalf of Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon): (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Mr. Mahomed Sabir Qureshi, B.A., a Muhammadan graduate, who was appointed in the Railway Audit Department, Multan, on the 31st January, 1931, was discharged by the D. A. O., just after 5 days of his appointment on account of retrenchment?

(b) Was there a majority of Mussalmans in the Department concerned that a Mussalman was discharged?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state whether a Hindu gentleman who was appointed on a similar post on the same day was not discharged instead of the Muslim?

**Mr. A. A. L. Parsons:** I have called for the necessary information and shall inform the Honourable Member as soon as possible.

### CLAIMS OF MUSSALMANS TO APPOINTMENTS IN THE SIND AND BALUCHISTAN POSTAL CIRCLE.

932. \*Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan (on behalf of Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon): (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to an article under the heading "Injustice to Mussalmans in Sind and Baluchistan Postal Circle", which was published in the *Daily Al Wahid* of Karachi in its issue of the 10th February, 1931?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether the figures given in the said article are true?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state what action they propose to take in the matter?

**Mr. J. A. Shillidy:** Government have not seen the article. An enquiry will be made and the information will be furnished to the Honourable Member when received.

### HINDU OFFICIALS IN THE KARACHI GENERAL POST OFFICE AND ITS TOWN SUB-OFFICES.

933. \*Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan (on behalf of Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon): Will Government be pleased to give the following information: (i) the total number of Hindu officials on the clerical cadre now working in the Karachi General Post Office and its town

sub-offices, and (ii) the number of Hindu officials on the clerical cadre now working in the Karachi General Post Office and its town sub-offices who belong to Sahiti (Nawabshah District)?

**Mr. H. A. Sams:** (i) 130.

(ii) 36.

#### APPOINTMENTS HELD BY MUSLIMS IN THE SIND AND BALUCHISTAN POSTAL CIRCLE.

934. \***Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan** (on behalf of Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon): Will Government be pleased to state the total number of lower selection grade appointments in the Sind and Baluchistan Postal Circle, and the number of lower selection grade appointments held by Muslims?

**Mr. H. A. Sams:** With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 934 and 939 together as the former, and part (a) of the latter, are the same. As regards parts (a), (b) and (c) of the latter, the information wanted by the Honourable Member has been called for and will be supplied to him in due course.

As regards part (d), the reply is in the affirmative. The Director makes his selections in accordance with the rules laid down by the Director-General and it is within his discretion to decide what clerks fulfil the prescribed conditions. With regard to the last part, the reply is in the affirmative.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MUSLIMS IN THE KARACHI GENERAL POST OFFICE.

935. \***Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan** (on behalf of Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon): Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that there are about 16 lower selection grade officials in the Karachi Head Office and that all these with the exception of one Town Inspector are held by Hindus? If so, what steps do Government propose to take to bring over a sufficient number of Muslim selection grade officials to safeguard the interests of Muslim time-scale officials?

**Mr. J. A. Shillidy:** The answer to the first part of the question is that the fact is substantially correct.

As regards the second part, I understand that the words "bring over" mean transfer and that the suggestion is that some Muslim lower selection grade officials should be transferred to the lower selection grade posts in the Karachi Head Office. The Government of India do not consider it necessary to adopt the suggestion, as the interests of all officials in the time scale are adequately safeguarded by the right of appeal to the proper authorities.

#### TRANSFER OF HINDU OFFICIALS FROM THE KARACHI GENERAL POST OFFICE.

936. \***Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Are Government aware that there are certain selection grade Hindu officials belonging to Sahiti, Nawabshah District who have remained in the Karachi General Post Office, for a considerable number of years in contravention of orders issued by the Director-General to the effect that no official should remain at one place for more than three years?

(b) If so, do Government intend to take immediate action for their transfer from Karachi General Post Office?

**Mr. H. A. Sams:** (a) and (b). Government have no information and they do not propose to take any action, as there are no such orders of the Director-General. The orders which the Honourable Member doubtless has in mind refer only to certain categories of officials.

**APPOINTMENT OF MUSLIMS IN THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.**

937. **\*Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the number of Muslim clerks in the office of the Director-General, Posts and Telegraphs, and whether the average fixed by the Government of India for recruiting Muslims is properly followed by the Director-General?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that there are 15 appointments of office Superintendents in the office of the Director-General, Posts and Telegraphs and that all these appointments are held only by Hindus? If so, why? Will Government be pleased to state whether they propose to take immediate steps to bring over a sufficient number of Muslim officials from other Circles to keep up the required average?

**Mr. J. A. Shillidy:** (a) The number of Muslim clerks and assistants employed in the office of the Director-General is 21. Special attention has been paid to the recruitment of Muslims since 1923.

(b) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to my reply to parts 1 (b) and (2) of Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin's unstarred question No. 231 in this House on the 23rd February, 1931.

**APPOINTMENT OF MUSLIM POSTMEN, ETC., IN THE KARACHI GENERAL POST OFFICE.**

938. **\*Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Is it a fact that there are 152 postmen including overseers, readers and reserve postmen and 59 packers in the Karachi General Post Office and its sub-offices out of which there are only 81 Muhammadans in the former and 16 in the latter?

(b) Is it a fact that there are some orders of the Director-General or the Government of India to the effect that recruitment in the postmen cadre is to be made from the telegraph messengers of the General Telegraph Office as far as possible and that men in that office are mostly Hindus? What action do Government propose to take for the protection of Muslim interests in that cadre?

(c) Is it a fact that the men on the waiting list amongst the postmen and packers in Karachi are predominantly Hindus? What action do Government propose to take to safeguard Muslim interests?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state why the recruitment of other communities is not withheld till the average fixed by the Government is reached?

(e) Are Government aware that the population of Sind is predominantly Muslim and that Muslim representation in this Department is only nominal? Why should not the Muslims be given a major portion of the appointments in this Department? If not, why not?

**Mr. H. A. Sams:** (a) The information will be collected and furnished to the Honourable Member.

(b) There are orders to the effect that in filling up vacancies in the postmen's cadre, preference should be given to qualified Telegraph Messengers and other inferior servants of the Department, but Government have no information whether the men of the General Telegraph Office, presumably of Karachi, are mostly Hindus. Muslim interests in the cadre of postmen are protected directly by the reservation of one-third of the vacancies filled by direct recruitment, whenever made, to that cadre for the redress of communal inequalities. It is also protected indirectly by the reservation of one-third of the vacancies in the cadre of inferior servants for the same purpose.

(c) Government have no information regarding the communal composition of the men on the waiting list. The latter part of the question does not arise.

(d) and (e). The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given in this House on the 30th January, 1929, by the Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra to Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim's starred question No. 330.

#### APPOINTMENTS HELD BY MUSLIMS IN THE SIND AND BALUCHISTAN POSTAL CIRCLE.

†939. **\*Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the number of selection grade appointments in Sind and Baluchistan Postal Circle and how many of them are being held by Muslims?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the number of candidates on the waiting list who have passed the selection grade examination and how many of them are Muslims?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state the number of candidates allowed to sit in the last selection grade examination? How many Muslims were nominated and actually allowed to appear in the said examination?

(d) Were discretionary powers given to the Director to nominate any junior deserving men at the last selection grade examination? If so, was this privilege extended to the Muslims? If not, why not? Are the Mussalmans in a minority in the Circle (Sind-Baluchistan Circle)?

#### APPOINTMENT OF A MUSLIM ACCOUNTANT IN THE DELHI GENERAL POST OFFICE.

940. **\*Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Is it a fact that Mr. Mukand Behari Lal, Accountant, Delhi General Post Office, was transferred from Delhi some time back on the charge of inciting postmen to strike and on account of his anti-Muslim tendencies?

(b) Is it a fact that Mr. Mukand Behari Lal was never to be reposted to Delhi according to the orders then issued?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state whether the orders prohibiting the re-transfer of Mr. Mukand Behari Lal to Delhi were taken into consideration before sending him to Delhi a year back?

(d) Have Government considered the desirability of posting a Muslim accountant in the Delhi General Post Office?

---

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 934.

**Mr. H. A. Sams:** Government have no information. The matter is within the competence of the Postmaster-General, Punjab and North-West Frontier, to whom a copy of the question is being sent.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** May I know the authority on which the Honourable Member has made an untrue statement in this question?

**Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** I have got some information.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Is the Honourable Member prepared to substantiate his charge on the floor of the House when casting a reflection on a Government servant?

**Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** Yes, when the occasion will arise.

#### DISCHARGE OF MUSLIM WATER SPRINKLERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

941. **\*Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to an article under the heading "Calamity on one hundred and ten Mussalmans" which was published in the *Daily Inqilab* of Lahore in its issue of the 24th February, 1931, which shows that in the Delhi Divisional Commercial Department (North Western Railway) 110 Muslim water sprinklers are intended to be discharged under retrenchment?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether the information contained therein is correct?

**Mr. A. A. L. Parsons:** (a) Yes.

(b) The permanent establishment of watermen has had to be reduced by 111 posts; 96 Muslim watermen and 17 Hindu watermen. The sanctioned establishment now stands at 102 Muslim watermen and 198 Hindu watermen.

#### PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF PEONS OF THE KARACHI CUSTOM HOUSE.

942. **\*Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Is it a fact that peons of Karachi Custom House receive as salary Rs. 16 per mensem?

(b) Is it a fact that peons of all other Government Departments receive as salary Rs. 20 or over per mensem?

(c) Do Government propose to look into the matter and see that salaries of Karachi Custom House peons are put up to a minimum of Rs. 20 per mensem, as in other departments?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that peons of Karachi Custom House when on probational leave get half of their pay, *vis.*, Rs. 8 without any allowance, house rent, etc., which they otherwise get?

(e) Is it a fact that peons of all other Government Departments receive their full pay including allowance, house rent, etc., when on probational leave?

(f) Do Government propose to look into the matter and see that the peons of Karachi Custom House are treated as those in other Departments?

(g) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that peons of all Government Departments get half of their pay when they retire on pension?

(h) Is it a fact that the peons of Karachi Custom House when they retire on pension get only one-fourth of their pay, *vis.*, Rs. 4?

(i) If the answer to part (h) be in the affirmative, are Government prepared to look into the matter and see that the peons of Karachi Custom House are treated similarly to those of other Government Departments?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** The information asked for by the Honourable Member is being obtained and will be supplied to him as soon as it is received.

#### INVESTMENT OF THE GOLD STANDARD RESERVE AND AMOUNT AND TERMS OF STERLING LOANS.

943. **\*Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing how the amount of the Gold Standard exchange Reserve of £40 million sterling is invested, and the rate of interest, etc.?

(b) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the total amount borrowed by Government in England and the rate of interest during the last year?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** (a) The statements showing the position of the Gold Standard Reserve published quarterly in the Gazette of India give the information required by the Honourable Member. The latest statement for the quarter ending the 31st December, 1930, has been published in the Gazette of India of the 7th March, 1931.

(b) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given by me on the 26th January, 1931, to part (a) of Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad's starred question No. 13.

#### RECENT CONVICTIONS IN THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE.

944. **\*Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the number of persons jailed in the North-West Frontier Province since the commencement of the civil disobedience movement under the Frontier Crimes Regulation Act and during the last five years?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state with reference to the Murderous Outrages Regulation of 1901, whether during the last 30 years there has been a case wherein the offence took place in any of the five settled districts of the North-West Frontier Province and the fire-arm missed fire (*i.e.*, it did not go off) and the offender was tried, convicted and sentenced to death?

**Mr. J. G. Acheson:** The information is being obtained and will be communicated to the Honourable Member in due course. The Honourable Member will understand that its answer will require an exhaustive examination of the records of the five districts.

With regard to (a) of the question, however, from such information as is available, it appears that approximately 244 persons in the North-West Frontier Province were imprisoned under the Security sections of the Frontier Crimes Regulation from the 6th April, 1930, to the 31st January, 1931.

**POLICE AND MILITARY ACTION AT CHARSADDA.**

945. \*Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the statement made to the Press by Khan Ali Gul Khan and Mian Sahab Jafar Shah, two prominent leaders of the North-West Frontier Province, and published in the *Hindustan Times* in its issue dated the 4th March, 1931, in connection with the police firing in Charsadda?

(b) Is it true that large forces of police, military and cavalry were concentrated at Utmanzai, on the 7th January and on the 7th February, 1931?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the reasons which led them to do so?

(d) Is it a fact that on both these occasions the police looted the houses belonging to the volunteers of the *Khudayi Khidmatgar* movement, and stole some cattle and took away their household utensils?

(e) Is it true that on the 15th of February, 1931, large forces of police and military with fixed bayonets patrolled in Charsadda and terrorised the inhabitants and shopkeepers?

(f) Is it true that on the night of 20th February, 1931, a large police and military force gathered at Utmanzai?

(g) Did Government apprehend any breach of peace to necessitate such concentration of forces?

**Mr. J. G. Acheson:** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) No. On January 8th, however Utmanzai was visited by a column of troops which was on a training tour in the neighbourhood.

(c) Does not arise.

(d) No.

(e) No.

(f) No. A force of 215 police and 82 mounted Frontier Constabulary supported by a squadron of cavalry and a company of infantry reached Utmanzai on the morning of the 21st February.

(g) Yes, for the reasons given in my answer to the next question.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi:** How can supplementary questions be asked if the reasons are to be given in the answer to the next question?

**Mr. J. G. Acheson:** Perhaps the Honourable Member will kindly ask his supplementary question in connection with the answer to the next question.

**POLICE AND MILITARY ACTION AT UTMANZAI.**

946. \*Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: (a) Is it true that each and every person who went to attend the meeting at Utmanzai on the 21st February, 1931, was subjected to a very careful search of their pockets and person?

(b) Were not Government aware that the meeting was convened for the purpose of paying tributes to the memory of two prominent Indian leaders, namely, Maulana Muhammad Ali and Pandit Motilal Nehru?

(c) Is it true that soon after the meeting had assembled a large force of police, infantry and cavalry, formed a cordon round the meeting, and an aeroplane was also hovering above?

(d) Is it true that when the meeting was in progress, suddenly and without warning two British officers on horseback charged the crowd, one of them firing all the time?

(e) Is it true that immediately after this the police, infantry and cavalry charged the assemblage with *lathis*, bayonets and some firing at the same time?

(f) Is it true that as a result of this firing two died on the spot and 100 were injured out of whom two more have died since, bringing the total number of deaths to four and injured to 98?

(g) Is it true that medical aid was refused to the injured men?

(h) Is it true that when the wounded men were being removed by the public to Peshawar for medical aid being given, the police and military prevented this and arrested the wounded men and locked them up in jail?

(i) Are Government aware that as a result of this action two have died and several are lying in a precarious condition?

(j) Is it true that the day after these incidents, *viz.*, on the 22nd February, 1931, Utmanzai was again occupied by the police and military?

(k) Is it true that on the 22nd February, 1931, Dr. Khan Sahib's dispensary was searched by the police? If so, why?

**Mr. J. G. Acheson:** (a) No, Sir.

(b) No, Sir, as is evident from the poster advertising the proposed meeting, which contains no mention of the object mentioned in the question, but only of the holding of a demonstration outside Charsadda Tahsil in defiance of Government orders prohibiting such meetings.

(c) Three platoons of police only were drawn up on three sides of the crowd. The infantry and cavalry did not form a cordon round the meeting and took no part in the dispersal of it, but were merely held in reserve. An aeroplane was used merely to ascertain beforehand and inform the local authorities where the meeting was to be held.

(d) and (e). These allegations are entirely untrue.

(f) The casualties to the rioters so far as is known were 2 killed by firearms and between 50 to 60 injured with *lathis*. The cause of the deaths was, under the orders of the Deputy Commissioner, enquired into under section 176 of the Criminal Procedure Code by a First Class Magistrate on the 25th and 26th February.

(g) No.

(h) Some slightly injured rioters, who were being taken in lorries to Peshawar, were arrested. Of these, one had a flesh wound in the arm and the remainder small scratches and contusions. They received medical aid in jail.

(i) If the action of which the Honourable Member speaks is that referred to in (h) above, the answer is in the negative. If not, the answer is that given in reply to (f) above.

(j) No. Utmanzai was not so occupied. A force however, proceeded there on that date in order to arrest persons charged as leaders of rioting on the previous day.

(k) The living rooms above the dispensary were searched. The object of the search was a cyclostyle which it is believed was used for the printing of posters issued in connection with the meeting. The cyclostyle was not found.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi:** How was the dispersal order communicated to the people who were collected there?

**Mr. J. G. Acheson:** The order was communicated by the Assistant Commissioner shortly before the dispersal of the crowd.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi:** Will the Honourable Member assure the House that there is no definite evidence of the fact that the Assistant Commissioner communicated the order?

**Mr. J. G. Acheson:** I think I cannot do better than invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the findings of the Magistrate who conducted the enquiry into this matter.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi:** Will the Honourable Member kindly read out the finding of the Magistrate so that we may know what it contains?

**Mr. J. G. Acheson:** I am sorry I have not got the copy of the finding here but I shall be quite prepared to lay it on the table of the House or to supply it to the Honourable Member.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi:** I shall be glad to have a copy of it.

**Mr. J. G. Acheson:** Certainly, Sir.

#### INQUIRY INTO HAPPENINGS IN THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE.

947. **\*Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon:** (a) Are Government aware of the strong feeling prevailing in the minds of the public in general and Muslims in particular over the happenings in North-West Frontier Province?

(b) Are Government prepared to appoint a non-official committee of this House to inquire into these allegations and submit a report? If not, why not?

**Mr. J. G. Acheson:** (a) Yes, Sir. Government are alive to the concern felt by a considerable section of public opinion over the events of the past year in the North-West Frontier Province. As the House is aware the difficult administrative and constitutional problems with which the Local Government are now faced are engaging their close and constant attention and also that of the Government of India.

(b) No, Sir. The appointment of a Committee as suggested is not likely to promote the restoration of peace and normal conditions which it is the object of all to secure.

## PUBLICATION OF THE STATE RAILWAYS TIME TABLE IN URDU.

948. \*Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan: (a) Are Government aware that the Time Table of the State-managed Railways is published in English and Hindi, but not in Urdu, which is widely understood in India?

(b) Are Government prepared to give directions to the authorities concerned to give facilities to the Urdu-knowing public by publishing the Time Table in Urdu?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) and (b). On State-managed railways the following vernacular sheet time-tables are displayed at stations:

On the North Western Railway . . . . .	In Urdu and Hindi at all stations and also in Sindhi at stations in Sindh.
On the Great Indian Peninsula Railway . . . . .	In Hindi and Mahratti.
On the Eastern Bengal Railway . . . . .	In Bengali.
On the East Indian Railway . . . . .	In Bengali, Urdu and Nagri.

Information is being obtained as to what vernacular time-tables in book form are now published by these railways and I will communicate with the Honourable Member later.

## LANGUAGE CLASSIFICATION FOR THE CENSUS OF THOSE USING URDU.

949. \*Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan: (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the editorial note of the Urdu Daily *Millat* of Delhi dated the 5th March, 1931, headed "*Mardum shumari aur Urdu kai sath dushmani*" (Census and animosity with Urdu)?

(b) Have Government issued any instructions that *Hindustani* should be written for the language of those who claim Urdu as their mother tongue?

(c) If not, do Government intend to take action on the complaint voiced by the *Millat*?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: (a) Yes.

(b) The terms Urdu and Hindi have been retained to distinguish the written language by those provinces which require such a record. As regards the spoken language the word "*Hindustani*" has been used, as at last Census, to cover both Urdu and Hindi.

(c) Does not arise.

## MARKING OF RAILWAY TICKETS IN URDU.

950. \*Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan: (a) Is it a fact that the distance, fare and place are marked on the railway tickets in both English and Hindi and not in Urdu?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in affirmative, are Government prepared to instruct the authorities concerned to give the facilities to the Urdu-knowing public by marking the railway tickets in Urdu as well?

**Mr. A. A. L. Parsons:** (a) No. The information printed on tickets is in accordance with the requirements of the Indian Railways Act, in a vernacular language in common use in the territory traversed by the railway. The vernacular used varies on different railways and on different sections of some railways, and in certain cases it is Urdu.

(b) Does not arise.

**APPOINTMENT OF A MUSLIM TO THE IMPERIAL LIBRARY, CALCUTTA.**

951. **\*Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Aziz:** (a) Is it a fact that the post of a permanent clerk has fallen vacant in the Imperial Library owing to the recent death of a permanent member of its staff? If so, how is it contemplated to fill the said vacancy?

(b) Is it a fact that there are only two permanent Muslims as against 18 Hindus on the clerical staff of the Imperial Library?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state what steps they propose to take in order to give the Muslims their due share on the staff of the Imperial Library and whether they would fill the vacancy referred to in part (a) above by appointing a Muslim?

**The Honourable Khan Bahadur Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain:** (a) Yes. The matter is under the consideration of the Council of the Imperial Library.

(b) Yes.

(c) A copy of the question and answer will be forwarded to the Council of the Imperial Library.

**Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Aziz:** Sir, the next question (No. 952) has already been answered.

**REFUSAL OF CALCUTTA-DELHI TRANSFER CONCESSIONS TO CERTAIN CLERKS IN THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL, POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.**

953. **\*Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Aziz:** (a) Is it a fact that certain clerks of the Camp Office, Simla, of the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs, who have been refused the grant of Calcutta-Delhi transfer concessions have since been detached from the Camp establishment and retained in Delhi permanently?

(b) Is it a fact that by retention of the above mentioned clerks in Delhi they are losers by *at least* Rs. 1,000 per annum each in their emoluments?

(c) Is it a fact that, for the loss of the considerable amount referred to in part (b) above, the clerks so affected have not yet been compensated to any extent, in any shape, in spite of the promises made by Mr. Rogers on the floor of this House on the 8th of September, 1928, *vide* para. (iii) of the replies to my starred question No. 226?

(d) Is it a fact that those clerks who were brought up from Calcutta to Delhi, are not losing anything in any way in their emoluments, but have been granted the concessions?

(e) If the replies to parts (a), (b), (c) and (d) above be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether the clauses of rules and regulations dealing with the questions of equity have been deleted or are

not in any way applicable in the case of these poorly paid actual sufferers? Is it a fact that *on an office file*, for no fault of their's these men have already been declared *malcontents* by the authorities, who dealt with my unstarred question No. 414 answered on the 20th day of September, 1928?

(f) If the reply to any portion of part (c) above be in the negative, what objection, if any, have Government in furnishing the House with satisfactory replies justifying the grant of concessions to those clerks who were not at all losers in any way and the refusal of concessions to those clerks who are actually losers all round?

**Mr. J. A. Shillidy:** (a) Yes.

(b) The reduction in emoluments consists in the withdrawal of the allowances admissible under the Simla Allowances Code. These allowances were granted to meet the special circumstances of Simla, and their withdrawal on the permanent location of the staff at Delhi cannot therefore be regarded as a loss.

(c) In part (iii) of his reply on the 8th September, 1928, Mr. Rogers stated that the question of compensation to the staff of the Wireless Branch would be considered on their transfer to Delhi. The case of the clerks of the Wireless Branch was examined and such of them as were entitled to any concession have been granted it. As regards the remaining members of the Simla Camp Office establishment and the question of compensation, a reference is invited to the reply given by the Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra to Maulvi Muhammad Yukub's starred question No. 185 on the 4th September, 1929.

(d) Yes. The grant of the concessions to the staff permanently transferred from Calcutta to Delhi was justified on grounds other than the cancellation of the Simla allowances.

(e) The first part of the question does not arise in view of the replies to (b) and (c) above. With respect to the second part, Government are not prepared to divulge the nature of any notes in their office files, which are confidential, and which may not be treated otherwise without grave impropriety. It would appear some one has been communicating notes on files which are confidential to the Honourable Member. The Director-General is investigating the matter and shall take the necessary disciplinary action against anyone guilty of this misconduct.

(f) Does not arise in view of the reply to (e) above.

#### RETRENCHMENT OF POSTAL ORDERLY PEONS IN BENGAL.

954. \***Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim:** (a) Is it a fact that the postal retrenchment has commenced with the abolition of the orderly peons of the 1st Class Postmasters in charge of district offices in Bengal? If so, who will now do the orderly peons' duties?

(b) Will Government kindly state how many orderly peons are sanctioned for

- (i) the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs, India,
- (ii) each of the Deputy Directors-General,
- (iii) each of the Assistant Directors-General,
- (iv) Superintendent, office of the Director-General,

- (v) Office of the Director-General,
- (vi) each Postmaster-General;
- (vii) each Deputy Postmaster-General,
- (viii) each Assistant Postmaster-General,
- (ix) each Office Superintendent, Postmaster-General's Office,
- (x) each Office of the Postmaster-General,
- (xi) each Range Officer, in Bengal and Assam,
- (xii) each office of the Range Officer, in Bengal and Assam,
- (xiii) each Superintendent of Post Offices and Railway Mail Service;
- (xiv) each Inspector of Post Offices and Railway Mail Service,
- (xv) each Presidency Postmaster,
- (xvi) each Deputy Presidency Postmaster,
- (xvii) each Assistant Presidency Postmaster,
- (xviii) Postmasters, Rangoon, Lahore, Karachi, Madura, Delhi, Poona, Patna, and Mandalay, and
- (xix) each Assistant Postmaster, Rangoon and Madras General Post Offices?

(c) What are the grounds for (i) giving two orderly peons to a Superintendent of Post Offices and (ii) for not giving any orderly peon to a District Postmaster? Has not the District Postmaster, like the Superintendent, both indoor and outdoor duties? Is it not a fact that a District Postmaster or a 1st Class Postmaster has a larger office than the office of a Superintendent of Post Offices?

(d) How many orderly peons of the officers shown under part (b) have been abolished as a measure of economy?

**Mr. H. A. Sams:** (a) The orderly peons of three 1st class Postmasters in Bengal were abolished by the Postmaster-General as they were found not to be justified on public grounds.

(b) and (d). Government have not the information and do not consider that any public purpose would be served by calling for it.

(c) The number of orderly peons is fixed with reference not to the status of offices concerned but to the exigencies of the public service.

#### EDUCATION OF MUSLIM GIRLS IN DELHI.

955. **\*Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to a note entitled "Miss Mitra Sahiba" published at pages 2 and 3 of the *Khawaja School Gazette*, Delhi, dated the 24th January, 1931?

(b) If the reply to part (a) above be in the affirmative, will Government please state whether they have inquired into the allegation made in the said note to the effect that Miss Mitra, the Assistant Superintendent of Female Education, Delhi, does not care for the education of Muslim girls? If so, with what result? If not, why not?

(c) Is it a fact that Miss Mitra, Assistant Superintendent of Female Education, Delhi, has been exercising pressure on the Muslim school-mistresses under her charge to discard the *purdah* system?

(d) Will Government please state how long Miss Mitra has held the office of the Assistant Superintendent of Female Education in Delhi?

(e) How many (i) Muslim girls' schools, and (ii) non-Muslim girls' schools have been recognised and aided by the Department of Education, Delhi, since Miss Mitra's appointment as Assistant Superintendent of Female Education, Delhi?

(f) Is it a fact that nothing has been done by the Department of Education, Delhi, to encourage female education among the Muslims since Miss Mitra's appointment as Assistant Superintendent of Female Education?

(g) How many (i) Muslim girls, and (ii) non-Muslim girls have been admitted as stipendiary students to the Training School for Women, Delhi, since Miss Mitra's appointment as Assistant Superintendent of Female Education?

(h) How many (i) Muslims, and (ii) non-Muslims have been appointed as school-mistresses in the girls' schools maintained by Government and local bodies in the Delhi Province during Miss Mitra's tenure of office as Assistant Superintendent of Female Education?

(i) Do Government propose (i) to take any steps to encourage female education among Muslims in Delhi, and (ii) to remove communal inequalities in the girls' schools in Delhi? If so, what? If not, why not?

**The Honourable Khan Bahadur Mian Sir Fazl-i-Hussain:** (a) Yes.

(b) No. Government see no justification for an enquiry into the allegation made, as the only ground on which it is based is that the Assistant Superintendent of Female Education had not acknowledged, by the 24th January, 1931, receipt of an application made on the 22nd December, 1930, for the recognition of a newly opened girls' school.

(c) and (f). No.

(d) Since the 14th November, 1918.

(e), (g) and (h). The information asked for is being obtained and will be furnished to the Honourable Member on receipt.

(i) Government already take all possible steps to encourage female education among Muslims by means of inspection, recognition, grants-in-aid, stipends and scholarships. They have no evidence that there are communal inequalities in girls' schools in Delhi, but enquiries will be made into any specific instances which are brought to their notice.

#### TRANSFER OF NON-MUSLIM TEACHERS FROM THE GOVERNMENT HIGH SCHOOL, DELHI.

956. \*Lieut. Nawab Muhammad Ibrahim Ali Khan: With reference to Government's reply to starred question No. 753 asked in the Legislative Assembly on the 21st March, 1930, will Government please state what steps they have taken to remove the long standing grievances of Muslims in the matter of transfer of non-Muslim teachers, who have been on the staff of the Government High School, Delhi, for more than 10 years?

**The Honourable Khan Bahadur Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain:** One Hindu teacher has already been replaced by a Muslim teacher and the replacement of another is under consideration.

**APPOINTMENT OF A MUSLIM AS HEADMASTER OF THE GOVERNMENT HIGH SCHOOL, DELHI.**

957. \***Lieut. Nawab Muhammad Ibrahim Ali Khan**: With reference to Government's reply to starred question No. 752 asked in the Legislative Assembly on the 21st March, 1930, purporting that no Muslim has ever been Headmaster of the Government High School, Delhi, will Government please state whether they propose to take a Muslim Headmaster from the Punjab to hold the post of the Headmaster, Government High School, Delhi, on the retirement of the present Headmaster of the said High School?

**The Honourable Khan Bahadur Mian Sir Fazi-i-Husain**: The suggestion of the Honourable Member will be considered when the present Headmaster retires towards the end of this year.

**RECRUITMENT OF ACCOUNTANTS TO THE CALCUTTA OFFICES OF THE PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPARTMENT.**

958. \***Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan** (on behalf of Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad): (a) Is it a fact that an examination for the recruitment of accountants in the Calcutta Offices of the Printing and Stationery Department will be held in September or October, 1931?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government please state how many applications have been so far received and what safeguards have been made for minority communities?

**Mr. J. A. Shillidy**: (a) Yes. The examination is intended to be a qualifying test for making promotions to the grade of Accountant from the clerical staff of the Stationery and Printing Department.

(b) The nomination of candidates for the examination will be made in the month of July. It is open to members of the minority communities employed in the Stationery and Printing Department possessing the necessary educational qualifications to apply through the Heads of their offices for permission to appear in the examination.

**RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF MUSLIMS FOR THE PRINTING TRADE.**

959. \***Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan** (on behalf of Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad): (a) Will Government please state how many apprentices have so far been recruited and trained for the printing trade in the United Kingdom?

(b) How many of them are Muslims?

(c) How many apprentices are recruited each year in the Calcutta Press for training and how many are Muslims?

(d) If no Muslims are recruited, why not?

**Mr. J. A. Shillidy**: (a) and (b). Five apprentices have been recruited and sent to England for training. Of these, one is a Muslim.

(c) One apprentice is recruited each year for training in the Government of India Press, Calcutta. Two Muslims are at present under training in the Press.

(d) Does not arise.

**APPOINTMENT OF MUSLIMS TO HIGHER POSTS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, DELHI.**

960. \***Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan** (on behalf of Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad): (a) Is it a fact that all the higher posts in the Government of India Press, Delhi, are occupied by non-Muslims? Is it a fact that, since the Delhi Press was started, no Muhammadan has been occupying posts in the following capacities: Assistant Manager, Head Assistant, Head Reader, Accountant and Cashier, General Store Keeper, Head Computer and Assistant?

(b) Will Government please lay on the table of the House a statement showing the total strength of the clerical establishment and how many of them are Muhammadans?

(c) What steps do Government propose to take to rectify the paucity of the Muhammadans in the supervising staff of the Government of India Press, Delhi?

**Mr. J. A. Shillidy:** (a) I am not sure what the Honourable Member means by "higher posts" but it is a fact that the posts named in the question have not been held by Muslims in the Delhi Press. The following supervisory posts are, however, held by Muslims:

Machine Room Foreman . . . . .	1
Bindery Foreman . . . . .	1
Section-holder . . . . .	1
Section-holders (Offg.) . . . . .	2

(b) The total strength of the clerks on the permanent establishment is 37, of which 7 are Muslims; 3 Muslim clerks are also employed on the fluctuating establishment.

(c) As far as these posts are filled by promotion, communal grounds cannot be taken into consideration. But when direct appointments are made the usual policy of Government regarding minority representation in services is being followed.

**TRANSFER OF CERTAIN CLERKS FROM THE RAILWAY BOARD'S OFFICE TO THE OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER OF RAILWAY ACCOUNTS.**

961. \***Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal:** (a) Is it a fact that the Statistical Branch of the Railway Board was transferred to the office of the Controller of Railway Accounts last year?

(b) Is it a fact that in that Branch some temporary men of the Railway Board were transferred to the Controller of Railway Accounts' Office with clear hopes of confirmation in that office very soon?

(c) If the reply to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government please state whether they have since been confirmed? If not, why not?

(d) Is it a fact that out of these temporary men who were transferred from the Railway Board there are three men who were declared qualified by the Public Service Commission?

(e) Is it a fact that the Office of the Controller of Railway Accounts is considered one of the attached offices and does not move between Simla and Delhi?

(f) If so, why were these qualified temporary men transferred to the Office of the Controller, Railway Accounts, which is an attached office?

(g) Was the consent of these men taken before the transfer was made? If not, why were the qualified men selected for transfer to the Controller of Railway Accounts' Office in that Branch in preference to unqualified men?

(h) With reference to a reply given to question No. 172, dated the 11th February, 1931, to the effect that at present there were one Second Division and nine Third Division unqualified men working in the Railway Board, will Government please state the justification for keeping these unqualified men in the moving of the Secretariat Office particularly in preference to the qualified men transferred to the Controller of Railway Accounts' Office with the Statistical Branch?

(i) Will Government please state the number of temporary men working in the Railway Board when the Statistical Branch was transferred to the Controller of Railway Accounts' Office and how many of them were kept behind in the Railway Board and how many were so transferred? How many were unqualified men amongst the men who remained in the Railway Board?

(j) Have Government ever enquired from the qualified men transferred to the Controller of Railway Accounts' Office whether they were willing to go back to the Railway Board or not?

(k) Is it a fact that in the Government of India offices qualified men are shown senior to unqualified men and are so considered for permanency and always shown preference? If so, why should the Railway Board be an exception?

**Mr. A. A. L. Parsons** (a) Ycs.

(b) and (c). Some temporary men were transferred to the Controller of Railway Accounts' Office but no specific undertaking was given that they would be confirmed very soon. Three of them, however, have since been confirmed.

(d) No. The number is 2.

(e) The Office of the Controller of Railway Accounts is not an attached office of the Railway Board and does not move to Simla.

(f), (g) and (h). The transfer of the staff was arranged in the interest of the work.

(i) The number of temporary men working in the Railway Board's office at the time of transfer of the Statistical Branch to the C. R. A.'s office was 34. The number of temporary men transferred to the C. R. A.'s office was 8. The number of temporary men not qualifying from the Public Service Commission and retained in the Railway Board's office was 10.

(j) No.

(k) There is no general rule about seniority of temporary men, but in filling up vacancies, as a permanent measure, the principle followed in the Railway Board's office as in other Government of India offices is to give preference to qualified men.

**TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE PAID ON TRANSFER TO CERTAIN DAFTRIES AND RECORD SUPPLIERS.**

962. \***Pandit S. N. Sen:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what rates of travelling allowances have been paid to the Daftries and Record suppliers of:

- (i) the Office of the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs,
- (ii) the Meteorological Department, and
- (iii) the Office of the Imperial Records,

at the time of their permanent shifting from Calcutta to Delhi, and from Simla to Poona, as the case may have been?

(b) Will Government please state if the rates of travelling allowances referred to in part (a) are uniform?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the negative, will Government be pleased to assign the reason for any difference in those rates?

(d) Do Government propose to take early steps to remove the difference, if any, in those rates?

**Mr. J. A. Shillidy:** (a) (i), (ii) and (iii). The Daftries and Record Suppliers of the office of the Imperial Records were granted third class fares while intermediate class fares were granted to Daftries of the Office of the Director-General, Posts and Telegraphs, and the Director-General of Observatories.

(b) No.

(c) The reason for the difference in the rates is due to the fact that the Daftries and Record Suppliers of the office of the Director-General, Posts and Telegraphs, and of the Meteorological Department who are officers of the fourth grade were allowed travelling allowance admissible to the officers of third grade as a concession. It was realised after this that an unsatisfactory precedent was being created and it was therefore decided not to extend this concession to any other Department.

(d) No.

**CONSTRUCTION OF A PERMANENT RAILWAY STATION AT FARIDPUR.**

963. \***Pandit S. N. Sen:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state:

- (i) when the railway station at Faridpur (Bengal) was constructed;
- (ii) if the construction is permanent or temporary;
- (iii) if not yet permanent, why not;
- (iv) what the approximate cost of constructing a permanent station there will be; and
- (v) what the annual income from that station is?

(b) Are Government aware of any resolution regarding the Faridpur railway station that has been recently passed at a joint meeting of the Passengers' Association, the Merchants' Association and the Anjuman Public, and endorsed by the Faridpur District Board and Municipality urging the necessity of having a permanent railway station there?

(c) If so, what steps do Government propose to take in the matter?

**Mr. A. A. L. Parsons:** I am making inquiries on certain points and a reply will be sent to the Honourable Member as soon as all the information has been collected.

**ENGLISH TEACHERS IN THE ROYAL INDIAN MILITARY COLLEGE AT DEHRA DUN.**

964. \***Mr. B. N. M'sra:** (a) Will Government please state how many English teachers there are including the Principal, in the Royal Indian Military College, Dehra Dun, and what are their emoluments, including the basic pay, overseas pay and other allowances?

(b) What were the total emoluments drawn by the various English teachers individually for the last month?

(c) In addition to the above emoluments, what other concessions do they enjoy in the way of free quarters and passages to England, etc.?

(d) How many classes are there in the Royal Indian Military College and what are the class hours taught by each of the English teachers every day?

(e) Do the English teachers know any Indian language? If not, how do they impart instruction effectively to the newly admitted boys of between 11 and 12 years of age?

**Mr. G. M. Young:** (a) and (b). There are 9 European teachers, including the Principal, and 2 British soldier instructors. I lay on the table a statement showing their rates of pay and allowances.

(c) European teachers, other than the two British soldier instructors, receive the concessions admissible to members of the Indian Educational Service, for example, free passages under the Lee concessions and free medical attendance. They also receive free quarters.

(d) There are nine classes and, in addition, a special class of four new cadets who are backward in English.

In addition to his other duties, the Principal teaches 15 periods a week. The European masters teach between 23 and 30 periods a week. Each European master also turns out at college games for 3 afternoons each week and is on duty as Master of the Day for 24 hours each week.

(e) All European teachers have special lessons in Hindustani to enable them to give instructions to new cadets.

---

*Statement laid on the table with reference to parts (a) and (b) of starred question No. 964.*

(a) Pay and allowances of European teachers in the Dehra Dun College.

*Principal.*—Basic pay Rs. 1,550—100—1,750. Overseas pay Rs. 300. Principal's allowance Rs. 150.

*Section Masters (3).*—Basic pay Rs. 400 to Rs. 1,500. Overseas pay on scale authorised, which varies according to basic pay. Allowance Rs. 100.

*Assistant Masters (5).*—Basic pay Rs. 400 to Rs. 1,500. Overseas pay on scale authorised, which varies according to basic pay.

*British soldier instructors (2).*—Pay and allowances of rank under Army Regulations.

(b) Total emoluments drawn last month by European teachers in the Dehra Dun College.

*Principal*.—Rs. 1,700 plus £30 overseas pay.

*Section Masters*.—(1) Rs. 1,300 plus £30 overseas pay.

(2) Rs. 1,200 plus £30 overseas pay.

(3) Rs. 1,100 plus £30 overseas pay.

*Assistant Masters*.—(1) †Rs. 650 plus £25 overseas pay.

(2) Rs. 600 plus £15 overseas pay.

(3) Rs. 600 including Rs. 150 overseas pay.

(4) Rs. 550 including Rs. 150 overseas pay.

(5) Rs. 550 including Rs. 150 overseas pay.

#### VERNACULAR TEACHERS IN THE ROYAL INDIAN MILITARY COLLEGE, DEHRA DUN

965. \***Mr. B. N. Misra**: (a) How many vernacular teachers are there in the Royal Indian Military College, Dehra Dun?

(b) What are the emoluments and other concessions granted to these teachers?

(c) What languages are taught by the vernacular teachers?

(d) Is it a fact that vernacular teachers teach subjects other than vernacular languages? If so, why?

**Mr. G. M. Young**: (a) Three.

(b) Their scale of pay is Rs. 180—10—300 a month. They are granted free quarters or Rs. 30 a month in lieu.

(c) Urdu, Persian, Arabic, Punjabi, Gurmukhi and Hindi.

(d) Yes, but only occasionally and at their own request.

#### COST AND RESULTS OF THE ROYAL INDIAN MILITARY COLLEGE, DEHRA DUN.

966. \***Mr. B. N. Misra**: (a) What is the total expenditure incurred on the Royal Indian Military College, Dehra Dun, since its inception and how many cadets have passed out of it to qualify in England for the Indian Army?

(b) How many boys have failed to obtain admission to the Cadet College in England and what facilities have been afforded to them to secure any other employment?

(c) How many boys have been removed or withdrawn from this college and for what reasons?

**Mr. G. M. Young**: (a) The gross total expenditure from 1921-22 to 1929-30 was about Rs. 16,13,000. Receipts amounted to about Rs. 1,26,000 in the year 1929-30.

51 boys trained at Dehra Dun have qualified for admission to the various cadet colleges in England.

(b) 11 cadets who appeared at the Army Entrance Examinations on the completion of their course were unsuccessful. I am endeavouring to obtain the information asked for in the latter part of the question.

(c) 13 cadets have been removed and 29 withdrawn from the College for the following reasons :

Removals.		Withdrawals.	
Undesirable . . . . .	2	Financial reasons . . . . .	2
Misconduct . . . . .	1	Medical reasons . . . . .	9
Educationally backward	7	Educationally backward . . . . .	10
Financial reasons . . . . .	1	Private reasons . . . . .	8
Medical reasons . . . . .	2		
	-----		-----
	13		29
	-----		-----

**COST AND RESULTS OF THE ROYAL INDIAN MILITARY COLLEGE, DEHRA DUN.**

967. \***Mr. B. N. Misra:** What is the total annual budget of the Royal Indian Military College, Dehra Dun, and how many cadets go out of it annually to qualify in England?

**Mr. G. M. Young:** The revised budget estimate for 1930-31 is Rs. 2,37,000. The receipts in this year amounted to Rs. 1,41,300.

The number of boys who qualify for admission to the cadet colleges in England varies every year. As stated in my reply to question No. 966, 51 boys have qualified at the Army Entrance Examination.

**FOOD SUPPLIED TO CADETS IN THE ROYAL INDIAN MILITARY COLLEGE, DEHRA DUN.**

968. \***Mr. B. N. Misra:** (a) What kind of food is given to the cadets in the Royal Indian Military College, Dehra Dun, and what is the monthly expenditure per head per month?

(b) Is it a fact that the cadets are given English food and not Indian food? If so, why?

**Mr. G. M. Young:** (a) The cadets mess in European style except that curries and *chupatties* are also given, and no beef or pork is allowed inside the mess or the kitchen.

The monthly expenditure on food for each cadet is a little over Rs. 56.

(b) Yes, so as to accustom the boys to the food which they will receive in cadet colleges in England.

**SUBJECTS TAUGHT IN THE ROYAL INDIAN MILITARY COLLEGE, DEHRA DUN.**

969. \***Mr. B. N. Misra:** (a) What subjects are taught in the Royal Indian Military College, Dehra Dun?

(b) Does military training form a subject of instruction in this College?

(c) If the reply to part (b) above be in the negative, why is this College called a military college?

(d) Is the instruction imparted in this College in any way different from that of a public school in India?

(e) Is it a fact that the Diploma examination of this College is equivalent to the Matriculation examination of the Indian Universities?

(f) If the reply to part (e) above be in the affirmative, what is the justification for running such an expensive college?

**Mr. G. M. Young:** (a) *Obligatory subjects:* English, History, Geography, Mathematics, Science, Indian languages, Physical Training, Gymnastics and games.

*Optional subjects:* Higher Mathematics, British Imperial History and Drawing.

(b) No.

(c) Because it trains students for the Army Entrance Examination.

(d) Government have no information.

(e) Yes, it has been accepted as such by leading universities in India.

(f) The Dehra Dun College produces, by common consent, by far the best officer recruits for the Indian Army under the present system. But the whole question of the retention of this institution will of course come under the consideration of the Committee on the Indian Military College.

#### ADMISSION TO ENGLISH MILITARY COLLEGES OF CADETS OF THE ROYAL INDIAN MILITARY COLLEGE, DEHRA DUN.

970. **\*Mr. B. N. Misra:** (a) Do the cadets from the Royal Indian Military College, Dehra Dun, get any preference over the outside candidates who compete for admission to the military colleges in England?

(b) If the reply to part (a) above be in the negative, what justification is there for a cadet to spend about Rs. 12,000 in six years to compete with the candidates from much cheaper colleges?

**Mr. G. M. Young:** (a) and (b). They get no preference in the examination; but, as I have already indicated, the best candidates are, as a matter of fact, those who have been educated at Dehra Dun, and that is the justification for maintaining the College.

#### LAVATORY ARRANGEMENTS FOR THIRD CLASS PASSENGERS ON THE BARSILIGHT RAILWAY.

971. **\*Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state as to what is the existing arrangement for the third class passengers in the matter of lavatory and latrine arrangements on the Barsi-Light Railway running between Miraj and Pandharpur?

(b) If there be no existing arrangement, what steps do Government propose to take in this matter and when?

**Mr. A. A. L. Parsons:** I understand that latrines are not provided on roadside stations between Pandharpur and Miraj, that lavatories are provided in women's compartments, and that the Company are considering the provision of lavatories in certain coaches which run on fast trains. The Railway Board propose to ask the Senior Government Inspector to look into the matter.

#### TRAFFIC LOST BY THE GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY AT AMRNOTI.

972. **\*Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Will Government please state whether the Great Indian Peninsula Railway have suffered any loss on account of the Amrnoti railway station not being on the main line during the last four years? If so, what is the approximate loss?

(b) Will Government please state how much passenger traffic has been diverted by the motor bus service?

(c) What steps do Government propose to take to recoup the loss that is being suffered by this railway on account of the diversion of the passenger traffic?

**Mr. A. A. L. Parsons:** (a) and (b). I am afraid it is not possible to give these figures, for it is impossible to say what extra traffic would have been obtained in the past had the arrangements at Amraoti been different from what they are.

(c) I am, however, grateful to the Honourable Member for bringing to notice the possibility that there is an avoidable loss of traffic owing to the arrangements at Amraoti, and I am asking the Agent of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway to look into the matter.

#### FIRE-ARM LICENCES CONFISCATED IN THE UNITED PROVINCES.

973. **\*Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan:** (a) Are Government aware that the licences of fire arms of many persons who have been loyal to Government have been confiscated in certain districts in the United Provinces during the recent non-co-operation movement on suspicion that they sympathised with the Congress programme?

(b) Are Government prepared to issue directions to the United Provinces Government to instruct the District Magistrates to issue licences to such persons again in order to create a cool atmosphere and regain confidence?

**The Honourable Sir James Orerar:** (a) I regret I have no information, but I have no doubt that if action has been taken, it has been under section 18 (a) of the Indian Arms Act, 1878, which empowers licensing authorities to cancel or suspend licenses when they consider this to be necessary for the security of the public peace.

(b) The matter is within the discretion of the Local Government, to whom I shall, however, send a copy of the question and my reply.

#### DUTY ON SUGAR.

974. **\*Kumar Gupteshwar Prasad Singh:** (a) With reference to the speech of the Honourable the Finance Member introducing the Budget for 1931-32 on February the 28th, will Government be pleased to state whether the landed price of sugar at Calcutta *ex-duty* was below Rs. 4 per maund on the 28th February, 1931, and even now?

(b) Is it a fact that Indian sugar factories manufacture about 50 per cent. sugar of below 23 D. S.?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government state why this grade of sugar is termed as of minor importance and as such why is custom duty kept at 8 as. per cwt. lower than sugar of above 23 D. S.?

(d) Are Government aware that sugar manufactured in this country of the grade below 23 D. S. is not protected? If so, are Government prepared to take immediate steps to remove the difference of 8 as. per cwt. kept between the two grades of sugar, below and above 23 D. S.?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** (a) The landed price of white sugar at Calcutta *ex-duty* on the 28th February, 1931, was Rs. 3-15-2 per maund and has remained at that level since then.

(b) Yes.

(c) and (d). I described lower grades of sugar as of minor importance, because the volume of their imports is only about one-eighth of the total volume of imports of all kinds of sugar. For the rest, the Honourable Member will doubtless realise that my Budget proposals were made from the point of view of revenue and not from the point of view of protection. The whole question will have to be carefully considered in connection with the Tariff Board's Report.

**APPOINTMENT OF MUHAMMADANS TO THE COMMERCIAL AUDIT BRANCH OF THE INDIAN AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS SERVICE.**

975. **\*Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur:** Will Government please state whether:

- (a) it is not a fact that in spite of repeated requests every year, no Muhammadan of the Indian Audit and Accounts Service has been taken in the Commercial Audit Branch;
- (b) it is not a fact that there is not a single Muhammadan gazetted officer in that Department; and
- (c) it is not a fact that by reason of the entire absence of Muhammadan officers, the Government of India's order regarding the recruitment to the services of one-third of the members of the minority communities has been violated not only in letter but also in spirit and that members of other minority communities have been taken?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** (a), (b) and (c). There is at present no Muslim Gazetted Officer in the Commercial Audit Branch. The Superior Officers in this Department belong to the Indian Audit and Accounts Service and are liable to transfer all over India to the various branches of the Audit Department. Postings to individual branches are not governed by communal considerations. The Government of India's orders regarding the recruitment of members of minority communities apply to initial recruitment to services as a whole and not to the postings of the members of the services to particular posts. I may add that there has been no request on the part of Muslim Officers of the Indian Audit and Accounts Service to be posted to duty in the Commercial Audit Branch.

**APPOINTMENT OF MUHAMMADANS IN CERTAIN ACCOUNTS OFFICES.**

976. **\*Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur:** (a) Will Government kindly state the total number of (i) Hindus, (ii) Muhammadans, and (iii) members of other minority communities, in the clerical grade in the offices of the Auditor General, Commercial Audit, Accountant General, Central Revenues, Accountant General, Posts and Telegraphs, Telephone Revenue Accounts Officer, Audit Officer, Indian Stores Department, and Pay and Accounts Officer, Secretariat?

(b) How many Muhammadans have been taken as probationers in the Subordinate Accounts Service as compared with Hindus during the last three years in the Departments mentioned in part (a) above?

(c) Do Government intend to take an adequate number of Muslim probationers in those offices?

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** (a) and (b). A statement containing the required information is laid on the table.

(c) No appointments of Subordinate Accounts Service probationers are likely to be made in the Pay and Accounts Office, Secretariat. As regards the other offices, instructions were issued last year to the heads of offices to make special efforts to find members of minority communities who would be suitable for direct appointment as probationers. No further action is contemplated at present.

Name of office.	Total number in the clerical grade.			Total No. appointed as probationers in the S. A. S. during the last three years.	
	Hindus.	Muham-madans.	Other minority commu-nities.	Hindus.	Muham-madans.
1. Auditor General . . . .	66	10	5	1	1
2. Director of Commercial Audit	44	4	7	1	Nil.
3. A. G., C. R. . . . .	232	19	16	1	Nil.
4. A. G., P. & T. . . . .	64	3	1	Nil.	Nil.
5. Telegraph Revenue Accounts Officer.	23	9	4	Nil.	Nil.
6. Audit Officer, Indian Stores Deptt.	102	18	13	Nil.	Nil.
7. Pay and Accounts Officer, Secretariat.	40	6		Nil.	Nil.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

RATES OF FREIGHT FOR COTTON AND WHEAT BETWEEN DELHI AND KARACHI.

304. **Mr. E. F. Sykes:** Will Government please give the rates of freight specified in the statement below?

Commodity.	From	To	Date.	Rs. a. p.
Cotton . . . .	Khanewal	Kiamari	{ 1913 1931	
		Delhi Jn.	{ 1913 1931	
Wheat . . . .	"	Kiamari	{ 1913 1931	
		Delhi Jn.	{ 1913 1931	

**Mr. A. A. L. Parsons:** The railway risk rate for raw cotton full-pressed from Khanewal to Kiamari in 1913 was Rs. 0-15-0 per maund. No owners risk rate was quoted. The railway risk rate is now Rs. 1-14-4 and there is an owners risk rate of Rs. 1-13-10. The railway risk rate from Khanewal to Delhi in 1913 was Rs. 1-2-3 and the owners risk rate was Rs. 0-11-11. The railway risk rate is now Rs. 1-6-6. No owners risk rate is quoted.

The rate for wheat from Kiamari to Delhi in 1913 was Rs. 0-8-0 per maund and is now Rs. 0-10-7. The rate from Khanewal to Delhi in 1913 was Rs. 0-7-7 and is now Rs. 0-9-2.

#### COAL PURCHASED FOR THE ROYAL INDIAN MARINE.

305. **Mr. K. C. Neogy:** (a) Will Government be pleased to give information in regard to the purchase of coal for the Royal Indian Marine under the following heads:

- (i) the procedure under which coal is purchased for the Royal Indian Marine;
- (ii) the quantity of coal purchased for the Royal Indian Marine during the last five years; and
- (iii) the quantity of Indian, Natal and Welsh Coal, giving separate figures for each quality purchased, during the last five years?

(b) In case no Indian coal has been purchased, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for not purchasing the same?

**Mr. G. M. Young:** (a) (i). Coal purchased in India.—The usual procedure of inviting public tenders by advertisement in local papers is adopted.

Coal imported from England for supply to subsidised naval vessels in the Persian Gulf is obtained through the Director-General, India Store Department, London.

(a) (ii). 98,272 tons.

(a) (iii). Indian—14,491 tons.

Natal—3,471 tons.

Welsh—80,310 tons. This figure however includes the coal supplied, through the Royal Indian Marine, to the ships of the Royal Navy in the Persian Gulf. I will endeavour to obtain the figures for Royal Indian Marine ships separately, and will inform the Honourable Member when I get them.

(b) This does not actually arise, but I should like to inform the Honourable Member that the possibility of utilizing Indian coal in warships is being taken up by the Flag Officer Commanding, Royal Indian Marine.

#### WORKING HOURS OF EMPLOYEES OF THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

303. **Mr. N. E. Gunjal:** With reference to the reply given on the 1st February, 1928, to Mr. N. M. Joshi's unstarred question No. 6,

regarding working hours of employees of the Railway Mail Service, will Government be pleased to lay on the table the result of their promised consideration with regard to the question of treating the attendance of sorters of the running sections in Record Offices for the preparation and examination of work papers as "period spent on duty"?

**Mr. H. A. Sams:** The matter is still under my consideration and I will shortly issue orders.

#### ADMISSION OF TEMPORARY CLERKS TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION EXAMINATION.

307. **Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** (a) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the names of temporary clerks serving in the Government of India Offices, who do not possess the minimum educational qualification required by the Public Service Commission?

(b) Will Government be pleased to place on the table a statement of such temporary clerks who are being allowed to appear at the ensuing qualifying examination of the Public Service Commission with names, period of service and the reasons in each case?

(c) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the names of those temporary clerks who have not been allowed to appear at the ensuing qualifying examination of the Public Service Commission, with reasons in each case?

(d) Are Government aware that a number of temporary clerks, who have been serving in the Government of India offices for a considerable period, have not been permitted to appear at the said examination, on the ground that they do not possess the minimum educational qualification required by the Public Service Commission?

(e) Is it a fact that a number of temporary clerks who do not possess the minimum educational qualification required by the Public Service Commission are being allowed to appear at the said examination as special cases? If so, will they be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the name, period of service and reason in each case?

(f) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the name and period of service, in each case, of the temporary clerks who have been employed in Secretariat or its attached offices between the 1st of April 1928 and the 31st December 1930, but do not possess the minimum educational qualification required by the Public Service Commission?

**The Honourable Sir James Crerar:** (a) to (f). The statements asked for by the Honourable Member will involve a great deal of labour and will serve no useful purpose. It is not a fact that temporary clerks who do not possess the minimum educational qualification are being allowed to appear at the forthcoming examination. As far as I am aware only one exception has been made to this rule in the case of a clerk who rendered war service and comes under terms of paragraph 4 of the Home Department Resolution No. 1099 of the 8th August, 1919.

1

## STATEMENTS LAID ON THE TABLE.

### CONSTRUCTION OF A CHILDREN'S WARD IN THE PESHAWAR HOSPITAL.

**Mr. J. G. Acheson** (Foreign Secretary): Sir, I beg to lay on the table the information promised in reply to a supplementary question to starred question No. 266 asked by Mr. B. R. Puri on the 2nd February, 1931, regarding the construction of a children's ward in the Peshawar Hospital.

“(a) The Local Administration has under consideration a suggestion that when funds are available for the construction of another ward, maternity or children's, in the Lady Reading Hospital at Peshawar, the ward should bear the names of Sardar Ganga Singh's wife and children.

(b) The financial situation does not yet permit a reply.”

### ACTUAL EARNINGS OF CERTAIN NEWLY CONSTRUCTED RAILWAY LINES.

**Mr. A. A. L. Parsons** (Financial Commissioner, Railways): Sir, the Honourable the Railway Member, who is indisposed, has asked me in fulfilment of an undertaking which he gave on the 19th February, 1930, during the general discussion of the Railway Budget, to lay on the table a statement giving the information at present available as to the actual earnings of certain newly constructed railway lines and a comparison of the return given by these earnings on the capital outlay with the return anticipated on the original estimates.

Statements showing actual net earnings during the financial year 1929-30, of new lines opened, after 1st October 1927, throughout for traffic for a full year.

Item No.	Name of project.	Working railway.	Gauge.	Mileage.	Date of opening.	Net income creditable to the project for 1929-30.	Percentage return of income (column 7) on Capital outlay.	Estimate percent age return of income on Capital outlay some few years after opening as estimated originally.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	Purasing-Badulipara Jorhat	A. B.	3' 3 1/2"	43.28	1-8-1928	Rs. 20,770	0.61	7.00	
2	Kardinganj-Longal Valley	A. B.	3' 3 1/2"	39.45	1-1-1929	-1,54,554	-5.46	5.5	
3	Vetrokum-Mohanganj.	A. B.	3' 3 1/2"	17.55	1-4-1929	20,967	1.05	9.6	
4	Sibsagar Road-Khowang	A. B.	3' 3 1/2"	58.79	10-11-1927	94,253	2.67	7.00	
5	Vizapur-Amvillysan Extension	B. B. & C. I.	3' 3 1/2"	25.76	1-10-1928	21,931*	1.96	4.35*	
6	Gedivada-Dhimaaram	M. & S. M.	3' 3 1/2"	42.60	17-5-1928	1,44,708	3.55	6.61	
7	Khidavolin Narasapur	M. & S. M.	5' 6"	47.10	3-2-1929	2,16,940	3.14		
8	Kannirbhalli-Swanbhaili Extension	M. & S. M.	3' 3 1/2"	11.74	15-3-1928	2,71,541	47.21	†	† The line was sanctioned for construction on the assurance that a minimum output of 35,000 tons of manganese ore annually by the Sandur Mines Company would be enough to guarantee the railway against loss.
9	Jessara-Shakargadh Chak Jhomru	N. W.	5' 6"	29.0	21-2-1927	-32,941	-1.79	6.00	† In order Rs. 4,00,000 guaranteed by Punjab Government against loss.
10	Kangra Valley	N. W.	5' 6"	108	1-4-1929	a)-3,10,779	-0.94	5.51	
11	Lyalpur-Jarnwala	N. W.	5' 6"	29.10	2-13-1927	-67,834	-3.83	5.48	
12	Bohtak-Goban - Panipat	N. W.	5' 6"	44.31	15-3-1928	-17,697	-0.63	6.33	
13	Shaldara-Narawal	N. W.	5' 6"	47.73	21-12-1926	2,43,404	7.23	4.84	
14	Cuddalore-Viduthachalam	S. I.	3' 3 1/2"	35.59	21-6-1918	(a) 75,710*	5.00	§	§ The line was considered unviable but the District Board of South Arcot, who were created in it have expressed their willingness to guarantee the Government of India against loss, if any, arising out of the construction and working of the line.
15	Dindigul Pollachi	S. I.	3' 3 1/2"	75.10	19-11-1928	7,05,822*	9.01	9.44	
16	Madura-Bodhrayakattur	S. I.	3' 3 1/2"	45.94	20-11-1928	2,94,088*	5.5	8.71	
17	Shoranoor-Kilimbar	S. I.	5' 6"	41.32	26-10-1927	-46,110	-0.88	4.00	
18	Vilupnam-Trichinopoly	S. I.	3' 3 1/2"	109.0	1-2-1929	9,47,928*	4.89	6.50	

\* Excluding the earnings of the existing lines from new traffic, interchanged with the new Railway.  
 (e) The figures do not include payments of amounts on account of guarantee payable by Local Government or District Board.

## ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ROADS.

**Mr. J. A. Shillidy** (Secretary, Industries and Labour Department): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this Assembly do proceed to the election for the financial year 1931-32, in such method as may be approved by the Honourable the President, of six Members to serve on a Standing Committee on Roads which will be appointed by the Governor General in Council and the constitution and functions of which shall be as defined in the Resolution on Road Development adopted by the Assembly on the 4th February, 1930."

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. President:** I may inform Members that for the purpose of election of Members to the Standing Committee on Roads the Assembly Office will be open to receive nominations up to 12 noon on Wednesday the 18th March, while the election, if necessary, will be held in this Chamber on Friday the 20th March, 1931. The election will be conducted in accordance with the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

---

## ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

**Mr. President:** Non-official Members will now proceed to elect eight Members to be members of the Committee on Public Accounts. There are 13 candidates whose names are printed on the ballot papers which will now be supplied to Honourable Members in the order in which I call them.

(The ballot was then taken.)

---

## ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

**Mr. President:** Members will now proceed to elect two Members to sit on the Governing Body of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research. There are six candidates whose names are printed on the ballot papers which will now be supplied to Honourable Members in the order in which I call them.

(The ballot was then taken.)

---

## THE INDIAN INCOME-TAX (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster** (Finance Member): Sir, I move  
12 NOON. for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922, for certain purposes.

The purpose of this Bill has already been referred to and explained in general terms in my Budget speech. I do not therefore intend at this stage to speak in any detail about its objects. It is a very important Bill, for it goes to the very basis of the liability to taxation that the present Act imposes.

While I do not intend to say anything now in elaboration of my explanations already given about the objects which we have in view, I should like to say a word on procedure. It was originally our intention after the Bill had been introduced, to move that it be referred to a Select Committee, and simultaneously, in order to save time, it was our intention that the Bill should be circulated for opinions by executive order. It is quite obvious that on so important a matter the public generally and the bodies representative of commerce and industry should have an opportunity of expressing their views on the Bill and of bringing forward criticisms. There are one or two features in the Bill which may be controversial. On the other hand, in the present circumstances, it is extremely important that the major effect of this Bill should come into operation as quickly as possible, and if the Bill is now circulated for opinions and is not passed this Session, it means that we cannot get advantage of its effects for a full financial year. Therefore, if the general feeling of the House were to be that it is in the public interest that the Bill in its present form should be placed on the Statute-book immediately, the Government would respond to that idea, but it is a matter in which we should be entirely guided by the opinions expressed in this House, and we feel that there would have to be a fairly general opinion to justify that action. If that action were taken, it would not in the least obviate the necessity of getting full public criticism and giving full opportunity for consideration of the Bill by commercial bodies. It would really only amount to adopting the procedure which we had originally intended in an inverted form; that is to say, we might put the Bill on the Statute-book, circulate it for opinion, and provide facilities for discussing amendments at the Simla Session. I merely wanted to take this opportunity of throwing out that idea so that Honourable Members might have an opportunity to consider it between now and the stage when I move the appointment of a Select Committee. I realise that the idea is rather a novel one, and there is no exact precedent, as far as I am aware, for such a course of action. But the considerations are very special just now: it would be a great advantage to us to get the addition to revenue, whatever that may be, which this measure would bring, and it is also very desirable that the other effects of the Bill should operate as soon as possible. I do not think that it is necessary for me to say anything more on the subject. I shall take the opportunity of the second reading to give fuller explanations of the Bill.

Sir, I move.

**Mr. C. C. Biswas** (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban): I did not quite catch the meaning of what the Honourable the Finance Member said as regards the novel suggestion which he has put forward. Do I understand it to be this, that the Legislature should be asked to agree to the Bill being passed at this stage without any consideration of the amendments that may be tabled, and that even the Select Committee stage would not be gone through, in other words, that we ought to pass the Bill here and now? Or is it merely suggested that the matter should go before a Select Committee and the Bill be passed in this Session? I am not quite clear about what the Honourable the Finance Member meant. I should like very much to have further light on the question.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster**: What I intended to say was this, that if there was a general feeling in the House that it was desirable to

[Sir George Schuster.]

get this Bill on to the Statute-book, we would dispense with the process of circulation *before* putting it on the Statute-book. Of course, there is no possibility of dispensing with the ordinary procedure and the ordinary debate on any amendments that may be down, but that would make it possible to pass the Bill this Session and not to wait for opinions obtained in circulation. That was the only idea which I suggested. In any case, I merely put forward the idea at this stage as a matter of courtesy to the House; and in my desire to be perfectly frank with them, I thought it desirable that Honourable Members should have that idea before them so that they might have time to consider it before we come to the second reading stage of the Bill. Therefore, I suggest that it is not appropriate that it should be discussed at all now. I wished that Honourable Members should consider it, so that we might have fully considered opinions when the second reading debate comes on.

**Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar** (South Arcot *cum* Chingleput: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I do not know whether I shall be in order in asking a question of the Finance Member. I should be glad if he would elucidate a little further what the immediate advantages will be of adopting the procedure which he suggests, namely, of putting the Bill on the Statute-book at once and afterwards considering the opinions and the amendments which may be necessary. I am not quite clear about it.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** The immediate advantages of the procedure will be this—that if the Bill is passed this Session it will come into operation at once, and we shall get certain additional revenue in the coming financial year. I also said that the other effects which we hope it will have, if the Bill comes into immediate operation, are that the inducement which exists at present to invest money in foreign securities will be taken away, and the sooner that operates the better we consider for Indian interests. I hope my Honourable friend is satisfied with that explanation.

**Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar:** Only as regards the first point, the Bill as it stands, if it is enacted, will come into force on the 1st April 1932. That is what I see in the Bill. So that, the first position does not seem to be correct.

**Some Honourable Members:** It is a misprint.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** My intention was, that if this procedure was adopted, the Bill would be amended to come into operation on the 1st April, 1931.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir** (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): I am sorry I was not here when the Honourable the Finance Member made his remarks. I understand that he desired that the House should consider the procedure of getting this Bill through at this Session. I personally would strongly object to rushing a Bill of this sort through without proper investigation and without the opinions of the public ascertained and considered by this Honourable House.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** Might I suggest to my Honourable friend that perhaps it is premature for him to express an opinion now. I merely took this occasion to inform the House that we had this idea in mind, but we shall be entirely guided by the opinions expressed in the House. I took this occasion to put forward the idea, so that Honourable Members might have some time to consider it. I suggest that if Honourable Members start expressing opinions now, we may get involved in a debate which perhaps would not be in the best interests of the House today. I hope my Honourable friend will appreciate my point.

**Mr. President:** The question is:

"That leave be given to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922, for certain purposes."

The motion was adopted.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** Sir, I introduce the Bill.

**Mr. B. V. Jadhav:** Is this a Bill for 1932 or 1931?

**Mr. President:** Order, order. Mr. Shillidy.

---

#### THE INDIAN FACTORIES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

**Mr. J. A. Shillidy** (Secretary, Industries and Labour Department): I move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Indian Factories Act, 1911, for a certain purpose.

The Bill is very simple and introduces no issue that is contentious. I need not say anything further at this stage.

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. J. A. Shillidy:** I introduce the Bill.

---

#### THE INDIAN FINANCE BILL.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster** (Finance Member): I move that the Finance Bill, 1931, be taken into consideration.

I do not propose at this stage to make any speech on the Bill. It has been usual, in moving for consideration, to say something of the cuts that have been passed by the House on the votes. On the present occasion only four token cuts have been passed involving a loss to the Government of Rs. 400. The Government propose to face this loss and to find this sum in the best way they can. Sir, I move.

**Mr. President:** The question is:

"That the Bill to fix the duty on salt manufactured in, or imported by land into, certain parts of British India, to vary certain duties leviable under the Indian Tariff Act, 1894, to fix maximum rates of postage under the Indian Post Office Act, 1898, to vary the excise duty on motor spirit leviable under the Motor Spirit (Duties) Act, 1917, to fix rates of income-tax and super-tax, to vary the excise duty on kerosene leviable under the Indian Finance Act, 1922, further to amend the Indian Paper Currency Act, 1923, and to vary the excise duty on silver leviable under the Silver (Excise Duty) Act, 1930, be taken into consideration."

11 10

**Mr. S. O. Shahani** (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): On a point of information. May I know how much time will be devoted to the general consideration and how much time to the amendments.

**Some Honourable Members:** There is no time limit.

#### SEPARATION OF BURMA FROM INDIA.

**U Kyaw Myint** (Burma: Non-European): Sir, I move that the consideration of the Bill be postponed for one day.

My desire in moving this, Sir, is to bring before this House the question of the separation of Burma from India. I particularly desire to express on the floor of this House what the real desire of the Burmese people is on this question, which really amounts to a matter of life and death to them. (Hear, hear.)

I shall be making an indictment against the Government of Burma, but that indictment will be levelled only against the Government of Burma because it is my firm conviction that the Government of India and His Majesty's Government are as much the victims of the Government of Burma as the Burmese people.

The Government of Burma—this is the accusation I make—has made deliberate and repeated attempts to mislead the Burmese people. I use the word "attempts" because at no time since the question of separation came to the front has there been anything like a unanimous desire on the part of the people of Burma for separation. But I do accuse the Government of Burma of having misled a section of the people into the belief that the separation of Burma from India would bring about one result of great and vital importance, namely the immediate acquirement by Burma of the status of a Dominion. That was, Sir, the bait that was offered. "You take separation and you get Dominion Status". This propaganda on the part of the Government of Burma has been going on for the space of about three years. The head of the Government of Burma has on every conceivable occasion since February 1928 indulged in statements which would have the effect of inducing the Burmese people to believe that Dominion Status was a necessary result of separation.

I repeat at this stage that in spite of this there has always been keen opposition to the idea of separation. This propaganda in favour of separation has taken the form of constant misleading statements and insinuations against the Government of India and had also the object of inciting the people of Burma against the alleged callous and inequitable attitude adopted by the people and Legislature in India on all matters pertaining to Burma. Then, Sir, on the part of the Government of Burma, there was a constant suggestion that the representatives of Burma in the Central Legislature could have no adequate voice in, and could create no adequate impression on, the Central Legislature.

On the question of separation, Sir, the Government of Burma has throughout ignored an important section of Burmese opinion—in fact the most important portion of the Burmese people—namely, the General Council of Burmese Associations which has always fought tooth and nail against separation. Now this General Council has boycotted the local Legislature. I do not intend to make any remarks disparaging the character of the local Legislature, but I must state here that the local Legislature

represents only a section of the people. I go further and say that if the General Council of Burmese Associations should choose at any time to enter the local Legislature, it could capture the vast majority of the seats open to election by Burmans.

Next to this section of the Burmese people come the People's Party who, with their following, form another important body of the Burmese people. The People's Party have entered the local Council and the People's Party have certainly asked for separation, but not in the manner in which the Government of Burma has represented their demand. They did ask for separation, but with it Dominion Status also. All along, the Government of Burma has made much of this demand for separation of a certain section of the people and suppressed the other portion of their demand, which is the vital portion, namely, the demand for Dominion Status. They have suppressed the fact that with the demand for separation is bound up also the demand for Dominion Status.

When the Simon Commission came to Burma, only one small section of the people decided to give evidence before it. The overwhelming majority of the people in Burma decided not to co-operate. The evidence tendered before the Simon Commission was one-sided evidence. It was evidence fostered by the Government of Burma and was not by any means what one might call "representative evidence". Even there the demand is perfectly clear, namely, separation along with Dominion Status.

Apart from the General Council of Burmese Associations and those connected with that General Council, who were boycotting not only the local Council but also the Simon Commission, the People's Party who had been co-operating in the local Council also boycotted the Simon Commission. The People's Party refused either to sit on the Provincial Committee or to give evidence before the Simon Commission. The recommendations of the Simon Commission as regards Burma were taken practically word for word from the Memorandum of the Government of Burma.

Next we come to the Round Table Conference. Four gentlemen were chosen as delegates from Burma to that Conference. No invitations were issued to anyone else. Of the selections made by His Excellency Sir Charles Innes, one was a European gentleman who has throughout been the foremost advocate of separation at any cost, and another was a gentleman who represented nobody. (Laughter.) The remaining two, Sir, were members of the People's Party. These two gentlemen actually protested against the unrepresentative character of the delegation. Their protest was overruled, and rightly or wrongly these two gentlemen attended the Round Table Conference under protest. Then, Sir, when the delegation arrived at the Round Table Conference, what happened? His Excellency Sir Charles Innes had already taken leave and gone to England. I am given to understand that the leave was granted on the ground of ill-health. In any case, there he was at the Round Table Conference, a towering personality who dominated the delegation which was not representative of the Burmese people.

Then, Sir, comes the mystery of the proceedings of the Round Table Conference, so far as it relates to Burma. At a meeting of the whole Conference sitting in Committee, the question of Burma was brought up at the fag-end of a long day's work, and before anybody realized what had happened, Sir, the principle of separation had been accepted. (Laughter.) A Sub-Committee for Burma was formed. I regret very much that my

[U Kyaw Myint.]

Honourable friend, Mr. H. P. Mody, has been prevented from being present in the House today, for he was a member of the Sub-Committee for Burma. Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Mody, and another delegate, Mr. Shiva Rao, fought strenuously during the deliberations of the Sub-Committee against the acceptance of the principle of separation before any decision was arrived at as to the status of Burma after the separation. They fought tooth and nail, and when the Sub-Committee's Report, together with the very able Dissenting Notes of these two gentlemen came before the Conference sitting as a Committee, they fought again. The whole question was rushed through, and never at any stage during the whole of the Round Table Conference was serious attention paid to this vital question. The principle of separation was accepted and there the matter ended. In the Prime Minister's final speech occur only three lines relating to Burma. No statement could be more equivocal than those three lines. In the Statement which His Majesty's Government issued at the end of the Round Table Conference, Burma is not mentioned at all.

The Government of Burma has since then continued the propaganda that it had previously indulged in. Not only has it done that, but it has also endeavoured to suppress the expression of public opinion of Burma against separation. I will give you, Sir, only one instance, and I will mention the name because it is a name which is not unfamiliar to the Honourable Members of this House. I mention, Sir, the name of the Reverend Ottama Bikkhu, who has suffered more for his country than any other Burman. Wherever he goes in Burma, he is dogged by the C. I. D. Wherever he stays in Burma, an order is served on him under section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code. He came to India recently, but he was stopped at Calcutta. He was detained there for some time but was eventually allowed to come to Delhi. He came to India to see Mahatma Gandhi. His intention was that, since he was not allowed to express his opinions in Burma, he would go to England where the English people themselves took pride in their freedom of speech. His passport, that would have enabled him to go to England, was promptly cancelled. That is only one instance. (*Cries of "Shame"*.)

Now, Sir, what has been happening in Burma during the last 8 or 10 weeks? Repressive measure upon repressive measure has been passed. An ordinance was promulgated which was called the Anti-Terrorist Ordinance. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons it was sought to prove that the Bengal Terrorist Party, not the Burmese Terrorist Party, was beginning to be active in Burma. There was not a scrap of evidence to that effect; there was no justification for the ordinance. Curiously enough, the ordinance contained in the end what amounted to a promise that the Government of Burma would see that the Criminal Law Amendment Bill, drafted on the lines of the ordinance was passed in the local Legislature. An attempt was made to have that done, but the Bill was thrown out. It was re-introduced as a recommended Bill but was again thrown out. Now, it is quite obvious from what has happened during the last few days that the moment the present Session ends, His Excellency the Governor of Burma will certify that Bill, for after the Session is over none of us from Burma will have an opportunity of moving an adjournment motion in this House.

These, Sir, are the things that are now happening in Burma. If I am now interrupting the business of this House, I have certainly this justification for doing so, that this is almost the only forum where a Burman can express his views honestly and fearlessly about separation. I do not know what would happen to me if I said in Burma today what I am saying here now. (*An Honourable Member*: "Don't go back to Burma.") An Honourable Member has been pleased to ask me not to go back to Burma. But I must tell him that it is my duty to go back to Burma and face whatever awaits me. (Applause.)

Sir, owing to the official propaganda of the Government of Burma, an impression seems to have been created in India that Burmans desire separation. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The attitude of political India is greatly appreciated in Burma. That attitude is this: The question of separation is a question for Burmans to decide. Nothing could be fairer than this; nothing could appeal more to Burmans than this.

Our fear in Burma now is that the whole question of separation is being rushed through in such a manner that, before we know where we are, we shall find ourselves separated and we shall find ourselves with nothing else. These are our fears and they have got to be reiterated; they have got to be expressed again and again not only in Burma but here on the floor of this House, in this country, and also in England, so that the Government of India and His Majesty's Government shall no longer be misled. The question is a vital one and the position must be clearly defined. The vast majority of the Burmese people have been and will continue to be against separation. The demand of the small section asking for separation has been and will continue to be for separation with Dominion Status.

The manner in which this question has been treated at the Round Table Conference, the announcement which the Secretary of State for India made in the House of Commons referring us back to the declaration of 1917, a declaration that has never been accepted in India during the years that have gone by, a declaration that means nothing at the present moment, and the repressive attitude of the Government of Burma—all these things have not only caused general consternation in Burma, but have also created in the hearts of those who at one stage had favoured separation a fear of separation. From the evidence before us and judging from the attitude that the Government of Burma has consistently and deliberately adopted towards this question, there cannot be the slightest doubt that separation is to be forced on us and that we are going to get nothing else.

Sir, the question of a Federated India became almost a settled fact at the Round Table Conference, although for some time the question of an Indian Federation was not considered to be within the range of practical politics. There cannot be the slightest doubt that it is the intention of the Government of Burma, by suppressing the expression of opinion of Burmans on the question of separation of Burma at the present moment, to strain every nerve to shut the door of the Indian Federation in the face of Burma. Once that door is shut, it does not require much intelligence on the part of Burmans to realise that they will be getting nothing but bare separation. We shall be going backwards; we shall certainly not be going forwards.

[U Kyaw Myint.]

If the Government of Burma genuinely believes that the consensus of opinion in Burma has been in favour of separation, it should have no hesitation in agreeing to the referendum demanded by the people of Burma. I would also strongly urge that the referendum should be held under the direct supervision of the Government of India, with this additional safeguard, that it should be conducted with the aid of a non-official committee representing every class of Burmese political thought and every shade of Burmese opinion.

These are the things which are implied in this motion for the postponement of the consideration of this Bill for one day. By adopting this motion for postponement, this House will be able to indicate to the people of Burma its adherence to the principle that it is for Burmans to decide whether to separate from India or to remain a part of the proposed Indian Federation. This House will be able to indicate to the people of Burma an expression of its concern at the manner in which the question of separation is being rushed through and treated as a settled issue. That is our grievance, Sir. It is being treated as a settled issue without an adequate opportunity being given to Burmans to exercise their choice in the matter. By adopting this motion, this House will be able to support what I have urged and to support the agitation for a referendum under the direct supervision of the Government of India. (Applause.)

Sir, what actually happened at the Round Table Conference can best be described or explained by those who actually participated in that Conference. I have not the slightest doubt that such of my Honourable friends as had the honour of being present at the Round Table Conference will take part in this debate.

Sir, I move. (Applause.)

**Mr. B. Das** (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I have great pleasure in rising once again to support the cause of Burma and to plead the cause of Burma on the floor of this House. It is seldom that we meet the Burman friends in India and it is seldom that Burmese Members are as vocal as my Honourable friend, U. Kyaw Myint, whom I must congratulate for the able maiden speech that he has just delivered today. Sir, my Honourable friend has described how the Burmese Government has been inspired by motives which are quite anti-national to the Burmese interests and also quite anti-Indian, but which are only in the interest of the Imperialist British Government and the British capitalists. Sir, if I have to trace the situation in Burma I trace it back to the days when my Honourable friend Mr. Haji brought in his Coastal Reservation Bill. My friend Mr. Haji wanted to reserve the coastal traffic between Burma and Karachi to Indian shipping interests. I think that opened the eyes of the European commercial interests and the Honourable Sir Charles Innes, who was then the Commerce Member of the Government of India and also a Member of this House, saw that British trade and British commerce must be preserved, and he felt that when he became the Governor of Burma, he should exercise his influence and exert his utmost to separate Burma from India, so that Indian trade and commerce should not influence the Burmese national interests and Burma could be conveniently made a colony of England. That was always my fear and my apprehension, and from what I have heard from my Burmese friends, I

find that my apprehensions have been justified. My friend said that only a very minority section in Burma had supported the Government of Burma in their cry of separation of Burma from India. The People's Party, the Nationalist Party that led the Burmese Council, had never approved nor played any part in the separation of Burma, and they never gave evidence before the Simon Seven, when they visited that province. Sir, with regard to the recent occurrences which my Honourable friend U. Tun Aung brought the other day before this House, with regard to those repressive measures and repressive ordinances adopted by the Burmese Government, My Honourable friend Mr. Kyaw Myint has said today that those measures had been adopted only to suppress all those associations which are not supporting separation of Burma from India. Sir, that a Government should identify and play such a mischievous part in suppressing those people who are nationalist enough not to side with the British interests and that it should openly work for the separation of Burma from India passes one's comprehension. My Honourable friend also remarked about the Burma Criminal Law Amendment Act that was twice rejected by the Burma Legislative Council, in spite of its present constitution and in spite of the fact of a great number of nationalist Burmans not being represented in the Burma Council. Yet His Excellency the Viceroy has passed an ordinance so that the Government of Burma can go on in their own way and suppress all nationalist aspirations.

Then, my Honourable friend referred to Revd. Ottama whom I knew in the good old days when I was a Member of the Congress. He was also a Member of the Congress as he is now and is a great patriot and he has always been a good friend of India. It is strange that he should be shadowed by the C. I. D. in Calcutta and that he should not be allowed to visit Delhi in order that he might speak out the truth which the Burmese Government by their repressive measures have suppressed and which the ordinances of the Government of India did not allow to filter from Burma to India. The other day, I said that if Burma wants separation and if the Burmese people want separation, let them have it. But they should not be made a cat's-paw in the hands of certain Imperial British interests or the British commercial interests who want to exploit Burma in their own interests. Anybody who knows Burma well knows that it has the best oil-fields and the ruby mines; all these are in the hands of European capitalists. There is also Indian capital invested there, but it does not control the mining interests of Burma. Naturally the European capitalist interests and the Imperialists of British administration find that India is slipping out of their hands, and so they want Burma completely to remain under their thumbs. Why should they want Burma to be separated? Let them take a plebiscite. But how to take a plebiscite? I am told, and I heard from a very reliable source, that during the recent Tharrawadi rebellion, a certain high official said to certain friends that the Government would do what they did in Malabar that is, they would crush and kill everybody who raised their hands against the Government and that the Government would do the same thing in Burma, if the people in Burma rose in rebellion against the Government and if they go against desire of the Government to separate Burma from India. This may be true, or this may not be true, but in India we have heard such things before. We have heard of it in the good old days. But we are now in a peaceful atmosphere. In the good old days, there were *jabardast* Civilian

[Mr. B. Das.]

bureaucrats, who posed to be great authorities of imperialism and they wanted to rule with an iron hand and with the sword. Sir, if the Government of Burma want today to separate Burma from India, it is to their interest to rule Burma with an iron hand and to keep it as a preserve for young Britishers and to keep it also as a preserve for the British capitalist interests, and it may be a day will come when Indian capitalists will be ousted from Burma. It may be that these so-called Imperialistic British friends of the Burmans will introduce legislation there, in case they are able to separate Burma, that the Indians should be disenfranchised in Burma. I am not concerned about the Indians' interests; they can take care of themselves. I am only concerned about the Burmans' interests. So long Burma has enjoyed equal liberty and the Burmese have cherished equal aspirations with Indians. Just at the moment when we are almost reaching the goal and are going to have self-government for India, a mischievous agitation is being started in Burma, inspired by the Government of Burma and by almost every officer of the Burma Government who is paid with the money from Burma and India, that Burma should be completely separated, not in the interest of better government of the people of Burma, but in the interest of the Imperialist section of the Britishers and the British capitalists. Sir, no Member of this House, no Indian, should be a party to it. If the people of Burma want separation, let them have it by all means, but before that they must be promised Dominion Status and equal freedom as Indians will get. Otherwise Indians will never support the Imperialistic interests in Burma.

**The Honourable Sir George Schuster:** Sir, I wish to say a few words at this stage of the debate on behalf of Government. I intervene solely as Member in charge of the Finance Bill and I merely wish to put forward certain considerations in connection with the business aspect of this debate. As far as Government are concerned, we obviously cannot intervene in any discussion on the merits of the question which has been raised. That is a question of which the Round Table Conference is now seized and the Government really cannot express opinions about it now. Sir, we have no wish to prevent the continuance of this debate if it is the desire of this House that it should continue. I only feel bound to point out that there are a great number of amendments down for consideration on the Finance Bill, that there is a certain amount of other important business for the House to transact this Session, and that any time lost now will have to be made up in some way or other. If the House, taking all these facts into account, wishes to continue the debate, this day, we for our part will not offer any sort of opposition, and we shall be pleased to see the debate continuing. That, Sir, is our position. I am bound as Member in charge of the Finance Bill to put in a formal opposition to a motion which will keep the House from what is at present the main business before it. But it is a purely formal opposition.

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban):** Mr. President, I am very thankful to my brother from Burma for having raised this question on the floor of this House. It is of such tremendous importance both to India and to Burma that I think by this discussion we may clear the air a bit. Sir, I feel bound to tell

exactly what took place at the Round Table Conference with reference to this question of separation of Burma. On the 1st December, 1930, the Round Table Conference met in committee. The delegates from Burma were all keen on the separation of Burma and they wanted that question to be removed from consideration at the further stages of the Round Table Conference, so that the necessity for these delegates partaking in questions like federal structure, or in questions relating to minorities might not arise. On the first day therefore the Prime Minister put a general proposition whether in principle that House, the Round Table Conference, was agreed about the separation of Burma. With a few dissentients that was agreed to, and a committee for the separation of Burma was then constituted. Even then certain delegates questioned whether the principle itself would be open to review if other evidence came in to support such review. The committee then met and made certain recommendations with reference to how this separation should be carried out, taking for granted that Burma would be separated. In the meanwhile, as my friend has already stated, the delegates were deluged with telegrams and cables from Burma, notably from the G. B. C. A.—the General Council of Burmese Associations, from the People's Party and various other organisations. The Prime Minister himself at a later stage in the proceedings was forced to concede, and the late Lord Russell who presided over the Burmese Committee had to acknowledge, that they had both been inundated with a number of cables from Burma urging that Burma should not be separated. After the report of the Burmese Sub-Committee, the matter came up again before the Round Table Conference in plenary committee on the 16th January. At that stage we had better information with regard to the prevailing opinion in Burma on the question of separation than we had at the very early stage on the 1st December, when we were much more concerned about our own affairs and wanted to abide by the opinion of the Burmese delegation on such a matter as my friend has pointed out. The opinion of the Indian delegates was merely this that in a matter of such a character, we who had asked for the recognition of the principle of self-determination, we Indians who were asking for Dominion Status on the ground that we were determined as a body to have it, we could not possibly stand against any similar contention being raised by any other section. That was how the separation of Sindh was taken up; that was how the question of reforms for the North West Frontier Province was taken up; and consistently with that position no Indian delegate could either then, or, I venture to state, can now stand against the position that self-determination should be the main and guiding principle with reference to this question of the separation of Burma. We made it clear further in the plenary session that at the time of the invasion of Burma such vocal and organised opinion in India as existed among the Indians, notably the Indian National Congress, had declared against that invasion, and had declared against the absorption of Burma in the Indian Empire. They stood out against all those projects and methods that had been adopted by the Government of India of the day with reference to Burma. Consistently therefore with our own position and consistently with the principles that we were urging at the Round Table Conference there was no course open to us on the 1st December except to acquiesce in the then unanimous declaration of the Burmese delegation that they wanted the separation of Burma. But later on when we found that opinion was being regimented and organised against the separation of Burma, when facts had had time to dribble even into the St. James' Palace in London with

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

reference to the real opinion of Burmans on this question, many of us had to revise our opinion; and therefore you will find it very significant that at the committee stage of the plenary session on the 16th January, there were doubts, and more than doubts, assertions were made that the people of Burma were neither unanimous nor even in a majority with reference to the question of the separation of Burma from India. You will find also—I do not want to cumber the proceedings of this House with detailed references to the Round Table Conference discussions—you will find, Sir, that the Burmese Sub-Committee made a very significant statement that the Government of the day, His Majesty's Government, should immediately make a declaration announcing the separation of Burma. That was one of the recommendations of this Committee. When this matter came up before the plenary session in committee, delegate after delegate from the Indian side protested against any such premature declaration being made by His Majesty's Government with reference to the separation of Burma, and to this day His Majesty's Government have not made that declaration which was recommended by the Burmese Sub-Committee. That was why in the declaration which was read out by the Right Honourable Prime Minister of England there was no reference to Burma. I should only like to refer to two delegates, who made representations on this subject. The first delegate said:

"I should very much like it to be noted that we strongly object to any declaration being made by His Majesty's Government and to say that the consensus of opinion in the Conference on this point is that His Majesty's Government should make no such declaration."

I think that is very emphatic and very clear.

The Chairman (the Prime Minister) said:

"If you wish that to be noted and communicated we shall have to do it."

Then followed Mr. Jinnah. He went a step further, as an old Parliamentary hand, and said:

"Then will you make it clear as your ruling on the record that nothing that is noted here will constitute a decision until after the plenary session of the Conference has decided?"

*The Chairman*: Yes, that is my ruling. That is what passes today under the expression, 'It is noted'."

Sir B. N. Mitra who ornamented the Treasury Bench until recently took up the same position and said that the principle of the separation of Burma would be further considered at the plenary session and that it was open then for the delegates to raise the whole question and get the plenary session to review its decision with reference to the separation of Burma. I might tell the House that Sir B. N. Mitra was a member of the Burma Sub-Committee and he says:

"It is perfectly correct as Mr. Jinnah says, that since then"—i.e., since the Committee had sent its report or was constituted,—"most of us have been flooded with representations from Burma. It now rests with you and perhaps for the plenary session of the Conference to decide whether in view of these later representations the fundamental question should not be reviewed and the modification or proviso suggested by Mr. Jinnah provided."

I may here explain that the proviso which Mr. Jinnah wanted to be inserted was, "provided the people of Burma desire it", a recommendation for the very referendum which my friend so ably and eloquently pleaded for today on the floor of the House. The plenary session did not take

Sub-Committee's Report into consideration at all. What happened at the plenary session was that our mind was directed mainly to the Indian question, and the single resolution was put forward by the Prime Minister that the Reports of these committees afford valuable material on which the further stages of the deliberations of the Round Table Conference can proceed. Therefore that opportunity which, Sir B. N. Mitra, Mr. Jinnah and all of us hoped to have to revise our opinions with reference to the separation of Burma never arose, and I am very glad therefore that my friend has brought this motion today on the floor of the House, so that with the authority of the non-official Members of this House—for from what I have heard from the Finance Member I take it that the official block will be neutral on this occasion—with the opinion of the non-official Members of this House, the opinion of the country will authoritatively go forward that the least that could be done is that the whole question with reference to the separation of Burma should be reopened and should be revised if necessary. ("Hear, hear" from the *Opposition Benches*.) That is with reference to the proceedings of the Round Table Conference.

I want to put forward another proposition to my Burman friends and to the people of Burma and I crave my friend's special attention to this aspect of the question. At the time when the Burma Sub-Committee was constituted and at the time when that Committee sent its Report, the question of the future form of government for India had not even emerged beyond very hazy notions which individual delegates had on the subject. The Federal Structure Committee was still in the very first stages of considering whether there should be a single chamber or a double chamber; the form of the future constitution of the country, even the skeleton which has now emerged from the deliberations of the Round Table Conference had not then emerged. Now, what is the constitution that has emerged as a skeleton from the decisions of the Round Table Conference? We are asked to have an all-India federation in which provinces with autonomous governments and Indian States will come in and function on the basis of a federation. Inside this all-India federation, it has been suggested that there should be a special secondary federation called the British India Federation, where the provinces alone would come in and function, for the sake of maintaining uniformity and unity of administration of various important subjects,—with reference to those subjects which are not yet ready to be taken over by the all-India Federation because the States would not have them at the present stage, nor transferred to the provinces because that will cut at the root of all the good work that has been done during the last one hundred and forty years of British administration. And we at the delegation said, and I repeat it now that we recognise that some little good has after all been done by this administration, that all that good work should not be dissolved or removed by transferring these subjects to the provinces at the present stage. Therefore, as I visualise the future constitution of the country, there will be an all-India Federation, where only some subjects will come within the scope of that Federation and the provinces and States will be

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

partners thereof; there will be a further British India Federation, where some more subjects which are now Central and which cannot conveniently be transferred to the provinces, will be administered by the provinces coming into the Federation. It is open now—and I want my Burman friends to realise it—to Burma to come in either into the all-India Federation alone or into the British India Federation and the all-India Federation. If Burma, by its special geographical features, by its special characteristics with reference to race, religion and other subjects, thinks that this uniformity, which is required for the British India Federation, is not essential for its purposes, that it can thrive better if it can grow more as an organism and develop at a greater rate of speed by keeping out of the British India Federation, it is still open to Burma with all the rights and privileges that it wants as an autonomous state preserved to come only into the all-India Federation, practically on the same basis as an Indian State. These considerations were not before the Burma Sub-Committee. These considerations were not even before the Burmese delegation. It is not for me to question the character of that delegation. They were my honoured friends and colleagues at the Round Table Conference and I am the last person—I certainly am precluded in any way from casting any aspersion on the representative character or otherwise of the members of the delegation. But I venture to think that even if these delegates at an earlier stage had had the privilege of knowing how the Indian constitution was going to develop and had had also the knowledge of the two courses that were open to Burma, they would not have been consenting parties to that resolution which they were at the time. I therefore suggest to my Burman friends to take back with them not merely an agitation for referendum on the separation of Burma, but to take back with them also enlightenment and education of their own people with reference to the possibility of their coming into either an all-India federation or into both kinds of federation, with great profit for themselves and with mutual benefit both to India and to Burma.

I have been told by representative Burmans, whom I have had the privilege of seeing during the past few days, that there is a very grave misunderstanding as regards what Burma would be after it is separated from India. People have all sorts of curious opinions as to what the effect of that separation of Burma will be for India. I have been credibly informed that with reference to house property and other property owned by Indians in Burma, where, before this separation of Burma was decided in that form by the Round Table Conference, property was intended to be bought from an Indian by a Burman for Rs. 16,000 or Rs. 17,000, today the very same Burman would say, "I do not want it even for a thousand rupees, because directly Burma is separated from India, Indians will all be asked to go out from Burma and this property will come to us automatically without any payment of any money for it". With that sort of education, with that sort of knowledge, with that sort of advantage which they think they will be able to derive from the separation of Burma, it is no wonder that people hold such views. I do not go into the question of official propaganda—we heard a great deal of that in England—charges, very direct charges were levelled, when the Governor of Burma sat there, against the methods pursued by the Government of Burma and by the Governor himself on this question of the separation, these charges were met or were said to have been met by replies which some of the Conservative delegates made at the Round Table Conference—

I do not want to go into them. But I think my friends have a special duty to go back to their country and tell the people of Burma what is the limited advantage that they will get by the separation and how many more and how much graver will be the disadvantages if that separation were to take place. I have very great pleasure therefore in supporting the motion of my Honourable friend. (Cheers.)

**Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar** (South Arcot *cum* Chingleput: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I beg to join in this debate in order to show what our attitude in this matter is going to be. I fully support the motion made by my Honourable young friend from Burma, to whom I listened with great interest. He has made a speech which for its depth of conviction and for its sincerity is hard to beat. He has spoken with a feeling which shows that there is a great amount of dissatisfaction in Burma at the way in which things are going on there. Sir, I was in Burma about two years ago travelling through the country as President of the Indian Cinematograph Committee, and I may add my personal testimony that here and there there were complaints that official propaganda was being carried on advocating the separation of Burma from India. What our Honourable friend from Burma has told us today reveals to what extent the Government of India are prepared to ignore and to adopt the hush hush policy for which they have recently become so famous. Wherever attention is drawn of the Government of India to excesses on the part of the police or the suspicious methods adopted by Government officials in propagating certain ideas, the Government of India shut their ears and leave the rest to the man on the spot, a theory which is very favourable for them and with them, because they want to be trusted by the people at Home as the men on the spot, and therefore they transmit that theory from themselves to the men on the spot in the provinces. This hush hush policy will never do. They should not shut their ears. We here can bear testimony to the recent havoc which has been committed in various parts of the country, to the strained relations which have been created between the people and the Government on account of various excesses which have been committed. Now, Sir, what is it we hear from Burma? There is a deliberate policy which is being pursued of suppressing public opinion on a matter which is so vital to the Burmese people, and the people at Home are allowed to believe that the Burmans are asking for separation. Sir, we endorse every word which has fallen from my friend, that it should be left to the Burmese to decide what they want, but what is most essential is they should have the opportunity to say what they want to say. Have they had that opportunity? If my Honourable friend's statements are correct—and I have no reason to believe they are not correct—that opportunity is denied to them deliberately, because the advocates of one set of views are the stronger party; they are the official party there, and they have rallied all their forces to suppress opinion to the contrary. Why should not England know, why should not the British Cabinet know what really is the feeling in the country?

Sir, I am indebted to my Honourable friend Mr. Mudaliar for having elucidated one point, and that one point is, it is not yet a closed door. So far as the question of separation of Burma is concerned, it is still kept back as an open question to consider at the future discussions of the Round Table Conference. Before those future discussions take place, it is urgent that the Burmese people should have the opportunity of expressing their real opinion in the matter. I fully sympathise with my friend from Burma.

[Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

that they should be given that opportunity. His complaint by means of this motion is, his appeal to the Government of India by means of this motion is, that they should be given that opportunity. He seems to have great faith in the Government of India. Let the Government of India justify that faith by the action they propose to take. I am sorry, Sir, my friends the other Members of the Government were not here this morning to hear the eloquent and sincere speech delivered by my friend from Burma. What opportunity have they to gauge the real opinion of Burma if they do not listen to gentlemen like our friend who spoke this morning, with a conviction and a sincerity and with a knowledge of the local affairs which a Burman gentleman alone can do? If they had heard him here today, would they not have taken time to decide in the way in which we are urging the Government of India to do? It is by personal contact that we can realise the gravity of the situation. Sir, notwithstanding the slight inconvenience which has been caused to this House by means of this motion deferring the consideration of the Finance Bill, on which my friend the Honourable the Finance Member is so much bent, notwithstanding that inconvenience, I think, in order to mark our sense of the gravity of the situation created in Burma, we ought to give our united support to this motion for adjournment of the House today. Sir, that attitude of ours will show that we Indians are not behind-hand in extending our hand of co-operation to them when they are in trouble, and I am sure the Burmese people will appreciate our attitude in the matter. In fact, other reasons have been urged why this adjournment should be carried, because the Burmese people had no opportunity of considering the other alternative which my friend Mr. Mudaliar has drawn pointed attention to—the question of separation or no separation, or that Burma should come into the idea of Federation which has now come into the range of practical politics. If they get full provincial autonomy or Dominion Status, why would they desire to be out of India, having been connected so long with India? They might like to remain in India in the Federation as other provinces would like to be. So there are various reasons why the real Burman opinion should be taken in the matter, and more essential than that is, there should be free and full opportunity given to the Burmese people to give expression to their opinions. That opportunity they have not had. So, Sir, it is to emphasise that aspect of it I and the people whom I represent lend our support to this motion.

**Sir Abdur Rahim** (Calcutta and Suburbs: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I have also no hesitation in supporting the motion which has been so eloquently, lucidly and impressively moved by the Honourable Member from Burma. The other day we had a discussion on the Burmese question with reference to certain methods adopted by the Burmese Government in connection with the question. . . .

**The Honourable Sir James Orerar** (Home Member): It was not in connection with this question.

**Sir Abdur Rahim**: I could not catch what the Honourable Member said.

**The Honourable Sir James Orerar**: I am sorry to interrupt the Honourable Member. I should like to make it clear that the matters which we discussed on the occasion to which the Honourable Member referred as

measures taken by the Burmese Government were not in respect of the motion now before the House, but they were in respect of the rebellion.

**Sir Abdur Rahim:** I did not mean that the previous motion was in respect of the question that is now raised by the Honourable Member from Burma. I don't think there was any room for misunderstanding on that point. Sir, the question that has been raised today is one of the greatest importance. Burma is not a small province which can be neglected. It has now been connected with India for a fairly long time. My friend Mr. Mudaliar has explained to the House how the question relating to the separation of Burma was dealt with at the Round Table Conference, and there can be no doubt that what he has told us represents the true facts. It was rushed through. The delegates from Burma apparently did not represent a very large volume of public opinion in Burma, and when that opinion made itself felt, when telegram after telegram was sent to the delegates of the Round Table Conference regarding the actual situation, the Indian members hesitated a great deal in accepting the position which had been taken up at the earlier stages by the Burmese delegates. And, Sir, I think it is all to the good that no final or conclusive declaration was made on this question by His Majesty's Government. From what we have heard from the Honourable the Mover of this motion, who spoke with such a depth of conviction and intimate knowledge of the situation, there is a very considerable opinion in Burma against separation being effected without a simultaneous declaration that the Burmans will enjoy Dominion Status in the same way as the Indians, and now that there is a good deal of opinion in favour of an All-India Federation, it affords an additional reason why the Burmese should reconsider their position with respect to separation. The interest of India in Burma is very great, and, so far as we are concerned, we have no desire whatever to stand in the way of the Burmans attaining their fullest political ambition. If they want separation from us, it has been made perfectly clear by all sections of this House that we, the Indians, do not stand in their way. It is only right and proper that the Burmese opinion in a matter of this vital importance to them should have full effect without any interference from us. On the other hand, we, Indians, will be very glad if Burma remains a part of the Indian Federation, but that is entirely for them to choose. Now that the question has been brought to this stage, it is evident that Burmese opinion is greatly stirred as to what may be the result on their province of any premature separation from India, because, after all, Burma is a small country compared to India, and they might well consider it a great advantage for their future, to remain connected with India and not to be separated from her. Sir, it is essential that on a question of vital importance to them the Burmese opinion should be heard fully. Every possible opportunity should be given to the Burmans to express themselves on the question of separation. I am afraid—we at least on this side of the House feel considerable doubt—whether the Burmese opinion is having full play on this important question. For some time, a certain amount of agitation has been going on in the direction of separation, and it is difficult for us to come to a definite conclusion how far that represented a genuine desire on the part of the Burmans to be separated from India. But the Honourable the Mover of this motion, I think, has succeeded in convincing us that there is a great need, indeed an absolute necessity, for Burmese opinion being properly consulted before any definite decision is arrived at. I am not prepared—I do not think that any Member of this

[Sir Abdur Rahim.]

House is prepared—to endorse at once any statement that methods are employed by high officials in Burma in order deliberately to suppress public opinion. That may or may not be the fact. At the same time, there is no doubt that there is a considerable division of public opinion in Burma in this important matter, and the suggestion made by the Honourable the Mover that regular steps should be taken to consult all shades of opinion, I think, deserves the support of this House. It is a great relief to us that the question is still open for consideration, and we do hope that no decision will be arrived at until Burmese opinion on the subject has been fully consulted.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi** (Nominated Non-Official): At the Round Table Conference I was one of the interested and keen observers of the proceedings regarding the question of the separation of Burma from India. My colleague Mr. B. Shiva Rao, who along with me in that Conference represented the workers of India, and I take it, including Burma, took part in the proceedings of the Burma Sub-Committee and of the plenary session of the Committee itself. Mr. Shiva Rao put the case as regards the separation before the Conference very ably, and I am glad to find that the efforts which he made then are finding recognition from the Burmese people.

The question of separation of Burma must be decided mainly by the Burmans themselves. But before the separation takes place, it is necessary for us to see how the interests which are involved in the separation are affected. I am mainly concerned with the interests of the workers in Burma, both the Burmese workers and the Indian workers who are working in Burma. Sir, at present, in Burma more than two-thirds of the workers working in factories, mines, plantations, oil-fields and other industries are Indians. There are some industries which are almost wholly manned by Indian workers. It is necessary for us, therefore, to see how the interests of these workers as well as of Burmese workers will be affected by separation. At present, when Burma is included in India as one of its provinces, the workers in Burma are under the protection of the same labour legislation as prevails in India. I do not suggest that that protection is very large, but at the same time, the Indian workers as well as the Burmese workers in Burma have that protection. Moreover, the Government of India has some control over the Government of Burma, especially in labour matters. Now, we must see how the interests of the Indian workers working in Burma will be affected and how we can safeguard those interests if Burma is to be separated. In the first place, if Burma becomes a separate Dominion or a separate country, we shall have to take some steps, before the separation is effected, to protect the interests of the Indian workers. We may come to an agreement with Burma as we have come to an agreement with the Government of Ceylon and the Government of Malaya, for the protection of the interests of the Indian workers in Burma.

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi** (Burma: Non-European): Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt my Honourable friend, but I rise to a point of order as to whether all this is relevant to the issue before the House.

**Mr. President:** I had my doubts also. The question that is being debated today is whether Burma should be separated from India or should not be separated. If the question is decided in favour of separation,

then, necessary provision will have to be made not only in regard to labour but in regard to all the interests that may be affected by such separation. The main question here is whether the consideration of the Finance Bill should be postponed for a day in order to allow the House to discuss the one particular matter which the Honourable Member from Burma has raised.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** I do not wish to question your ruling, but at the same time as we are discussing the question of separation, I feel it is my duty to place before this House—not to discuss fully—the matters to which consideration will have to be given. I assure you that I do not propose to discuss these matters fully. I am just mentioning the points which will have to be considered. Then, Sir, we shall have to find out some way . . . .

**Mr. President:** May I point out to the Honourable Member that it would be better if he would confine himself to the main issue that is before the House. If I allow the debate to go into a consideration of the various interests that will be affected, if separation takes place, it would lead to an interminable debate. The main question before the House is whether Burma should be separated or not and whether the decision should be by the voice of the Burmese people. That is the issue. If the Burmese people decide that Burma should be separated, then all questions as to how the various interests in India and Burma should be reconciled will be relevant. Honourable Members must realise that this is an extraordinary procedure adopted on the present occasion. The motion is to postpone the Finance Bill for one day in order to enable this particular question of principle to be discussed. I am sorry therefore I cannot allow the Honourable Member to deal with the details that will arise, in case the principle is decided.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Agreeing with your ruling, I shall confine myself now to one question and it is this. If Burma is to be separated, that separation, in my judgment, should take place in accordance with the wishes of the Burmese people. The wishes as expressed in Burma point to the fact that if Burma is to be separated at all, she must be made a Dominion. Sir, this point is of great importance to workers in Burma as well as the workers in India. Burma as a Dominion along with India is a member of the International Labour Conference. The workers in Burma along with the workers in India have got some international protection in regard to their life and work. If Burma ceases to be a Dominion and a part of India and does not get right of a separate seat in the League of Nations, the Burmese workers will to this extent lose the protection which the Burmese workers get under the present arrangement. I am therefore anxious that if Burma is to be separated at all, Burma must be made a Dominion with a separate seat in the League of Nations. That alone will enable the Burmese workers and the Indian workers in Burma to retain whatever little international protection they enjoy today. Sir, I support the motion.

**Mr. President:** I should like to ask Honourable Members whether it is their desire that the House should adjourn for lunch. I would personally prefer to sit till about 2 o'clock if necessary, and then adjourn if the amendment is carried.

**Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty** (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadan Rural): We have not heard the Government point of view at all in this matter. I was here when my friend the Honourable the Finance Member spoke. He only said that to take up this question at this stage will mean postponement of the consideration of the Finance Bill, which means that we will be working against time at a later stage. Surely, Sir, when such an important issue has been raised, since Burma is still a part of India, we are entitled to know what the Government themselves think about this matter and what action they propose to take on the discussion that has taken place. I think it will be treating the House very discourteously if we do not hear the Government point of view.

**The Honourable Sir James Orerar:** This is, I think, a question which, if my Honourable colleague, the Leader of the House, had been present it would have been appropriate for him to answer, and in his absence I propose to speak very briefly on the subject. I think the Honourable gentleman who has just spoken and the House generally, having regard to the importance of the question raised by this motion—and it must be universally recognised by the House as a very important question—could not expect the Government of India, without notice, apart from many other considerations, to pronounce a deliberate and considered opinion on matters of such momentous importance, and I must emphasize once more the point which has been made by my Honourable colleague, the Finance Member, that the whole of this complex, intricate and important question must necessarily be considered in the course of the continuance of the discussions of the Round Table Conference. That being so, it would not only be impossible but it would be improper for the Government of India to undertake at this stage and at this short notice, in any insufficiently considered manner, to express opinions on matters of which the Round Table Conference is now seized. I say it would not only be impossible, but it would be improper. For these reasons I regret very much that it is not possible for me to respond to the suggestion made by my Honourable friend.

**Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar:** The point is whether opportunity will be given for free and full expression of opinion. Cannot the Government of India give an assurance on that point?

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar:** May I ask whether the Government of India have had any correspondence with His Majesty's Government with reference to any question which takes the question of separation of Burma further.

**The Honourable Sir James Orerar:** It necessarily follows from the circumstances of the case that we have been in communication with His Majesty's Government on the subject, but these communications have not reached a stage which enables me to make any pronouncement on the subject before the House at this juncture.

**Sir Abdur Rahim:** Has the question been left open so far as the Government of India are concerned? May I inquire whether the question has been left open by the Round Table Conference or not—the question of separation?

**The Honourable Sir James Crerar:** I regret very much that I cannot add to the Honourable Member's information beyond the public pronouncements which have already been made on this subject.

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** What is the position of the Government of India? Do the Government of India treat the question of separation as a settled issue or not a settled issue? I am not talking of His Majesty's Government. I am only talking of the Government of India.

**The Honourable Sir James Crerar:** I think the House will recognise that I cannot allow myself to be cross-examined on this question. I have endeavoured to make my point clear, and for my own part and so far as the Government of India are concerned, I regret very much that I must leave it at that.

**Mr. President:** I cannot allow this to go on any longer. I have allowed some of the leading Members of the different parties in the Assembly to interpellate Government and they have received such replies as Government are prepared to give. I cannot allow this to proceed further. I should like again to ask whether Honourable Members desire that they should continue the debate after lunch.

**Honourable Members:** Yes.

The Assembly then adjourned till a Quarter to Three of the Clock.

---

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at a Quarter to Three of the Clock, Mr. President in the Chair.

---

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** Mr. President, it is a matter of misfortune that my Honourable friend, Sir George Rainy, is unable to attend the House today, by reason of indisposition. As we all know, Sir George Rainy, is suffering from a severe cold in the head; but I have not been able to understand why that should have given my Honourable friend, Sir James Crerar, cold feet. (Laughter.) I have been amazed and I am sure the whole House has been amazed at the attitude which my Honourable friend, Sir James Crerar, has taken up in the course of this very important debate. He has refused to answer any questions on the ground that he refuses to be cross-examined. This important debate is taking place in this House, serious allegations have been made by my Honourable friend, U Kyaw Myint, in the course of his very able maiden speech, the House naturally expects to hear whether the Government of India admit any of the charges made, or whether the Government of India are in a position to deny any of the charges made; but Sir James Crerar has definitely said that he does not wish to open his mouth in the course of this debate.

Sir, at the very outset I would like to pay a tribute to His Excellency Sir Charles Innes, who occupied a seat on the front Treasury Benches in this House for a number of years with great distinction and who is now making history as Governor of Burma. Sir Charles Innes I regard, Sir, as the greatest Empire-builder that Great Britain has produced during the past sixty years.

**Mr. B. Das:** Quite.

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** He has succeeded in mesmerising the Government of India, and he has also succeeded in mesmerising His Majesty's Government. (Laughter.) Mr. President, Sir Charles Innes assumed office as Governor of Burma in the beginning of January, 1928. The very first public utterance Sir Charles Innes made was at the Convocation of the Rangoon University held in February, 1928, when he delivered his address as Chancellor of the Rangoon University. I take it, Sir, that the Government of India take interest in matters of importance relating to every province, including even my province of Burma. In the course of that address and in his subsequent speeches delivered in Burma, His Excellency Sir Charles Innes stressed a number of points; but he emphasised two main points. He told his audience, the limited audience which was assembled in the Convocation Hall for that particular function and the wider audience within the province of Burma, that Indians were displacing Burmans in almost every walk of activity in the province. He asked Burmans to ponder over the ultimate result of this if nothing was done to stop it. He went further, and the second point he put forth was that if Burmans did not wake up, the Burmans as a race stood the risk of being exterminated.

**Mr. B. Das:** By whom? By the Europeans or by the Indians?

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** By the Indians. I am not in the course of this debate going to deal with the question whether it is or it is not possible for the Burmese race to be exterminated by the Indian or by the Chinese or by any other race. I shall only deal with the clear implication of this observation, solemnly and deliberately addressed by the Governor of Burma to the public in Burma. What he said was, "If you Burmans as a race want to save yourselves, you must keep the Indians out of the province". Nay, more than that, "You must put the Indians down"; and according to His Excellency the Governor of Burma, the only method of doing that was by clamouring for separation from India. Now I am not here concerned with the embarrassing situation in which my Honourable friend, Sir James Crerar, may or may not find himself as a result of certain instructions which he might or might not have received from His Majesty's Government, but I will make this very clear statement on the floor of this House that ever since Sir Charles Innes set foot on Burmese soil, he started this propaganda of inciting the Burmese people against . . .

**The Honourable Sir James Crerar:** On a point of order, Sir, I suggest that the Honourable Member has already transgressed or is in danger of transgressing Standing Order 29 (iv) by referring to the conduct of the Governor of Burma.

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** I wish to assure my Honourable friend, Sir James Crerar, that his apprehension that I have transgressed or am about to transgress that particular Standing Order is unfounded. However, I shall be very careful . . . . .

**Mr. President:** The Honourable Member started his observations in such a manner as to lead to the apprehension that he may come within the provisions of the Standing Order referred to. I would ask the Honourable Member to confine his observations to the main issue that is before the House.

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** I shall take the greatest care, Sir, not to transgress that Standing Order.

Now, I shall proceed to deal with the grave implication of this propaganda. Are the Government of India prepared to endorse this statement that separation will enable Burmans to keep Indians out of the province of Burma or to impose disabilities on the Indians who have settled in Burma? This is a statement which the Government of India are bound to deal with because, as I shall now proceed to point out, this was the starting point adopted by the Government of Burma to mislead the Burmese public. Sir Harcourt Butler laid down his office as Governor of Burma after a very distinguished record. I sat on the Opposition Benches as an elected Member of the Burma Legislative Council during the entire period of Sir Harcourt Butler's office as Governor of Burma. I have no hesitation in paying a tribute to Sir Harcourt Butler who proved himself to be a great friend of Burma without adopting any tactics of rousing racial animosity. (Applause.) Now, I would ask the Government of India whether they are prepared to endorse this statement made by the Government of Burma to the people of Burma that after separation, the people of Burma will benefit to this extent that they will be able to keep out Indians from Burma and will also be able to keep down the Indians in Burma. This has been the greatest misleading plank in the course of the separation propaganda. Now, I do ask Honourable Members sitting on the Government Benches, if such an attempt were made by any Government in Burma, whether it was a Government which was part of British India or whether it was a Government of a separated Burma, what would be the attitude of the Government of India? The answer can be one and one only. Therefore, it is up to the Government of India now, through Sir James Crerar, to declare to the people of Burma that if they have been misled into asking for separation in the expectation that in a separated Burma they will be allowed to keep out one particular section of His Majesty's subjects or that they will be able to subject them to any disabilities in the province of Burma, then they are gravely mistaken. They may or may not desire separation on other grounds, but if they desire separation on this ground, then they will be bitterly disappointed, and the Government of India as an honest Government, cannot be a party to any such misleading suggestion. That is Sir James Crerar's obvious duty and I do hope he will discharge it in the course of this debate. (Applause.)

Now, Sir, during the past three years, Sir Charles Innes has delivered a number of speeches in Burma. He spoke on more than one occasion at the meetings of the Burma Chamber of Commerce, the Rangoon Trades Association, St. Andrews' Dinner and in his address to the Burma Legislative Council. All these speeches and addresses were distributed over more than two years. All the addresses which he made to the people of Burma were in the same strain. Is it any wonder that a simple-minded, trusting race, or at least a section of them, has been misled into thinking that it is desirable for Burma to ask for separation on the grounds advanced in these speeches and addresses and for reasons quoted by the Head of the Province? That, Sir, was the beginning of the trouble. But, as my Honourable friend, U Kyaw Myint, has pointed out, the Government of Burma, in spite of a systematic propaganda of a most misleading nature, has not succeeded in hoodwinking the province of Burma or anything like

[Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi.]

a majority in the province of Burma. The Government of Burma has certainly succeeded to a certain with a certain section of the Burmese people. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that, if such speeches were made by any Indian politician in India or by any Indian or Burmese politician in Burma and if they were brought to the notice of Sir James Crerar, he would be the very first to endorse the proposition that that man ought to be dealt with immediately under section 124-A of the Indian Penal Code. A series of deliberate attempts to sow discord between two friendly races and to rouse feelings of hatred amongst the Burmans as against the Indians are, I take it, governed by section 124-A of the Indian Penal Code. If that is not so, then all the prosecutions launched by the Government of India or by the Provincial Governments during the past 10 years ought to be wiped out.

Now, Sir, I come to the second stage of the achievement of the Government of Burma, for which, of course, the main credit must go to His Excellency Sir Charles Innes. The second stage was reached when the Round Table Conference was formed. The task of inviting delegates from Burma to the Round Table Conference, was, I presume, left to the Government of Burma.

**The Honourable Sir James Crerar:** It has already been explained by the Leader of the House that these invitations were extended to the delegates by His Majesty's Government.

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** Am I to understand from Sir James Crerar's last statement that the Government of India were not approached directly or indirectly by the Government of Burma with regard to the number of the Burma delegates and with regard to the personnel of the Burma Delegation?

**The Honourable Sir James Crerar:** No, Sir. The Government of India were not approached by the Government of Burma.

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** Did not the Government of India care to find out if the Government of Burma had secured a proper delegation?

**The Honourable Sir James Crerar:** I have already replied to the question.

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** I take it that the Government of India were indifferent as to whether the Government of Burma submitted a fair and proper list to His Majesty's Government or not. If the Government of India want to take upon their heads more and more charges, I cannot stop them; but I did not intend to make this charge against the Government of India that they were so indifferent to the interests of Burma that they made no effort at any stage to ascertain whether the Government of Burma was or was not submitting a fair and proper list to His Majesty's Government. A list of four delegates was submitted to His Majesty's Government by the Government of Burma, according to Sir James Crerar, without the knowledge and consent of the Government of India and behind their back. One delegate was Sir Oscar DeGlanville. He is a distinguished man. I have nothing to say against him. He is a personal friend of mine. But, Sir, however distinguished he may be his political views do not fit him to represent a large province with a population of 14 million which includes 12 million Burmans. Sir Oscar DeGlanville represented his own community and the Government of Burma. I do not grudge the European community the representation they got at the Round Table Conference; they were entitled to

it and they had it. I do not think that my Honourable friend, Sir James Crerar, in spite of his protestations of ignorance, is prepared to go to the length of saying that he does not even now know that no delegate was called from Burma to represent the Indian community. I am sure he does know that although a delegate was invited from Burma to represent the European community, whose population in the whole province is less than five thousand, no representative was called to the Round Table Conference to represent the Indian community in Burma with a population of more than one million. Now, if the Government of India had discharged their duties as a Central Government should do, such an amazing omission would not have taken place. If the whole of the delegation had been confined to and composed of Burmans, I would have raised no protest against it because I have always held the view, and I will continue to hold it, that minorities in any country can only prosper and be happy with the goodwill and friendship of the majority community. That is the principle, Sir, that I have tried to preach to my Indian brethren in Burma; and I venture to think I have succeeded in achieving a certain measure of success in this direction. But my objection is this that if the very small European community in Burma could find representation, why should similar representation has been denied to the Indians in Burma? I wish to emphasise one more point in this connection. That point is that Sir Oscar DeGlanville, who was selected by the Government of Burma, has been the foremost champion of the separation of Burma from India at any cost. I have now dealt with the European member of the Burma delegation. U Aung Thein one of the Burmese delegates, as my Honourable friend, U Kyaw Myint, has pointed out, represented nobody if he did not represent the Government of Burma. The two remaining Members of the Burma delegation were U Ba Pe the Leader and U Ohn Ghine the Deputy Leader of the People's Party, whose selection was perfectly justified, as the People's Party, for whom I have great admiration and regard, is an important political party in Burma and no conference, commission or committee dealing with Burma can be complete without an adequate representation of the People's Party. On that ground, nobody can have any grievance. But as the People's Party itself has pointed out, the Burma Delegation was unrepresentative in character, as the People's Party alone could not represent and did not claim to represent the whole province. The result was that the Government of Burma, the European community in Burma and the People's Party were represented at the Round Table Conference and the rest of Burma was wholly unrepresented (*Cries of "Shame"*).

Now, Sir, if the Government of Burma at any time genuinely believed that the people of Burma as a whole desired separation at any cost or on the terms cherished by Sir Charles Innes, there should have been no hesitation on the part of the Government of Burma to play its part fairly and honestly and to submit to His Majesty's Government a representative list including even the opponents to the movement for separation.

I now turn to the next stage in this drama and it is this stage that fills me with boundless admiration for His Excellency Sir Charles Innes. I am sure my Honourable friend, Sir James Crerar, cannot stop me and would not like to stop me from expressing my admiration for Sir Charles Innes. What happened at the Round Table Conference? I have been told by my Honourable friend, Mr. H. P. Mody, who unfortunately has been

[Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi.]

called away to Bombay, that the question of separation came up one afternoon before the Conference. After three or four speeches had been delivered, the Prime Minister put it to the Conference that he took it that there was not only a general but almost an overwhelming desire that Burma should be separated. I have tried to ascertain from my Honourable friend, Mr. Mody, and several other delegates to the Round Table Conference but nobody has been able to tell me clearly what happened during that hour. Anyhow within a few minutes, the principle of separation had been accepted. After this declaration was made by the Prime Minister, I believe Mr. Shiva Rao rose to ask the Prime Minister, who was the Chairman, whether the question of separation was or was not an accomplished fact and whether it could be debated in the Burma Sub-Committee, and he was told that it was a closed and settled issue. Now, Sir, after this, I am sure Sir James Crerar will not grudge my paying tribute to Sir Charles Innes, for the great skill with which he rushed the whole thing through the Conference in a few minutes.

**An Honourable Member:** Is all this in the published proceedings?

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** I think my Honourable friend, Mr. Mody, will be able to tell you better. I am sure Sir James Crerar will not grudge the tribute I am paying Sir Charles Innes because if he could achieve so much, he certainly deserves tribute and His Majesty's Government were mesmerised to this extent that they closed this issue of separation in a few minutes and said, "It is a settled issue". Now, Sir, the farce enacted at the Conference over this question of separation is a farce unparalleled in the constitutional history of any country.

We now come to another stage in the Burma Committee which was presided over by the late Earl Russell, who was then Under Secretary of State for India. In the Burma Committee Mr. Shiva Rao and my Honourable friend, Mr. Mody, again raised the question, whether the question of separation of Burma was a closed issue or whether it was an open issue and the Chairman told them that it was a closed issue. But they tried to argue that it was not a closed issue, that nobody knew what had happened and they contended that His Majesty's Government could not turn down the destinies of twelve million Burmans in the off-hand manner they did. Sir Isaac Foot, one of the Liberal representatives at the Conference came to the help of Mr. Mody and urged on the Chair that it could not fairly be treated as a settled issue because the question had never been discussed by anybody. In some half-hearted manner, the question was treated as partially open to indirect discussion in the Burma Committee, and then came the minutes of dissent. Some trouble arose as to whether the minutes of dissent put in by Mr. Shiva Rao and Mr. Mody could or could not be treated as forming part of the Report of the Burma Committee. However, the Report came back and was considered by the Conference, not the Plenary Session of the Conference, but by the whole Conference sitting in Committee. By this time the delegates' rooms were flooded with cablegrams received from Burma; innumerable meetings were held, hundreds of memorials, lengthy representations and strong protests were sent from Burma. Of course, I can easily understand the feelings of pain and surprise with which the Indian delegates must have suddenly discovered that they had been innocent and unwilling parties to very great

harm being done to Burma, without any proper discussion at the Conference. In the absence of adequate discussion, the question of separation of Burma was treated as a closed issue and that was on the footing, on the assumption, and on representations made to the Indian delegates that Burma desired separation, not that a small section of Burmans desired separation, but that Burma as a whole desired separation. On the other hand, the fact was that a large section of Burmans objected to separation. Then, naturally efforts were made to reopen the whole question, and to do full and proper justice to Burma. Now, Sir, I wish to make it clear to you, because what I say is likely to be misunderstood in Burma, that when at this meeting of the Conference which met in full Committee, the Indian delegates tried to reopen the question they did so not on any racial or communal grounds, but purely on the ground that they had been misled into playing a part which they thought Burma desired. Now when they found that they had been misled into playing that part, they, as conscientious men working for the interests of Burma, wanted to satisfy themselves as to what Burma really and actually desired. When the Prime Minister found that there was vehement opposition at this stage, he tried to take up an evasive attitude. But when Mr. Jinnah, if I may use the expression, practically drove him into a corner, the Prime Minister was compelled to say that the question of separation was not a closed issue and that it would be further considered by the full Plenary Session of the Conference—they were meeting at that stage in full Committee. This evidently afforded satisfaction to the Indian delegates.

Then comes the most amazing chapter of the drama. Nothing more was heard about Burma. Day after day, people in Burma were opening their papers anxiously to find out what was happening to that reopened question of separation, what His Majesty's Government were going to do about it, in what way they were going to find out the true sentiment and desire in Burma. What really happened after this was that in the full Plenary Session of the Conference on the very last day, the Prime Minister delivered his speech and in that exhaustive speech which raised so much hope in India, there was a brief reference to Burma, confined to three lines. I remember, Sir, I was in the Rangoon Bar Library at the time, and we all put our heads together and tried to put a construction on what the Prime Minister was trying to say about Burma. We found that there were two constructions possible, each of which could be advanced with equal assurance. If one construction was put, it appeared as if the question of separation was an open issue; if another construction was put, it appeared as if the question of separation was a closed issue. However, the Indian delegates to the Conference could not, in that naturally excited state of mind when they were listening to the future of India, sit down and analyse the exact significance and meaning of the three lines in which the Prime Minister disposed of Burma. We in Burma did not know what to make of it. But the next morning Burma was thoroughly frightened. Here I am constrained to state that the tactics adopted by His Majesty's Government in that Conference were nothing short of breach of faith. I take you back, Sir, to that stage when the Prime Minister told Mr. Jinnah and the full Conference that the issue of separation was not a closed issue, and that the issue of separation would be considered further by the full Plenary Session of the Conference; that pledge was never kept. Not that the Prime Minister lost sight of it, because if he had lost sight of it, he would not

[Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi.]

have inserted those three brief lines in his speech, giving, like the Oracle of Delphi, an utterance which might equally mean one thing or the other. The Prime Minister wound up his speech by a statement which he read out on behalf of His Majesty's Government, and in that statement no reference whatever was made to Burma. The Conference then broke up. Next day—I do not know whether it was manœuvred or whether it was a fortuitous coincidence—but the next day Mr. Wedgwood Benn in answer to a question put by a Member of Parliament—I forget his name and I have not got the Press cutting with me now—made a statement in which he said (I am now speaking from memory) that His Majesty's Government had decided to separate Burma and would proceed to give effect to that decision. The pledge given by the Prime Minister to the Conference that this question would be debated in full Conference was torn up, and this definite declaration was made within less than 24 hours after Mr. Ramsay MacDonald had made that cryptic statement of three lines in his speech and had made no reference whatever to Burma in the official statement read out by him. Then a supplementary question was put, if I remember rightly, as to what form of Government separated Burma would have. Mr. Wedgwood Benn carefully avoided the slightest use of or reference to the expression "Dominion Status", but he said that the pledge given to Burma when she formed part of British India in 1917, that she would have gradual realisation of responsible government, held good. Of course when this answer came, if the Burmans were philosophers and nothing else they might have been overjoyed. But the Burmans are not altogether philosophers. It was then that a full sense of awakening took place. It was then—if I may use a highly unparliamentary expression—that the people of Burma realised that Sir Charles Innes had sold them a pup. I apologise to you, Sir, and to the House for using an unparliamentary expression.

Sir, my heart bleeds for Burma. I belong to a microscopic minority—the Parsee Community. I have no interest to serve one way or the other. The only stand which I take up now, which I have taken in the past and which I will continue to take in the future, is dictated by my love for Burma and the Burmans, a simple, trusting, loveable race, a race overflowing with love and goodwill for everybody. Seeds of discord have been attempted to be planted in Burmese hearts; pledges were given which were intended to be dishonoured; and deception has been practised on Burmans from start to finish. My Honourable friends from India attending the Round Table Conference were very busy with their own affairs, and were unconsciously a party in doing Burma very grave harm; but let me say it again clearly to their great honour, that the moment they discovered that, they, equally with the Burmese race, had been made victims of misrepresentation and deception, they asserted themselves, but, as I have explained, their efforts have so far been in vain.

Sir, I will now give the House a short review of the attitude of the Government of Burma after Cæsar came back to Burma as conqueror. Sir, we have had in Burma recently an attempt to suppress the free expression of public opinion more particularly against separation. We have had recently an Ordinance. I am not dealing with the Ordinance; I am only pointing out the fact that there is an Ordinance.

**The Honourable Sir James Crerar:** Sir, I may point out that that Ordinance has no reference to the expression of public opinion. It has reference to the terrorist movement or rebellion.

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** Sir, I take it that my Honourable friend, Sir James Crerar, has read that Ordinance. He says that it has no reference to the expression of public opinion. That Ordinance, and the Bill which is a reproduction of the Ordinance, confer on the Government of Burma power to arrest and imprison any person whom they consider connected with certain activities specified in the Ordinance. I am unable to appreciate Sir James Crerar's difficulty. He is unable to see the connection between expression of public opinion on the one hand and the use of this Ordinance or the Bill on the other hand. I will try to make it clear to him. My Honourable friend, U Kyaw Myint, told the House this morning that you, Sir, allowed him to make this fearless speech in this House this morning, but that if he goes back to Burma and tries to repeat half the speech that he made here this morning he would be arrested under the Ordinance if the Bill has not come into operation or under the Bill if it has come into operation, of course on the alleged ground that this harmless young Burman is connected with some alleged revolutionary party. If the connection is still not clear to Sir James Crerar, I may have to labour the point further but I think it is now quite clear to him. Now, Sir, the Central Government have a serious responsibility in the matter. They have got sacred obligations and they cannot close their eyes to the fact that the Government of Burma is very keen on the question of separation, that the Government of Burma is determined to achieve its end by using every power that it can wield in that province. Is it fair and proper on their part, without proper inquiry, to arm the Government of Burma with such extraordinary powers which are bound to produce, and I say have already produced, a suppression of public opinion in Burma against separation?

Sir, that is one step the Government of Burma has taken. The other step is that they have declared the very powerful G. C. B. A. an illegal association by issuing a notification under the Criminal Law Amendment Act. Now, Sir, as my Honourable friend, U Kyaw Myint, told the House, the G. C. B. A. represents in Burma not only what the Congress represents in India but a great deal more; it is more powerful and a great deal more far-embracing; because it is sometimes said in India that there are some important schools of political thought which are outside the Congress. It is said that the important Muslim community is out of the Congress. But there is no such thing in Burma. The four letters, G. C. B. A., mean the General Council of Burmese Associations. It consists of associations spread over every town and village in Burma. It embraces millions of Burmese Buddhists; it represents Burmese opinion; it represents Burmese sentiment. The G. C. B. A. wield the real and true political power in Burma. Now, Sir, the G. C. B. A. has all along been entirely against separation,—whether rightly or wrongly I am not concerned with. The G. C. B. A. is entirely against separation and the Government of Burma is for separation by hook or by crook. Is it not therefore natural, as human nature is constituted, that it should use extraordinary powers in suppressing that association? The whole of the U Soe Thein G. C. B. A. has been declared unlawful; anybody who claims to be a member of or acts as a member of that association is liable to be imprisoned.

[Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi.]

This is the final stage of Burma's misfortune or shall I say the beginning stage?

Then, Sir, there is a man who as an individual wields more influence in Burma than any other man, and that man is U Ottama. As my friend, U Kyaw Myint, pointed out, U Ottama cannot open his mouth in Burma. If he does he will be immediately put inside the four walls of a prison. He is not allowed to say anything in Burma with regard to the real sentiment and desire of Burmans on the question of separation. He is not even allowed to say it in India without being harassed by the Calcutta Police. He is not allowed to go to England to tell His Majesty's Government and the British public exactly what the Burmans want and desire.

Sir, is it proper for the Government of India to be a party to these tactics? If the Government of India say that they know nothing of these things, then I charge them with having failed in the discharge of their most elementary duty of exercising proper supervision and control over the Provincial Governments. Are we paying fat salaries to these Honourable gentlemen on the Treasury Benches for saying that they know nothing about the administration of the provinces under their charge? I am surprised at the attitude taken up by Sir James Crerar in the course of this debate. Sir James Crerar has refused to reply to questions, has refused to be "cross-examined", has refused to answer inquiries, and has refused to say anything as to where the Government of India stand on this question of separation—a question of the most vital importance to Burma. I shall now proceed, Sir, to make a series of assertions and I claim that the assertions which I shall make are correct and accurate. If they are incorrect or if any of them is inaccurate I am sure my Honourable friend, Sir James Crerar, will get up and contradict or correct me. If he does not, I am entitled to ask the House to accept my assertions as assertions admitted by the Government of India. My first assertion is this: that His Majesty's Government have issued instructions to the Government of India and to the Government of Burma to proceed with the task of completing separation through the usual official channels. I shall repeat it; there should be no misunderstanding about it. I assert and I challenge the Honourable Sir James Crerar to contradict me if I am wrong even in the slightest detail, that His Majesty's Government have issued specific instructions to the Government of India on the one hand and the Government of Burma on the other, to proceed departmentally with all necessary preliminary work with a view to give effect to the settled decision of separating Burma from India.

**The Honourable Sir James Crerar:** I am sorry to interrupt the Honourable Member . . . . .

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** I invite it.

**The Honourable Sir James Crerar:** But I must at this stage say that the Honourable Member will not be entitled to infer from any silence on my part any consent as to his propositions.

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** Mr. President, in this House we conduct debates on wellknown parliamentary principles, and not on principles enunciated by Sir James Crerar (*Opposition cries of "Hear, hear"*). This is the Indian Parliament. Sir James Crerar may regard it as a mock Parliament; we regard it as a real live parliament. I ask the House, is it

conceivable that any responsible Minister of His Majesty's Government would stand up in the House of Commons and tell a member who is making assertions and challenging the Treasury Benches to contradict him if they are incorrect, "I shall not say yes, nor shall I say no; but let not the House take anything for granted". They must take it for granted, and I do ask the House to assume that Sir James Crerar cannot contradict these assertions because they are accurate. (Opposition Cheers.) I can quite understand the position of the Government of India: they must carry out the instructions which they have received from His Majesty's Government; but had the Indian Government exercised the same control over the Government of Burma as His Majesty's Government exercise over the Government of India, Burma would not have been in this unfortunate position, because then the Government of India would have found out that what was being forced on Burma is quite the reverse of what Burma ever wanted or desired.

There is one thing which I wish to make perfectly clear and it is this: I think there was some misapprehension on the part of certain Honourable Members this morning. We, Members from Burma, are not asking this House to debate the question of separation as such; we, Members from Burma, are not asking this House to decide whether Burma should or should not have separation. As a matter of fact, if any section of this House took up that attitude, I should consider it my duty to stand up and protest against it, because that is a question for Burmans and Burmans alone to decide whether they want separation or not, and if they want separation on what terms they want separation. But we have raised a general debate and we want to go a great deal further than raising a mere general debate; we, Members from Burma, are now inviting the House to record by its vote the acceptance of a definite formula consisting of three clear points. That is what we, representatives from Burma, are asking our Honourable friends in this House to do, to go into the division lobby one way or the other and to vote for the acceptance of this formula consisting of three points or against it and so make the position clear. I shall read out the three points of the formula to the House. The first point on which we want the vote of this House is this: that this House records its adherence to the principle that it is for Burmans to decide whether to separate from India or to remain part of the proposed Indian federation. I am sure I shall have the entire non-official section of the House with me on this point. I am afraid I must again refer to what Sir James Crerar said when dealing with this point. Sir James Crerar and Sir George Schuster said that Government will remain neutral. Why neutral? What objection can they have to this particular point? I am asking Sir James Crerar and Sir George Schuster and the Official Benches to agree to this proposition, that it is for Burmans and Burmans alone to decide whether they want to separate from India or not. What conceivable objection can there be to the Government of India being parties to this proposition of ours? It is amazing. Neutrality on what? It is a principle which is a fair one; it is a principle which no member of any government could have the slightest hesitation in accepting. In this connection I wish to make a particular appeal to my Honourable friends sitting on the European Benches, though I only see a few of them now. It would be a matter of very great gratification to us, Members from Burma, and a great solace to the people of Burma if we could carry with us in this division, the non-official European Benches. With a view to carry with us every non-

[Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi.]

official section of the House, U Kyaw Myint has carefully prepared this formula consisting of these three points. I am sure there can be no objection to my European friends endorsing every one of them. I shall emphasise the first point again. By voting with us you will be expressing your adherence to the principle that it is for Burmans and Burmans alone to decide whether they want to remain part of India or to separate. We are not asking you to vote for separation or against separation. The second point is this: that we want to express our concern at the manner in which the question of separation is being rushed through and treated as a settled issue without an adequate opportunity being given to Burmans to exercise their choice in the matter. I do not know whether my Honourable friend, Sir James Crerar, wishes to claim that he is a particularly callous man. If he did I would not believe him: I think he is a very kind-hearted man. (Laughter.) If he is a kind-hearted man, as I am sure he is, would he not have ordinary human sentiments?—Would he not feel concern if this question of separation is being rushed through without Burmans being given any choice in the matter? I cannot imagine any man, unless he is totally callous to the most ordinary human instincts, to remain unconcerned at what is happening. I am not asking anybody to condemn anything. I think my Honourable friend, U Kyaw Myint, and myself have done enough of it. We are not asking the House to vote for every statement we have made in our speeches here. We are only asking the House to agree to this formula consisting of these three points. I am asking my European friends to vote with us in expressing concern at what is happening. I see that Mr. Arthur Moore has just re-entered the House. If you will give me a little indulgence, Sir, I might be permitted to repeat what I have just been saying. Mr. Arthur Moore and myself became greater friends in the last Assembly after we had a friendly breeze in the House on the Indian Cotton Tariff Bill; and I would very greatly value his vote with us in the division over this matter. We, representatives from Burma, would very much like to carry with us the European non-officials in this division and I wish to repeat my appeal to my Honourable friends on the European Benches. We, Members from Burma, are asking the House to vote with us on a formula consisting of three points: the first is that it is for Burmans and Burmans alone to decide whether they want to separate from India or remain part of it. I am sure my European colleagues could have no objection whatever to it. I am sure they do not claim that it is for the Government of India to dictate to Burma; I am sure they do not claim that it is for the Government of Burma to dictate to the people of Burma. It is for the Burmans themselves to decide. The second point is that we want this House to express its concern at the question of separation being rushed through without an adequate opportunity being afforded for the expression of Burmese opinion. My friend, Mr. Arthur Moore, is a journalist and naturally attaches very great value to free expression of public opinion; and I am certain that after he hears this debate we shall see very shortly leading articles in the *Statesman* voicing the grievances of the unfortunate people of Burma. (Laughter and cheers.) At the present moment my object is that he should let me convey to the people of Burma his concern as a gentleman of kindly feelings, as an Englishman of pro-Burman sentiments, his concern that anything should be done without the Burmans being consulted in a matter of life and death to political Burma.

And the third point, which is really the practical point of the formula, is this, that we want to urge upon the authorities—I do not know who is the ruling authority, whether it is the Government of Burma, it seems to me that it is the Government of Burma, or whether it is the Government of India or whether it is His Majesty's Government but whoever holds the greatest power in this matter—we want to urge on that power and on that authority to take immediate steps to test the real desire of Burma on the question of separation by a referendum to be held under the direct supervision of the Government of India with the aid of a non-official Committee representing every school of Burmese political thought and every shade of Burmese opinion. Now, I wish to draw the particular attention of the House to the use of the expressions "Burman" and "Burmese" used in our formula. I do not want the Government of India to find out what the Government of Burma wants, I do not want the Government of India to find out what the Europeans in Burma want, I do not want the Government of India to find out what the Indians in Burma want; but I do ask the Government of India to find out what the Burmans themselves want, what the Burmans themselves desire for their own country. The Government of Burma has been asserting that it has the people of Burma behind it on the question of separation. The political organizations in Burma known as the G. C. B. A., which represent real Burmese opinion, have been protesting against the separation of Burma. Is it not then the obvious duty of the Government of India as a fair minded Government to urge upon His Majesty's Government to hold a referendum to find out what the Burmans themselves desire? Now, Sir, when my friend, U Kyaw Myint, introduced his motion this morning, he urged that the referendum should be held under the direct supervision of the Government of India, because naturally he distrusts the Government of Burma. This morning he trusted the Government of India a little too much. (Laughter.) Anyhow, Sir, however disappointing my friend Sir James Crerar's attitude may have been, we, Members from Burma, still want to urge, that if a referendum is to be held, it must be held under the direct supervision of the Government of India, otherwise there is every chance, almost a certainty, of the whole thing being reduced to a farce by the unfair dominating tactics of the Government of Burma. That must be avoided at any cost.

Now, Sir, I am quite sure that my friends sitting on the European Benches could not possibly have the slightest objection to vote with us, Members from Burma, on these three points.

During the last three years I have refrained from taking any part in the separation controversy. But as a friend of Burma who has tried to serve Burma in the past and who aspires to serve her in the future, I can no longer remain silent. I consider it my duty to sound a note of warning to my Burmese brethren that Burma is on the brink of political destruction. I appeal to the Government of India to help Burma and to see that the Government of Burma does not succeed in closing the door of the Indian Federation in Burma's face regardless of Burma's desire or choice in the matter.

Now, Sir, before I sit down, may I make one appeal, possibly a futile appeal, to my Honourable friend Sir James Crerar? The appeal which I am going to make to him is not as an elected Member of this House to a Member sitting on the Government Benches. It is an appeal from one

[Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi.]

man to another. He is in charge of the Home Department. He is in charge of the preservation of law and order. It is he who has to scrutinise the applications received from the Government of Burma when they ask for extraordinary powers,—I appeal to him as man to man to look after the people of Burma and to scrutinise every such application with the greatest possible care. (Applause.)

**Sir Owasji Jehangir** (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I first desire to dissociate myself from the remarks of the Honourable the Mover and the other Honourable Member from Burma with regard to the representative character of the Burma delegation to the Conference. I am not in a position to deny their representative character or to assert it, but I certainly desire to dissociate myself from certain of the remarks made. Now, Sir, my friend, Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar, has spoken at considerable length and has given this House a very clear and a very correct idea of what took place at the Conference, and if any Honourable Members want confirmation of the facts that he related, I would advise them to dip into this Blue Book, wherein will be found ample evidence of the correctness of my friend's statements. The first time the question of Burma came before the Conference was at the very first meeting of the Committee of the Conference as a whole, when U Ba Pe spoke on behalf of his country. I am not going to weary the House by quoting long passages from his speech. I will content myself by reading two very short extracts. I would ask the House to remember that U Ba Pe was the Leader of the Peoples' Party, and my friend, Mr. Munshi, has admitted that he was a true representative of the people of Burma. This is what he said:

"Burma has been suffering for various reasons. As is well known to the Indian people, we have nothing in common with them. Our race belongs to quite a different stock. We are more Mongolian than Aryan."

Further on, U Ba Pe says:

"I raised the question in the Burma Legislative Council",—the question being the separation of Burma,—"by moving a motion to that effect which was carried unanimously, thus testifying that it was the unanimous wish of the people of Burma that Burma should be separated from India without any further delay."

Sir, there were only two British Indian delegates who took part in the discussion on that occasion, my friends, Mr. Chintamani and Raja Sher Mohammad; there were two Princes, the Maharaja of Alwar and the Maharaja of Bikaner. The position of the British Indian delegation on that occasion was exactly the position that all my friends here have taken up today, that is, that we as Indians have no desire to dictate to Burma whether they should separate or not. It is their affair, and having such a clear pronouncement from the Leader of the Peoples' Party, my friends from Burma will admit that we acted rightly and discreetly in not challenging that opinion. How could we? We were there at that time pleading for self-determination. We were there demanding before the British public our rights as citizens of our own country; we were there for a full measure of self-government. Who were we to deny to Burma the right to separate, if she so desired it. Well, Sir, on the strength of that speech, backed up by the Despatch of the Government of India, the Conference came to the conclusion that the first thing they should do was to agree to the separation of Burma. There were one or two British Indian delegates who raised the point immediately, whether the question of separation, was to remain open but in the usual way, the

Prime Minister ascertained generally the views of the whole Conference. There was some cheering, and so far as the proceedings of the Conference went at that stage, it was agreed that Burma could be separated. That was the ruling of the Prime Minister. Then, Sir, came the Committee. But before the Committee could sit, there were dozens of telegrams, all contesting the position taken up by U Ba Pe, but let it not be forgotten that there was not one single telegram that stated that under any circumstances Burmans were against separation. They wanted their own constitutional position clearly defined before they could agree to the separation. The British Indian representatives on the Committee took up that point very strongly and disagreed with that paragraph of the Report which desired His Majesty's Government to make an immediate announcement for the separation of Burma. The Report came before the Conference in Committee when a number—I have got all the names here, and anybody who wishes to know them may read this book—of British Indian delegates said that the decision was taken in a hurry, that the decision was taken without, let me clearly state, proper and adequate information, and therefore they desired not to be committed to the previous decision. My Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar, has read out to you the concluding portion of the debate in which Mr. Jinnah, the late Maulana Muhammad Ali and others pointed out that they were not prepared to allow or to agree to His Majesty's Government making any announcement. That was the understanding when that debate was finished, and I am prepared to state that that was the understanding of every one of the British Indian delegation, and I think that will be confirmed by all the other delegates who happen to be Members of this Honourable House. Therefore, as far as we are concerned, it is an open question. (*Mr. Jehanair K. Munshi*: "Who are 'We'") I mean the British Indian delegates, and I may add, even the princes,—as far as we are concerned, it is an open question. We take up, and I believe my Honourable friends will agree with me, we take up here the same position that the delegates took up at the Conference at the second stage of the discussion. We are not here to dictate to Burma what they should decide; nor will we allow anybody else to dictate to Burma. It is not for the Englishmen in Burma to express an opinion; it is not for us to express an opinion. It is not for the Government of Burma or the Government of India to express an opinion. It is for the Burmans themselves, and how best to get an impartial verdict from the Burmans is a matter for further consideration. Whichever section of Burmese public opinion expresses a desire for separation, the allegation will be made that they are influenced. If they are not for separation, the allegation most probably will also be made that they are influenced. Let us not forget that. Therefore, how to get an impartial opinion and verdict of the Burmans is a question for further consideration. But as far as the delegates go, I say with some confidence that they did take up that position, and they will continue to take up that position,—that Burma shall not be dictated to. After the debate was over, I see that the Secretary of State, in answer to a question put by Major Graham Pole, in the House of Common gave the following reply:

"Mr. Benn said that in connection with the Government's decision to proceed with the separation of Burma as announced by Mr. MacDonald yesterday, they wished it to be understood that the prospects of constitutional advance held out to Burma as part of British India would not be prejudiced, and the constitutional objective after the

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

separation would remain progressive realisation of responsible government in Burma as an integral part of the Empire. In pursuance of this decision, they intended to take such steps towards the framing, in consultation with the Burmese opinion, of a new constitution as might be found most convenient and expeditious, their object being that the new constitution for India and Burma should come into force as nearly as possible simultaneously."

I definitely state that to my knowledge the whole Conference are not committed to this reply.

Now, Sir, I do not desire to prolong this debate. I will only state one thing, and that is, that we are not here to place before the Burmans the advantages of remaining with India, that is not our business today. We have no desire now or at any other time to place arguments before the Burmans. Finally, I think the most refreshing part of my Honourable friend's speech was when he admitted that the treatment meted out to Burma during its connection with this country cannot be characterised as callous. I have heard the allegation on more than one occasion, that this House and the Government of India were tempted to treat Burma as a step-child and that their treatment was callous. This admission on the part of a clever young Burman who represents Burma in this House, that he does not characterise the treatment meted out to his country up to now as callous is, I think, a certificate for both the Government and the Opposition. In conclusion, while congratulating him, I trust that the heavy hand of Government will not fall upon him for having made a fluent and clever maiden speech. (Applause.)

**Sir Hari Singh Gour** (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muham-  
madan): My Honourable friends who adorned the Round Table Conference have assured this House that the question of separation of Burma is still an open question. (*Divan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar*: "So far as they are concerned.") I would ask the Honourable Members of this House to read this passage from the Prime Minister's statement on the last day of the Conference, page 77.

"As to the Sub-Committee on Burma, its findings have been noted, and the Government will pursue the decisions of that Sub-Committee separating Burma and making the necessary inquiries as to the conditions upon which the separation is to take place."

I drew the attention of one of the delegates to the Round Table Conference to this concluding speech of the Prime Minister, and I was told that the Mover of the Resolution had not referred to it, and that, at any rate, it was not a part of the declaration of His Majesty's Government read out to the Round Table Conference. Sir, the reason why Burma does not find a place in the declaration of His Majesty's Government read out to the Round Table Conference is that Burma was no longer to be a part of India. That is the reason why in the declaration on the future policy of His Majesty's Government regarding the constitution of India, no reference is made to Burma. The inference is not to be therefore that Burma was to remain a part of India, but that following the decision of the Round Table Conference, the Premier declared the separation of Burma as a settled fact. My Honourable friends have not only pledged their own words but the words of all members of the Round Table Conference to the view that the question of separation is still an open question. I wish it were an open question, but in view of the very clear, categorical and unequivocal statement made by the Prime Minister, and in view of the very declaration

made by His Majesty's Government, is there any room for doubt that so far as the Round Table Conference is concerned and His Majesty's Government is concerned, the question of separation is no longer an open question? Having said this, I am sorry that when the Prime Minister made this statement, my friends, Sir Cowasji Jehangir and Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar, did not immediately get up and say that this was not the decision of the Round Table Conference. Read the speech of Mr. Jinnah and read the interrogations of the various members of the Round Table Conference.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** I would draw the Honourable Member's attention to page 356 of the big book where the Chairman, the Prime Minister, has made a statement only two days before the other statement.

**Sir Hari Singh Gour:** If even the Prime Minister had made a statement two days before holding that the question of separation of Burma was an open question and two days later made a categorical statement that the question of separation was decided by the Round Table Conference, was it not the duty of the Honourable Members to protest immediately that that was not the decision of the Round Table Conference.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** The Honourable Member must understand that the Prime Minister's statement he is quoting was the last statement made at the Conference, after which the Conference ended, while the statement I referred to was made during the discussion when every member had an opportunity of pointing out to the Prime Minister that he did not agree to allowing this question to be an open question.

**Sir Hari Singh Gour:** I am afraid my Honourable friend is only making his case worse by his interjections. If the Prime Minister made a statement which was not in accord with the decisions of the Round Table Conference and if it was the last day when the statement was made, was it not open to the Honourable Members to write to the Prime Minister, pointing out that that was not a correct statement so far as the decisions of the Round Table Conference were concerned. Did they do it? I say they did not.

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar:** If my friend is taking us to task, I did not brief Sir Hari Singh Gour as to the course of action that we should pursue.

**Sir Hari Singh Gour:** If they had done me the honour of briefing me, they would not have fallen into that mistake. (Applause.) Let this House clearly remember that it is not a matter which this House has to decide today. Let this House clearly remember that the decision of His Majesty's Government at the present moment is that Burma shall be separated from India. It is perfectly open to this House to ask His Majesty's Government to reconsider that question, if there is a motion to that effect, it is perfectly open to my Honourable friends, beated though they are, to inform His Majesty's Government, through this House, that they were misled because they did not exactly realise the implications of the Prime Minister's speech. Better late than never. I think my Honourable friends, the distinguished delegates to the Round Table Conference, are trying to make amends for their shortcomings on that occasion when the speech by the Prime Minister of England was delivered and when, according to them, the interests of Burma were seriously jeopardised by their own silence.

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

Now, Sir, having said that, we now come to the main question. The main question is this. His Majesty's Government have decided  
 4 P.M. that Burma shall be separated and what is more—see the last sentence—“and making the necessary enquiries as to the conditions upon which the separation is to take place”. The Honourable Mr. Munshi asked the Honourable the Home Member whether he was prepared to deny categorically that communications have been passing between Whitehall and India regarding the separation of Burma. Sir, he would not have put to the Honourable the Home Member that question if he had carefully read the speech of the Prime Minister of England—that steps would be immediately taken to determine the conditions subject to which Burma shall be separated from India. That may therefore be one question upon which this House is entitled to be heard. I do not for a moment deny that the Honourable the Mover of this motion and the other Honourable gentlemen who have supported him are equally entitled to ask His Majesty's Government to revise their decision, but let them not forget that they are asking for the revision of a decision and not for the decision of an open question.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** Question.

**Sir Hari Singh Gour:** You should have said that in the Round Table Conference, not here. Now, Sir, if we turn to the next point, I think through a sheer piece of sentimentalism Honourable Members on both sides of the House seem to be fascinated with that much abused word “self-determination” and Honourable Members stand up here and say “We must give Burma the same right of self-determination which we, Indians, want in our own country”. Sir, if Honourable Members had gone to Burma and if they had made the careful inquiries, which the members of the Simon Commission made there, they would have found there that the opinion in Burma was hopelessly divided upon the question of separation. There was in the first place the Indian feeling which was solidly against separation. There was a bulk of Burmese opinion—such opinion as was given expression to in the evidence before the Simon Commission—which was equally firm in favour of separation. There was the opinion of the British mercantile community. I must inform this House that at the time when this inquiry was proceeding their chief organ *the Rangoon Gazette* wrote strongly against separation. When their representatives came before us and gave evidence, they showed very clearly that they were not quite decided whether they should ask for separation or be against it and it must be said to the credit of the British merchants in Rangoon that they were not then asking for separation because it would serve the interests of the British mercantile community. What they said was, that there was an opinion in that country in favour of separation. There was also an opinion equally strong, perhaps not equally open, against separation. So far as they were concerned, they would not mind if there was separation and they would not mind if there was no separation. That was the opinion of the British merchants at that time. I quite admit that some of the Government members were in favour of separation, and the Burmese witnesses who appeared were also in favour of separation. When they were asked for their reasons for wanting separation, they said that they had three reasons for asking for separation and those three reasons were supported by men in high offices. One of them was that the Indian money-lender, the *chettiar*, goes to Rangoon in very large numbers and charges a very

high rate of interest. The second was that half a million Indian coolies migrate to Burma to take part in the cutting of the paddy and to do other menial labour, and they take away a very large amount of wealth from Burma. The third reason, and a very strong reason which the Government have publicly expressed, is the fact that Burma was not fairly treated by the Government of India, that a very large portion of the revenues of the Government of India was hypothecated for military purposes, and that if Burma was separated from India, Burma stood to gain and not to lose anything by that separation. Those were the reasons given in Burma in favour of separation; but there was an equally strong view expressed against separation. It was said that the defence of Burma was the defence of India, and consequently, with this separation of Burma you would not be able to economise on military expenditure. The second question was, as the Burmese put it: "We people have not got iron and we have not got coal and you have got a protective policy and you are putting protective duties upon iron and steel and other economic products of the country. Burma is suffering for it, and consequently we are made to pay for the pioneering of Indian industries in which Burma has not got a hand." That was the sort of objection raised by the Burmese leaders of opinion. We said, "Look at your rice. Rice would have to go down the depths of the Irrawady if India did not buy it. Burma is a fertile country, with only about 14 million population. It requires to be developed, and therefore India is the only nearest country to offer you facilities for internal development". Those were the questions. I am not in a position at the present moment to say that these are not weighty questions. Put all the reasons for separation, put all the reasons against separation, and what will be your verdict? I venture to submit that half of you will say, "We are for separation", and the other half will say, "No separation". I can quite understand, Sir, the reasons for which, after months of inquiry, we came to the conclusion that there should be no separation. But I can equally understand deciding the question either for separation or for no separation after half an hour's somnolent discussion. (Laughter.) That is the position which the Honourable Members are taking. We devoted months of inquiry to it, (Loud Applause), and we came to the conclusion that, on the whole, it would not be in the economic and political and social interests of the country that Burma should be immediately separated from India; and that of course is a question which this House has got to consider, whether,—whether with the constitution of a Federal Government in this country,—the Burmans would still insist upon their separation from India or would rather revise their opinion. Those are not the questions with which we are directly concerned at the present moment; not indeed is this the proper form where they can be profitably debated on this motion, and I am quite sure, Sir, that if these were the only questions, then the Honourable the Mover of the Resolution would not have troubled this House, but what is passing through his mind is this. He says, "It does not matter whether we are in favour of separation or against separation; what we want is the right to a free expression of our opinion, and we do not want to be gagged". That, I submit, is a fundamental right of every human being, and it is for that reason that he wants the concurrence and support of this House, so that the Honourable the Home Member might use his good offices to see that all the harassing pieces of legislation and ordinances and restrictive provisions are so modified or removed that there is not that embargo on the free expression of opinion of which the Honourable the Mover of the Resolution complains; and I think if we confine

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

ourselves to supporting his on this ground, we shall certainly stand upon stronger ground than if we digressed into a general discussion whether Burma should or should not be separated.

Sir, some of my Honourable friends said that the Government of India would be guilty of a gross dereliction of duty if they did not tell the people of Burma, "If you want separation, we are for separation". I say, Sir, that the Government of India would be guilty of a gross dereliction of duty if they abandoned the interests of the people of India, who have settled down in Burma, of people who have pioneered and advanced the interests of Burma, and if they were to say to the people of Burma, "Never mind about the people of India, never mind about those commercial interests which have developed and added to the welfare of Burma. If you want separation, we are for separation". I would say, Sir, that I should be very sorry if the Government of India ever took that attitude. If responsibility in the Government exists, it extends equally to the people of India as to the people of Burma, and they have to consider whether the separation of Burma would be conducive to the interests both of India as well as of Burma. A very large amount of debt is due from Burma; that question was raised, and I am quite sure that when the question of. . . . .

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** I rise to a point of order, Sir. The motion has made it clear that the Honourable the Mover does not invite this House to go into the merits—the pros and cons—of the question of separation.

**Sir Hari Singh Gour:** I do not see any point in the Honourable Member's point of order. All that I beg to say now is that the question of separation cannot be divorced from other considerations, financial and others, which we cannot go into today, and the question that strikes me as pertinent is that if this House is of opinion that the Government of India should permit a free expression of opinion on the question of separation, we should unitedly support the Honourable the Mover of the Resolution, and I venture to submit that that is all the purpose he has in his mind. We are not here committed either to or against separation: that is far too complicated a question, and we cannot possibly here say at once that His Majesty's Government are wrong in ignoring the protests that were made, in declaring for separation. I submit, Sir, that we should confine ourselves to that narrow issue,—that we support the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution and ask the good offices of the Home Member and of the Government of India to permit the free expression of opinion on the question of the separation of Burma from India. (Applause.)

**Mr. Arthur Moore (Bengal: European):** Sir, I entirely agree with my friend, Mr. Jehangir Munshi, and with my friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, that this is purely a question for Burmans to decide. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Munshi made an appeal to us to go into the division lobby with him. Well, Sir, at quarter past four I am quite sure my friend, Sir Hugh Cocke, has no intention of dividing the House on the questions as to whether we should resume the debate on the Finance Bill today, and I doubt very much if the Government have either and therefore I hardly think the question of division is likely to arise. (*Some Honourable Members:* "No Division.") My friend, Mr. Munshi, has asked me to state my opinion. Well, I would like to say that the one thing that appears certain to me—and I do profess to be impartial upon this point because I do not know whether Burma ought to be separated or not, and I have no definite opinion—the one moral that

seems to me to stick out of a mile is the futile results of "non-co-operation". (Hear, hear.) Here you have had the Simon Commission, with the Indian Committee—as my friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, has explained—spending months in the country going into this question in the greatest detail. Everybody knew that the issue was coming up once for all and yet as I understand, the General Council of Burmese Associations boycotted in the first instance that Commission, and in the second instance the Legislative Council. The result was that the Legislative Council, which is the representative organ of Burmese opinion in Burma, passed a unanimous Resolution in favour of separation. Then the third stage: you had the Round Table Conference in London where the issue was coming up for final settlement. Again the General Council of Burmese Associations boycotted the whole show, and yet they now say, "We are gagged, we are helpless", and they send frantic telegrams after the battle is lost! Now, Sir, what sense is there in that? What sense is there in telling us that they have had no opportunity of expressing an opinion? Why, they have had years in which to express an opinion? The whole argument has been slowly working up to the final stages, and they refuse to have anything to do with it till they are suddenly brought up against the facts.

**An Honourable Member:** What about the Congress?

**Mr. Arthur Moore:** Where this advice to boycott at various stages came from I do not know. I do not know whether it came from India or whether it originated in Burma. My friend over there is suggesting that the advice originated in India. But I am quite sure that the final lesson is that this advice was bad. We here, at any rate, have no desire to see the question rushed. The Burmese have got to make it clear whether they want separation or whether they do not, but I would ask this House to remember this very important fact that, whereas from Burma we hear only the voice of separation, the Burmese representatives appear to be against separation. Does not that suggest to us that Burma has already so completely lost interest in this Assembly and in its connection with India that it has not even troubled to send representatives here to voice the view of separation.

**Mr. Jehangir K. Munshi:** Mr. President, I must rise on a point of accuracy. Myself as well as my two friends, Mr. Tun Aung and U Kyaw Myint, were supported amongst other Parties by the Peoples' Party, which has been for separation.

**Mr. Arthur Moore:** I know that U Ba Pe represented the Peoples' Party in London and he was very definite for separation. Anyhow, I would appeal that in the later stages of this question, if there are going to be any later stages, we should hear no more of non-co-operation.

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi** (Dacca cum Mymensingh: Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, at this late hour I have no intention of boring the House with a long speech. My only excuse for getting up to speak this afternoon is that I was fortunately or unfortunately a member of the Burma Sub-Committee. The Burmans till the 10th of December said nothing to us when we were attending the Round Table Conference. The first intimation that we got in London was on the 10th of December. The Burmans knew that the Simon Commission had reported that Burma should be separated. They also knew that the Round Table Conference was to

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

assemble in London in November and the members were all nominated. Not a word was said to the members that the majority of the Burmans was opposed to separation. Nothing was said to the members or to anybody else. The first telegram that we received was on the 10th of December. All the same I must assure my Honourable friend who represents Burma in this House that we, as delegates, did our level best to protect their interest. Sir, it was on the 1st December that the Committee of the whole Conference assembled in the afternoon. As far as I remember, the question of Burma was not on the agenda paper of that day. After finishing all other matters that were on the agenda paper, the Chairman, the Prime Minister, said that as the question of Burma was very important, he would ask the Burmese delegates to state their case. I must say we were all taken by surprise. None of us went there with our considered opinion to make a speech as to whether we wanted the separation of Burma or not. I asked several of my brother delegates and they too said that they were not prepared for that particular subject on that day. After the speech of the Burmese delegate, Mr. Chintamani got up and opposed the separation. Thereafter, I think it was after about 20 minutes, that the Prime Minister gave his verdict that the House had agreed to the separation of Burma. I think my Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, was right when he said that this question of separation of Burma was no longer open. Mr. Shiva Rao raised this question the very same day and on page 186 of the Indian Round Table Conference Report this is what we find:

*“Mr. Shiva Rao :* Is the question of separation an open one, or . . .

*Chairman :* No; as I look at it, it is not open.

*Mr. Chintamani :* It should be open not only to consider the method of separation but whether there should be separation.

*Chairman :* I have only got eyes and ears for what the Conference says, and I take it that there is an overwhelming opinion in favour of the suggestion made. (Applause.) You see, the applause is all along the line.”

Well, Sir, on the 5th of December, the Sub-Committee sat for the first time on the question of the separation of Burma. My Honourable friend, Mr. Mody, who is not in the House just now, protested against this separation and he wanted to know from the Chairman, the late Earl Russell, whether he could again raise the question in the committee whether Burma should be separated or not. The Chairman ruled him out saying that it did not come within the scope of the Sub-Committee, but he said that he had noted his objection. The note in the proceedings is that he protested, that he wanted the question of separation to be re-opened at the Plenary Session. Thereafter, Sir, not a single day was given to us to re-open that question in the Plenary Session. We were expecting it from day to day, but not a single opportunity was given to us. The last day of the Conference was the 19th January and as my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir said, we had no opportunity of making a statement in this connection at all. Immediately after the speech of the Prime Minister, the Conference was closed. But throughout, the delegates, whenever they had an opportunity, made it clear that if the Burmans did not desire to be separated from India, it was for the Burmans to decide that and not for anyone of us or the Government. With these observations, Sir, I conclude my speech.

**Mr. B. B. Puri** (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, whether Burma is separated ultimately or remains part of British India, is a separate matter, but one thing is quite clear, that the Government of India have come out very badly in this picture. The question of the separation of Burma has been before the public for a fairly long time, and if during all this period the Government of India have not been able to make up their minds as to the course they propose to adopt and the attitude they want to maintain in this connection, I think it is a cause for very great regret. I submit, Sir, that the question of separation can be looked at from more than one point of view. The first is that so far as the relation of Burma with India goes, we have all along been comrades during a period of adversity. We have made common sacrifices and we have stood together, and now that we do see that we are on the eve of getting some constitutional reforms, it would be highly unsportsmanlike for us to suggest even for a moment that Burma should be separated. In all fairness to Burma, I think it is their right and privilege to say and it is up to us to concede that now, when the time for some kind of a reward is coming, you should be with us to share it; we should not appropriate the whole of it to ourselves. That is one way of looking at it. The other way and the other view is that if Burma is separated, would she be able to fulfil all the qualifications which a self-governing country must possess? Would Burma be able to defend herself? Would Burma be financially as sound as it would be, if it was part and parcel of this vast country? I submit that even from the Burmans' own point of view, having regard to this aspect of the question, it would be suicidal, so far as the interests of Burmans go, to claim separation from India. The attitude of the Government of India and the Imperial Government towards this question of separation seems to me to be in favour of Burma being separated from India. Various arguments have been put forward and this separation seems to me as if it is being inflicted and imposed upon Burmans whether they wish it or not. It has been suggested and it has been actually put into the heads of Burmans, that their culture, their modes of living, their customs and traditions are all different and so on, that geographically they are situated at a distance, that there is great disparity between the two races, the one dwelling in the Continent of India, and the other separated from it and so on. May I respectfully ask whether this geographical situation has now been created or whether it existed all along; whether these arguments have now for the first time dawned upon those who are in favour of separation? These arguments have existed all along; the disparity in customs, in traditions, culture and modes of living has all along been there. Why have the Government suddenly awakened to this question of Burma being separated on these grounds for the first time? Why so much solicitude, on the part of the Imperial Government, towards the interests of Burma, which they are advocating by seeking its separation from India? I submit, the Government know that if Burma remains part of India, she would naturally share in the constitutional reforms which are conceded to India. But if Burma was separated, then the case of Burma shall have to be treated quite differently. This separation is being inflicted upon Burmans, I submit, with all the resources that are available to a Government. This is a very serious grievance, which has been ventilated by Honourable Members who represent that country; they complain that this separation is being forced upon them, reinforced by all the legislative measures, repressive in character. Attempt has been made to

[Mr. B. R. Puri.]

introduce for the first time in that country the Criminal Law Amendment Act which has been thrown out more than once by the local Legislative Council. Recently we have seen an Ordinance which has come out, Ordinance No. 111 of 1931, which His Excellency the Governor General promulgated only the other day. I wish to say one word in connection with that Ordinance. Some time ago, just one month before this House met on the 14th January, 1931, some time in the month of December, two Ordinances were promulgated by His Excellency the Viceroy. Those Ordinances were issued at a time when the Legislative Assembly was not in session, and His Excellency the Viceroy made this perfectly clear in his speech which he delivered to this House. This is what he said:

“A little less than a month ago, I felt it my duty to have recourse again to the special powers, which I took last year for the better control of the Press and of unauthorised news-sheets and newspapers, and for dealing with persons who may instigate others to refuse the fulfilment of certain lawful obligations. In doing so, I expressed my regret that the urgent nature of the emergency, which necessitated the promulgation of these Ordinances, had not allowed me to await the meeting of the Central Legislature, but I indicated the intention of my Government to bring these matters before this House at the earliest opportunity.”

Now, Sir, I submit that it is a great insult to this House, when this Legislative Assembly is actually in session that His Excellency the Viceroy should not have thought it fit to call upon this body to express its own views whether an Ordinance under the circumstances was really called for or not. The argument, if it is a correct argument, led us to the conclusion that His Excellency the Viceroy at that time was forced to promulgate two Ordinances on his own responsibility simply because the Legislative Assembly was not then in session. I say, Sir, that it is hardly fair to this House that an Ordinance of a repressive character, which denies to the people of that country the ordinary procedure and the ordinary privileges to an accused person in a criminal trial under normal conditions, that such a measure should have been promulgated without this House being consulted is a matter of great regret.

**Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan** (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): I rise to a point of order. Can the conduct of the Governor General be questioned in this way?

**Mr. President:** The Standing Order is quite clear on the subject.

**Mr. B. K. Shanmukham Chetty:** I move that the question be now put.

**Mr. President:** The question is:

“That the consideration of the Bill be postponed for one day.”

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 17th March, 1931.