

8th March 1935

THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

Volume II, 1935

(20th February to 8th March, 1935)



FIRST SESSION

OF THE

FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
1935



NEW DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1935.

Legislative Assembly.

President :

THE HONOURABLE SIR ABDUR RAHIM, K.C.S.I., KT.

Deputy President :

MR. AKHIL CHANDRA DATTA, M.L.A.

Panel of Chairmen :

SIR MUHAMMAD YAKUB, KT., M.L.A.

MR. S. SATYAMURTI, M.L.A.

LIEUT.-COLONEL SIR HENRY GIDNEY, KT., M.L.A.

SARDAR SANT SINGH, M.L.A.

Secretary :

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

Assistant of the Secretary :

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

Marshal :

CAPTAIN HAJI SARDAR NUR AHMAD KHAN, M.C., I.O.M., I.A.

Committee on Petitions :

MR. AKHIL CHANDRA DATTA, M.L.A., *Chairman.*

MR. S. SATYAMURTI, M.L.A.

DR. ZIAUDDIN AHMAD, C.I.E., M.L.A.

RAJA SIR VASUDEVA RAJAH, KT., C.I.E., M.L.A.

MR. N. M. JOSHI, M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME II.—20th February to 8th March, 1935.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
WEDNESDAY, 20TH FEBRUARY, 1935—		SATURDAY, 23RD FEBRUARY, 1935—	
Member Sworn	971	Questions and Answers	1257—1301
Questions and Answers	971—1008	Election of Members to the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association	1301
Statements laid on the Table	1008—12	The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Election of the Standing Committee for the Department of Commerce	1012	Demand No. 6-E—Working Expenses—Expenses of the Traffic Department—Grievances of third class passengers	1303—32
Message from the Council of State	1012	Demand No. 3—Miscellaneous Expenditure—Rational and economic administration of Railways	1332—42
Bill passed by the Council of State	1012		
The Railway Budget—General Discussion	1013—56	MONDAY, 25TH FEBRUARY, 1935—	
THURSDAY, 21ST FEBRUARY, 1935—		Member Sworn	1343
Questions and Answers	1057—96	Questions and Answers	1343—76
Short Notice Question and Answer	1096—98	The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Election of the Standing Advisory Committee for the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department	1098	Demand No. 6A—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works—Indianisation of railway services	1377—1407
The Payment of Wages Bill—Referred to Select Committee	1099—1107	Demand No. 6-E—Working Expenses—Expenses of the Traffic Department—Manipulation of railway freight rates without due regard to all the interests involved	1408—25
The Code of Civil Procedure (Second Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	1107—13		
Resolution <i>re</i> Draft Convention of the International Labour Conference concerning unemployment insurance and other forms of relief—As amended, negatived	1118—41		
FRIDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 1935—			
Questions and Answers	1143—79		
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1179—1222		
The Railway Budget—List of Demands—	1222—56		
Demand No. 1—Railway Board—Railway administration in India	1225—56		

	PAGES.
TUESDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1935—	
Questions and Answers . . .	1427—45
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	
Demand No. 6E—Working Expenses—Expenses of the Traffic Department—	
Labour grievances . . .	1445—79
Excessive rates and insufficient facilities for transport of agricultural produce and live stock . . .	1490—95
Demand No. 6G—Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses—Wagon policy of Government . . .	1496—98
Demand No. 2—Audit funds . . .	1499
Demand No. 4—Re-funds . . .	1499
Demand No. 5—Payments to Indian States and companies . . .	1499
Demand No. 6B—Working Expenses—Maintenance and Supply of Locomotive Power . . .	1500
Demand No. 6C.—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Carriage and Wagon Stock . . .	1500
Demand No. 6D—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Ferry Steamers and Harbours . . .	1500
Demand No. 6F—Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments . . .	1500
Demand No. 6G—Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses . . .	1500
Demand No. 6H—Working Expenses—Electric Service Department . . .	1501
Demand No. 7—Working Expenses—Appropriation to Depreciation Fund . . .	1501
Demand No. 8—Interest Charges . . .	1501
Demand No. 9—Temporary Withdrawals from Depreciation Fund . . .	1501

	PAGES.
TUESDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1935—<i>cont'd.</i>	
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	
Demand No. 11—New Construction . . .	1501
Demand No. 12—Open Line Works . . .	1502
WEDNESDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1935—	
Members Sworn . . .	1503
Questions and Answers . . .	1503—42
Unstarred Questions and Answers . . .	1542—46
Constitution of the House Committee . . .	1546
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of section 406—Referred to Select Committee . . .	1547—86
The Indian Coastal Traffic (Reservation) Bill—Introduced . . .	1586
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . .	1587
The Repressive Laws Repealing and Amending Bill—Introduced . . .	1587
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of section 167—Introduced . . .	1587
The Specific Relief (Amendment) Bill—Introduced . . .	1588
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of section 205—Introduced . . .	1588
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of section 386—Introduced . . .	1588—89
THURSDAY, 28TH FEBRUARY, 1935—	
Presentation of the Budget for 1935-36 . . .	1591—1605
The Indian Finance Bill—Introduced . . .	1605
The Salt Additional Import Duty (Extending) Bill—Introduced . . .	1605
TUESDAY, 5TH MARCH, 1935—	
Member Sworn . . .	1607
Questions and Answers . . .	1607—54
Unstarred Questions and Answers . . .	1654—63
Short Notice Questions and Answers . . .	1663—69

	PAGES.		PAGES.
TUESDAY, 5th MARCH,		THURSDAY, 7th MARCH,	
1935— <i>contd.</i>		1935—	
Motion for Adjournment re		Member Sworn . . .	1781
Impending execution of		Incorrect Report of the	
one Abdul Quaiyum		proceedings of the Legis-	
for murder in Sind—		lative Assembly by the	
Disallowed by His Ex-		Press	1781—82
celsency the Governor		Questions and Answers .	1782—1813
General	1669—70	The General Budget—List	
Statements laid on the		of Demands—	
Table	1670—79	Demand No. 28—Exe-	
Message from the Council		cutive Council—	
of State	1679	General policy of the	
The Indian Mines (Amend-		Executive Council	
ment) Bill—Presentation		in the administra-	
of the Report of the		tion of the country	1814—67
Select Committee	1679		
General Discussion of		FRIDAY, 8th MARCH, 1935—	
the General Budget . .	1680—1725	Questions and Answers .	1869—1904
		Short Notice Questions and	
		Answers	1904—08
WEDNESDAY, 6th MARCH,		The General Budget—List	
1935—		of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
General Discussion of the		Demand No. 32—Home	
General Budget	1727—80	Department—	
		Repressive policy	1908—56

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 8th March, 1935.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

DISQUALIFICATIONS OF SEVERAL INDIAN VOTERS IN CEYLON.

725. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether they are aware of the fact that several Indian voters, otherwise qualified, have been disqualified in Ceylon recently on the ground that to constitute domicile in Ceylon, in addition to five years' residence the intending voters should have an intention of permanently settling down in Ceylon;
- (b) whether Government have examined the soundness of this; and
- (c) whether they propose to take any action in the matter?

Mr. Ram Chandra: (a)—(c). The Agent in Ceylon has reported that the names of certain Railway or Harbour or private employees have been deleted on the ground that they meant to return to India or had not yet decided to take up permanent or indefinite residence in Ceylon. The Government of India are making further enquiries and will take up the matter with the Ceylon Government if they consider that the provisions of the relevant Order in Council are not being observed.

LEGISLATION TO PREVENT PRINTING THE NAMES OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES ON GOODS MANUFACTURED IN INDIA.

726. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether they are aware that many firms, now manufacturing goods within the tariff wall in India, are still printing the names of foreign countries on their packages;
- (b) whether they do not print on those packages the words "Made in India";
- (c) whether Government are also aware that huge trust companies are manufacturing here in India under foreign names; and
- (d) whether there is any proposal to introduce any legislation to prevent this?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore: (a) The Government of India are not aware of any specific instances in which a firm manufacturing goods in India prints on its packages the name of a foreign country in such a

manner as to suggest that the goods are manufactured elsewhere than in India.

(b) The Government of India are prepared to believe that the Honourable Member's suggestion is correct. There is no legal obligation to mark goods manufactured in India with the words, "Made in India".

(c) Government are aware that branch factories have been established in India by companies whose parent factories are elsewhere. So far as the Government of India are aware, these factories operate under their own names.

(d) I presume the Honourable Member is concerned lest the Indian public be misled as to the origin of the goods they purchase. In this connection, I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to sections 2 (2) (b) and 6 of the Indian Merchandise Marks Act, 1889.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With regard to the answer to part (b) of the question, will Government take steps to see that these words "Made in India" are printed on these packages prominently?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I do not think that there is any reason for Government to insist upon that.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I suggest to the Commerce Member, whether it will not help the buyer to discriminate between really Indian made goods by Indian firms as against goods, which, though manufactured in India, still bear the names of foreign companies, in some place, though not in a prominent one?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I have considered my Honourable friend's suggestion, but at the present moment I am not prepared to say that Government will undertake legislation on these lines.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has the Honourable Member any information that soaps, and cigarettes particularly, are often manufactured in India and tried to be palmed off on the public with the names of reputed foreign firms?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am not aware of any specific instances.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Has the attention of the Government of India been drawn to this fact that some foreign companies, after the enactment of tariff against those countries, adopted a new method of avoiding those tariffs by establishing factories in India so that they may not have to pay taxes? They are run by foreign people with entirely foreign capital?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I think it is perfectly true that certain foreign companies have established factories behind the tariff wall in India.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Is the Honourable Member aware that cigarettes bearing the name of Gold Flake, which are entirely manufactured in India, are sold in the supposed belief that they are of American origin?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am not aware of the fact that Gold Flake cigarettes manufactured in India are sold as Gold Flake.

Mr. Bhanubhai J. Desai: As being of American origin? That is the suggestion behind it?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I must ask for notice of that, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government take steps to prevent the evasion of tariffs built up for the consumers in India being availed of by foreign companies in substance?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I do not think it is possible for the Government of India to prevent the establishment of companies with foreign capital behind the tariff wall in India. It is being done in England and elsewhere.

SELECTION OF APPRENTICES IN ORDNANCE.

727. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether any selection for apprentices in Ordnance has been made this year;
- (b) whether any vacancies are expected to arise in 1986;
- (c) whether the Public Services Commission received any application for admission to the competitive examination;
- (d) if so, the orders of the Public Services Commission on the same; and
- (e) whether some concessions, as are allowed to the Indian Civil Service candidates, namely, that they need have appeared for the B.A. degree examination by the time of the competitive examination, will be extended to this examination also?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) Yes. The Public Service Commission will make a selection this month.

(b) Yes.

(c) The Commission have received numerous applications for selection. There is no competitive examination, but only a preliminary test to ensure that candidates possess a sufficient knowledge of the subjects prescribed in the rules, which the Honourable Member will find in the Gazette of India of October 20th, 1984, published as Army Department Notification No. 570.

(d) The Commission have summoned eligible candidates to appear at the test.

(e) The Commission have applied to this selection the concession mentioned in the question.

Munshi Iswar Saran: May I know how many men will be taken?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I think at this selection there will be 18.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Next year?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I am not sure, but probably about the same number.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the answer that there is a kind of preliminary test and not a real competitive examination, may I know what are the general subjects prescribed for this?

Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham: The Honourable Member will find that in the notification to which I have referred. A candidate must have an elementary knowledge of dynamics, statics, mathematics up to quadratic equations, elementary trigonometry and physics. A written test of his knowledge of these subjects will be held by the Public Service Commission at such time and place as the Commission may direct.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is there any discrimination between wearers of Khaddar and the wearers of foreign cloth?

Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is there any discrimination made against those who have inclinations towards the Congress?

Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham: Not that I am aware of.

**VACANCIES FOR INDIANS IN THE ROYAL AIR FORCE, ROYAL INDIAN NAVY
AND THE INDIAN MILITARY ACADEMY.**

728. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether any vacancy will occur for Indians in the Royal Air Force and in the Royal Indian Navy at the competitive examination in October, 1935;
- (b) the number of vacancies that are offered in 1935 for the Indian Military Academy;
- (c) what is the composition of the Interview Board and whether there is any Madrasi on it; and
- (d) what is the general nature of the examination conducted by the Interview Board?

Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham: (a) None in the Indian Air Force but probably two in the Royal Indian Navy.

(b) Not less than 60.

(c) The Interview Board for the Indian Military Academy is constituted as follows:

Chairman—A member of the Public Service Commission.

Members—Two military officer, one a Major-General, the other an officer not below the rank of Colonel.

Two non-official members, one with military experience.

The same Board with the addition of a Royal Air Force officer interviews candidates for the Indian Air Force. In the case of the Royal Indian Navy the Chairman remains the same, but the members are two officers of the Royal Indian Navy and one non-official Indian gentleman.

The members of the Board are not permanent, and there is nothing to prevent a Madras from being nominated to it.

(d) The object of the interview is to arrive at a general appreciation of the character of the candidate by means of conversation with him after studying his record at school and college.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know from the Honourable Member when this competition will take place and when the interview?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The examination begins at the end of this month. I cannot tell you the exact date of the interview. It will be somewhere about the end of this month.

EUROPEAN OFFICERS LENT TO INDIAN STATES.

729. **Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of European officers in service or retired who have been lent to Indian States;
- (b) the number of European officers belonging to the Foreign and Political Department of the Government of India who have been so employed; and
- (c) whether there is any policy governing the action of the Foreign and Political Department in lending officers of the Department for service in Indian States?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: (a) The Government of India have not got the complete information.

(b) 13 (seven serving and six retired).

(c) Officers are lent to Indian States at the request of the Darbars concerned provided their services can be spared and they are willing to accept employment.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know what is the information, incomplete as it is, in the hands of the Government just now, with regard to (a)?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: Well, Sir, the Government of India would have to make very considerable inquiries in order to discover from the great many States in India exactly how many European officers they employ. That information is not available. It could, I suppose, with a certain amount of trouble, be collected, but it is not quite clear what the questioner means when he talks about officers being "lent": States often employ retired officers without any reference to us.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know from the Honourable Member if it is always the case that it is at the voluntary will of these rulers that these Europeans are being asked for?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: Invariably, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know if the Political Department exercises any influence with these Princes, in order to induce them to accept European officers, in preference to Indian officers?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: Absolutely none.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With regard to the State of Cochin, is the Political Department just now trying to influence the Maharaja of Cochin to accept a European officer, in preference to an Indian officer?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: Sir, I am ready to give all the information I can, but I must, on a point of order, bring to the notice of the Chair that questions which affect the relations between the Governor General in Council and Indian States are contrary to rule 7 of the Rules of Business.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On that point, I submit this question does not affect the relations between States and the Governor General in Council.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair holds, the point of order raised is a valid one.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I ask if it is invariably the case that they get no men of their own and are calling upon the Government

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Confining ourselves to the period of five years from today, will the Honourable Member be pleased to state what proportion of the increased number of European officers, either retired or in actual service, is now serving in Indian States?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: Is not that a question I have already answered?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: I am afraid not. I will repeat my question. I said I do not want any desultory or general information: what I want is, taking the last five years, what has been the increase of European officers in the service of Indian States, whether such officers are actually in service and have been lent or, being out of the service and having retired, they joined such service?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: That is not a question which I could possibly answer straight off, because I have not got the figures available. If the Honourable Member will put down a question on the paper, I shall be very glad to collect that information for him.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I ask one question with regard to (c)? I want to know what is the policy governing the lending of officers for foreign service? Have they any policy? My specific question is, whether they follow the policy of sending European officers, wherever possible?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: No, Sir, that is not the policy. I have explained exactly what the policy is, which is that officers are lent to States at their request. I can say no more than that.

APPOINTMENT OF AN INDIAN AS THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOMBAY PORT TRUST.

730. **Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state whether their attention has been drawn to a representation addressed by

the Indian Merchants' Chamber of Bombay addressed to the Government of Bombay in regard to the appointment of an Indian as the chairman of the Bombay Port Trust in the vacancy caused owing to the pending retirement of Mr. W. R. S. Sharpe, the present chairman; if so, what action do they propose to take in this matter?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: The attention of the Government of India has been drawn to the representation referred to. The power to appoint the Chairman of the Bombay Port Trust vests in the Government of Bombay under the Bombay Port Trust Act, 1879, and the Government of India do not propose to take any action in the matter.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, in view of the importance of Indianisation, will Government consider the possibility of advising the Government of Bombay to appoint an Indian, whenever qualified Indians are available?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I will be replying to my Honourable friend in the immediately succeeding question dealing with this matter.

INDIANISATION OF THE POSTS OF CHAIRMEN AND VICE-CHAIRMEN OF PORT TRUSTS.

731. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether they are aware of the fact that several commercial bodies, such as, the Indian Merchants' Chamber, Bombay, the Indian Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta, and the Bengal National Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta, as well as the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, have repeatedly demanded the appointment of an Indian as a chairman or vice-chairman of Port Trusts in the major ports of India; and
- (b) whether they have taken any action in the matter to meet the wishes and demands of the Indian commercial community and Indian public opinion?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: (a) The Government of India have received representations on the subject from the bodies named.

(b) The Government of India have no reason to suppose that the claims of Indians with the necessary administrative experience are not duly considered when vacancies occur, by Local Governments, by whom these appointments are in most cases made. They have recently impressed on all Local Governments the necessity of proceeding more rapidly and systematically with the Indianisation of the higher posts under Port Trusts, and as Indians, qualified by experience in the financial and commercial management of ports and railways become available in larger numbers, it should be possible to give effect to the wishes of the Indian commercial community in this matter.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has any Indian been appointed so far, to any of these places?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: Not that I am aware of. I speak to the best of my recollection.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether Government are prepared to make inquiries, and find out what the reason is why no Indian has been so far appointed to any of these appointments, throughout India?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: We must assume that the bodies who make these appointments are responsible bodies and that they make these appointments, because they consider that the persons they are appointing are best qualified for the post.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the fact that Indians have got to run an obstacle race for all these appointments—as the Honourable Member knows—will Government be good enough to make inquiries whether the claims of qualified Indians have always been considered by these appointing authorities?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I have no doubt myself that the names of Indians who are *prima facie* suited for these posts have been considered; but, as I have just now told the House, the Government of India have issued a general communication to the authorities asking them to bear the policy of a more rapid Indianisation of the higher posts in mind.

Mr. B. Das: May I inquire if the Local Governments have got full powers to appoint the Chairmen of the Port Trusts of Calcutta and Bombay, or if the Government of India give official sanction to such appointments?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: No, Sir. The Government of India do not give official sanction. The Local Governments have full Statutory powers to make the appointments.

Mr. B. Das: Are not the major ports under the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: To the best of my recollection, the only ports, in connection with which the Government of India make these appointments, are Chittagong, and, I think, possibly Aden, but I am not quite certain.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Have Government considered the advisability of appointing Indians as Chairmen of the Port Trusts in those ports which are directly under the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: We always bear that consideration very prominently in mind.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Do the Government of India accept the position that, so far, there have been no qualified Indians occupying these places?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: My Honourable friend must realise that these appointments are made by Local Governments, and, as I have said, we have no reason to believe that Local Governments have not taken into consideration the claims of all Indians who might *prima facie* be suitable for these posts.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are not the Local Governments under the superintendence, direction and control of the Government of India, in respect of the reserved subjects today?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I must bring to the notice of my Honourable friend that under Statute Local Governments have Statutory powers to make these appointments, and the Government of India cannot interfere, except by way of general advice; and, as I have already pointed out, that advice has been tendered to Local Governments.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: When was it given?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I cannot tell you exactly, but I should say within the last year.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Government of India try to find out if that advice is being heeded by any Local Government, in respect of any single port?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I understand, Sir, that we get quarterly reports.

TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS POSSESSED BY CHAIRMEN OF PORT TRUSTS IN INDIA.

732. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the present chairmen in the various Government Trusts of India possess any technical qualifications, and if so, what; and
- (b) whether there are no Indians of similar general capacity and experience to occupy the posts of chairmen or vice-chairmen of the Port Trusts?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: (a) It is presumed that the Honourable Member refers to the various Port Trusts. The present chairmen are men of proved ability and long administrative experience in the public service.

(b) There is no bar to the appointment of Indians with the necessary ability and experience, and their claims are considered *puri passu* with those of others as occasion arises.

Mr. B. Das: Do I understand that the Government of India have delegated full power over the administration of the Port Trusts of Bombay and Calcutta to the Governments of Bombay and Bengal, respectively?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: There is no question of delegating powers: the Statute definitely confers powers of appointments on the Local Government.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What is the life of a Chairman of a Port Trust?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I do not think it is a tenure appointment, so far as I know.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is it a permanent appointment?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I think in most cases it is.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: When was the last appointment—that to the Chittagong Port Trust—made?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I must have notice of that question.

INDIANISATION OF THE POSTS OF CHAIRMEN AND VICE-CHAIRMEN OF PORT TRUSTS.

733. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to state what steps they propose to take for Indianizing the posts of chairmen and of vice-chairmen of Port Trusts?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given to part (b) of his question No. 781.

MANUFACTURE OF LOCOMOTIVES IN INDIA.

734. *Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will Government please state whether Railway locomotives are manufactured in India? If so, will Government please state:

- (a) where they are manufactured;
- (b) what kinds of locomotives are manufactured;
- (c) what percentage of India's requirements in locomotives is supplied locally;
- (d) whether such production in India is advantageous in any way; and
- (e) if only certain types of locomotives are produced, why attempts are not made to produce the other types of locomotives?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Metre gauge locomotives are manufactured in the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway Workshops at Ajmer.

(b) The types so far manufactured are seven.

(c) About 15 locomotives per annum have been built during recent years. They represent practically the entire requirements of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway (metre gauge) and about 50 per cent. of the average number of metre gauge locomotives purchased in India during the last five years.

(d) The manufacture of metre gauge locomotives has been undertaken by the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway at their workshops in the belief that they can get their requirements, on the whole, cheaper than by importing them from abroad.

(e) As I have already informed the House, an investigation is being made as to the possibility of building a workshop in India to produce broad gauge locomotives and boilers. The question is whether it is likely to be remunerative.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Was not such an investigation made with regard to the possibility of having a locomotive workshop in India some years ago?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I am not aware that any complete investigation was made some years ago, but this investigation started only recently.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Are there any physical difficulties in the way of such a factory or workshop being set up in India?

Mr. P. E. Rau: No, Sir.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Are there any economic difficulties?

Mr. P. E. Rau: Yes; and that is what the Government are trying to find out, whether it is likely to be remunerative.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Is that all?

Mr. P. E. Rau: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: And what had they hitherto been of opinion?

Mr. P. E. Rau: That point has not been considered yet.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: It was never considered in the past?

Mr. P. E. Rau: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Is it not a fact that the workshop which was a locomotive workshop was taken charge of and then turned into a wagon factory?

Mr. P. E. Rau: To the best of my recollection, I think no locomotives were ever built in the Peninsular Locomotive Workshop. It was originally started for that purpose, but they were not built.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know, Sir, if the manufacture of metre gauge locomotives has been profitable?

Mr. P. E. Rau: The Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway think that on the whole they have been able to manufacture the locomotives as cheap if not cheaper than by importation from abroad.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Then, will not the manufacture of broad gauge locomotives be as profitable if they are manufactured in India?

Mr. P. E. Rau: The whole point is that we are now conducting an investigation so as to frame an estimate of the cost at which broad gauge locomotives can be built in India. After we have made the probable estimate of the cost, we shall be able to compare it with the cost of those imported from abroad.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: When do you expect the investigation to be over?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I hope it will be over very soon.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Will Government consider during the course of their investigation that even at a little disadvantage—I am using the word that the Honourable Member used in answering the question—it is more advisable to set up workshops in India as soon as possible?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: That is a question of policy. I have no doubt that all relevant matters will be taken into consideration before a final decision is taken.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: May I request for a little more definite answer?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I cannot make a pronouncement on the question of policy straightaway in reply to a supplementary question.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Is it not a policy that has been approved of by the Government of India times without number—at all events in terms and words?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: What policy is my Honourable friend referring to?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: The policy of setting up workshops here, so that the Indian money can be spent here in order to raise the Indian industries.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: Sir, I am afraid I am not quite clear about that point. If the cost is proved to be prohibitive or excessive, it will certainly not be in the interests of the Indian taxpayer.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: The qualifications are entirely uncalled for. I want my Honourable friend to answer this question. Provided it is not found to be prohibitive as it is not found to be prohibitive in the case of smaller engines, will that policy be followed and kept at the forefront of the programme?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: My Honourable friend is asking a hypothetical question, and I am not prepared to state what the policy of Government would be in certain circumstances.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: All possible questions as to the future policy of Government must necessarily be hypothetical. The question that I am asking is this: So far as the setting up of a workshop is concerned, will this question be borne in mind that it is better to raise an industry here if it is not reasonably prohibitive.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I have already said that all relevant considerations—and that is certainly a relevant consideration—will be taken into account before any final decision is taken.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Do I understand that I cannot get any definite answer.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am not in a position to give my Honourable friend any more definite answer than that.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: What I want is whether, as a primary consideration, would it be borne in mind? Relevancy is one thing and a primary consideration is another.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: My answer is equally definite. I said that this matter and all other relevant matters would be borne in mind.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: May I say that there is a distinction between what you might call relevant and primary consideration, and I do not mind being answered that it would not be a primary consideration?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am not prepared to go any further than what I have said already, in reply to a supplementary question on this subject.

Mr. H. P. Mody: On a matter of information, Sir. Was not the manufacture of locomotives once taken up at the workshop at Jamalpore?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I do not think that locomotives were built there.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the kind of investigation on which the Government are engaged now. Who is conducting it, and for how long it has been conducted?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I cannot tell my Honourable friend how long it has been conducted, but the investigation is as to the probable cost of production.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Who is doing it?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: The technical advisers of the Railway Board.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Who are they?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: One of them is Mr. Wrench, who is the principal technical adviser of the Railway Board.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: He is a European?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: Yes.

SPECIAL REVENUE DERIVED FROM THE LEVY ON YARN CONSUMPTION FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE HAND-LOOM WEAVING INDUSTRY.

735. *Mr. Samuel Aaron: Will Government be pleased to state (i) the total special revenue derived from the levy on yarn consumption for the benefit of the hand-loom weaving industry; (ii) how much of it has been allotted to the Madras Presidency; (iii) how it is intended to be utilised for the benefit of hand-loom weavers; and (iv) what steps have so far been taken in this regard?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (i) The protective duty on yarn is being collected from the 1st of May, 1934, but the exact amount available, for the assistance of the handloom industry, will not be known until after the close of the current financial year. It is estimated at about Rs. 4½ lakhs.

(ii) A sum of Rs. 26,500 has been allotted to the Madras Presidency for the period November, 1934 to March, 1935, and it is proposed to allot Rs. 59,500 during the coming financial year.

(iii) and (iv). The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to Bulletin of Indian Industries and Labour, No. 52, a copy of which is available in the Library of the House. It contains the Madras scheme for the development of the handloom industry. This scheme, has since been modified to suit the proposed grants, and it has received the approval of the Government of India.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do the Local Governments take into consultation the representatives of the handloom industry before they prepare their programme?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am not quite sure who the representatives of the handloom industry in this matter are, but I have no doubt that the Local Governments will take such advice as they may consider desirable.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will the Government of India consider the advisability of advising the Local Governments to take the representatives of the handloom industry into consultation?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No, Sir, and for two reasons. One is that the Local Governments can be fully trusted to exercise proper discretion in this matter, and the other is that we are here dealing with a provincial transferred subject.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In view of the fact that the Government of India are collecting all this money and then distributing it between various Local Governments, will the Government of India be prepared to consider the suggestion that these Local Governments should be advised to take into consultation the representatives of the handloom weavers?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No, Sir. As I have already said, the Local Governments can be fully trusted to exercise their discretion in this matter, and there is no necessity for the Government of India to advise them in regard to the obvious.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will the Government of India be pleased to refer this particular suggestion made on the floor of the House for the consideration of the Local Governments that the representatives of the handloom industry should be taken into consultation?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am quite willing to send a copy of the questions and my replies to all Local Governments.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: What is the amount allotted to the United Provinces from this fund?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am answering a short notice question on this subject. In reply to it, I am placing a statement on the table of the House showing the amount allocated to the different provinces. I may, however, inform my Honourable friend at once that for 1934-35 the United Provinces Government will get Rs. 32,000 and for 1935-36 they will get Rs. 72,000.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government be pleased to lay on the table of the House every year an annual report of the work that has been done in the various provinces with the money granted to them by the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The intention is that these schemes should be reviewed from time to time by the Industries Conference and the reports will be duly incorporated in a Bulletin similar to the one I have in my hand which will be available for the information of this House.

INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE OFFICERS TRANSFERRED TO CIVIL EMPLOY IN THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY.

736.*Mr. Samuel Aaron: Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) the names of the Indian Medical Service Officers transferred to civil employ in the Madras Presidency during the last three years;
- (b) how many of these are natives of the Madras Presidency;
- (c) whether it is a fact that officers who do not know the language of the Province and have no experience of its conditions are being transferred to the Madras Presidency in preference to Madras men in the Indian Medical Service; and
- (d) whether Government propose as far as possible to post Madras men in the Indian Medical Service in the Madras Presidency?

Mr. Ram Chandra: (a) A statement is laid on the table.

(b) None.

(c) and (d). I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer given by me to Prof. N. G. Ranga's question No. 458 on the 22nd February, 1935.

Statement regarding transfer of Indian Medical Service Officers to the Presidency of Madras.

The undermentioned Indian Medical Service Officers have been transferred to Civil employ in the Presidency of Madras during the last three years :

1. Major A. I. Cox.
2. Major J. A. W. Ebdon.
3. Captain R. D. Alexander.
4. Major General Sir F. F. Connor, Kt., D.S.O., K.H.S.
5. Lt.-Colonel C. M. Plumptre.
6. Captain J. F. Shepherd.
7. Captain P. J. Kelly.
8. Captain M. G. Kelly.
9. Bt. Major M. S. Gupta.
10. Lt.-Colonel C. M. Ganapathy.
11. Bt. Major F. M. Collins.
12. Major G. R. McRobert.
13. Captain Sangham Lal.
14. Captain J. S. McMillan.

INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE OFFICERS TRANSFERRED TO THE RESEARCH DEPARTMENT.

737. *Mr. Samuel Aaron: Will Government please state :

- (a) the names of Indian Medical Service Officers who have been transferred to the Research Department during the last five years;
- (b) how many Indian Officers of the Indian Medical Service have during the last five years applied for admission to the Research Department; and
- (c) how many European Officers of the Indian Medical Service have during the same period applied for admission to the Research Department?

Mr. Ram Ohandra: (a) Major R. C. Wats.

(b) 35.

(c) 11.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if the transfer of these medical officers to the Research Department is impending, and, if so, are there any Indian candidates?

Mr. Ram Ohandra: There are Indian officers of the I.M.S. who have applied for appointment to the Medical Research Department.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Who transfers them and under what circumstances?

Mr. Ram Ohandra: There is a Recruitment and Appointment Board which makes the selection from amongst the applicants.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: When is the Board meeting? Now?

Mr. Ram Chandra: The Board has already met.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Have they decided and sent in their recommendations?

Mr. Ram Chandra: Their decision has not yet been communicated to Government.

EXPENSES OF POLITICAL PRISONERS DETAINED UNDER REGULATION III

788. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what has been the expense per head per month for each of the political prisoners detained in different jails and detention camps under Regulation III?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the amount of total expenses incurred on political prisoners detained without trial since 1929?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) I invite attention to the reply I gave on the 6th February, 1935, to question No. 86 and to the list therein referred to, which was laid on the table in August last and which showed the allowances sanctioned in the case of State Prisoners and their families under Regulation III of 1818. Since then, No. 28 in the list has been granted a diet allowance of Rs. 1-6-0 a day and a personal allowance of Rs. 92 a month and his dependents an allowance of Rs. 95 a month.

(b) I regret that separate figures for State Prisoners are not available, and cannot be ascertained without undue labour. The expenditure from central revenues on State Prisoners and certain political refugees from April, 1929 to March, 1934, was Rs. 12,91,061. The budget estimate on this account for the financial year 1934-35 is Rs. 2,28,200.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the principles on which these allowances are usually fixed for the individual State Prisoners?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: In accordance with the necessities of each case.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are enquiries made by this Government, or are they made through the Local Governments?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The enquiries are only made through Local Governments.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Do this Government make up their mind finally, irrespective of the recommendation of the Local Governments, taking all circumstances into consideration?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, Sir; that is so.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are the circumstances of the dependents also taken into consideration?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: Will the Honourable Member state if the political prisoners in Midnapur jail are treated as ordinary criminals?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That does not arise out of this question.

PRISONERS CONVICTED DURING THE CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE MOVEMENT STILL IN JAILS.

739. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** Will Government be pleased to state how many prisoners convicted during the civil disobedience movement are still detained in jails even after the withdrawal of the movement?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given by me to Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant's starred question No. 346 on the 20th February.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the number today? Is it the same as on that date?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: As far as I know, yes.

MILITARY ROUTE-MARCHES IN THE CONTAI SUB-DIVISION, MIDNAPORE DISTRICT.

740. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** Are Government aware of the military route-marches in the Contai Sub-division, Midnapore District?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I invite attention to the reply I gave on the 13th February, 1935, to part (c) of question No. 216.

POSSIBILITY OF INTERNATIONAL MEASURES TO FACILITATE THE ABOLITION OR REDUCTION OF SUBSIDIES.

741. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** (a) Are Government aware that during the course of the statement which the President of the Board of Trade made in the House of Commons on the 3rd July last, it was stated that the British Government intended communicating with foreign countries to ascertain their views on the possibility of international measures to facilitate the abolition or reduction of subsidies and the formulating of schemes for laying up or scrapping superfluous tonnage or both, that in considering these problems it was essential to have the co-operation of the Dominions and India, and that they were therefore informing the Dominions and India of the position and seeking their views as to the possible lines of action?

(b) Have Government received any communication from His Majesty's Government relating to the subject mentioned in part (a) above?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether they will give an opportunity to the Assembly to

express its opinion on the points raised in these despatches as regards subsidies, laying up scheme and the reservation of the inter-imperial trade to British shipping, and also to consult Indian opinion on the subject?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) The question does not arise as no action is called for in regard to Indian shipping.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: When was the communication referred to in part (a) received?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Some time last year.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: Did not the Government of Great Britain invite the opinion of the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Yes, Sir.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: Did the Government of India consider it desirable to get the opinion of the Legislature or of the public?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: The Government of India have not departed by one jot or tittle from their previous policy in this matter, and that is well known to everybody.

Dr. P. N. Banerjea: What is that previous policy?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I had hoped that my Honourable friend, who seems to have taken some interest in this matter, would have taken the trouble of trying to know what that policy was. That policy is that the Government of India keep their hands free to use the means which they consider best suited for the development of shipping in this country.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the means they are using now for the development of shipping in this country?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I explained it the other day to the Honourable Member. The means are friendly negotiation and private settlement and those means have proved eminently successful.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Do they contemplate reserving the coastal shipping for Indian owned vessels?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: The Government are not considering that question.

CONFIRMATION OF CERTAIN CLERKS IN THE ARMY HEADQUARTERS.

742. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjea:** (a) Is it a fact that certain clerks in the Army Headquarters have not been confirmed, though they were appointed on probation against permanent vacancies and have successfully completed the period of probation? If so, how many such clerks are there in all in the Army Headquarters?

(b) Is it a fact that the clerks referred to in part (a) above have been asked to accept the terms of the Indian Army Corps of Clerks and that their confirmation has been made conditional on their accepting such terms?

(c) Is it a fact that the acceptance of the terms of the Indian Army Corps of Clerks entails the signing by these clerks of an agreement to serve under the India Army Act for a period of ten years?

(d) Is it a fact that the terms referred to in parts (b) and (c) above rank these clerks with the "Followers: Second Class"?

(e) Is it a fact that a majority of the clerks referred to in part (a) above have expressed their unwillingness to serve under these conditions? Is it also a fact that, because of their unwillingness to serve under these terms, they have not been confirmed in their respective posts?

(f) Is it a fact that these clerks were recruited as a result of the examination held by the Public Service Commission?

(g) If the reply to part (f) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state whether these clerks were given to understand at the time of the examination, or at the time of their appointment, that they might be required to serve under the Indian Army Corps of Clerks terms?

(h) If the reply to part (g) be in the negative, why do Government force such clerks either to accept the terms of the Indian Army Corps of Clerks or to quit service?

(i) Are Government aware that this causes general discontent among Government servants?

(j) If the reply to part (i) be in the affirmative, what steps have Government taken so far to improve the condition of the clerks in question?

(k) Do Government propose to shift all such clerks, at the earliest opportunity, from the Army Headquarters to other suitable departments and confirm them there? If not, why not?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) Yes. At present there are seventeen.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes.

(d) No.

(e) Yes.

(f) Yes.

(g) No.

(h) Government are not forcing these clerks either to accept the terms or quit the service.

(i) No.

(j) and (k). Every endeavour is being made to provide the men concerned with alternative appointments in other offices. (Six have already been absorbed, eight more are about to be absorbed, leaving only nine to be provided for.)

Dr. P. N. Banerjee: What do Government propose to do with the remaining nine?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Absorb them.

REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO THE ARMY HEADQUARTERS STAFF TO APPLY FOR APPOINTMENTS IN OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

748. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** (a) Is it a fact that the members of the staff employed in the Army Headquarters are not allowed to apply for any appointment in another department of Government?

(b) Is it a fact that the applications for such transfers are invariably withheld?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state how many applications of the members of the Army Headquarters staff for an appointment in any other department have been withheld, and how many have been forwarded, since 1st January, 1934?

(d) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, are Government aware that this attitude towards their employees causes general dissatisfaction among the latter?

(e) If the reply to part (d) be in the affirmative, are Government prepared to issue instructions to the effect that the application of any member of the staff of the Army Headquarters for better employment under other departments of Government should not generally be withheld?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) and (b). There is no general rule to the effect stated, but in one branch of Army Headquarters it has been necessary for the last six months to withhold applications for transfers, because the work was suffering owing to the constant changes that were taking place.

(c) 24 applications were withheld and 111 were forwarded.

(d) and (e). Do not strictly arise—but Government *are* considering the question of issuing general rules on the subject so as to secure greater uniformity of treatment.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if these people are drawn from the other Departments of the Government to the Army Department?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: No, Sir. They are recruited through the Public Service Commission, and take up appointments in Army Headquarters. Very often some of them wish to better their prospects and apply for appointments elsewhere.

Dr. P. N. Banerjee: With regard to part (c), what were the grounds on which the applications were withheld?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I imagine, Sir, that the 24 applications which were withheld were from clerks or Government servants serving in this

particular branch of Army Headquarters where a ban has been put on transfers for the last six months.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Were these 24 men recruited through the Public Service Commission or were they recruited direct or from the other staff of the Government of India?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I should imagine almost certainly that they were recruited through the Public Service Commission.

Q-ESTABLISHMENT SECTION IN THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL'S BRANCH.

744. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** (a) Is it a fact that the establishment section in every branch of the Army Headquarters deals with inter-sectional transfers of the Branch?

(b) Is it a fact that the Q-Establishment Section, which deals with inter-sectional transfers in the Quartermaster General's Branch, is composed of the same clerical men and that none has been transferred from that section to any other section for a number of years?

(c) Will Government please lay on the table a statement showing the names of the present clerical staff of the Q-Establishment and the period for which each has served in that section?

(d) Is it a fact that the major portion of Q-Establishment regularly moves each year between Simla and Delhi? Will Government please state the number of clerks in Q-Establishment section who move and the number of those who do not move?

(e) Is it a fact that the men in the moving portion of the Q-Establishment section have been moving for a number of years and that none of them has been transferred to the non-moving portion of the Q-Establishment or to any non-moving section of the Quartermaster General's Branch?

(f) Is it a fact that transfers are frequently made between other sections of the Quartermaster General's Branch?

(g) If the reply to part (f) be in the affirmative, will Government please state the reason for not transferring persons from the Q-Establishment section to any other section of the Quartermaster General's Branch?

(h) Are Government prepared to take steps to overhaul the Q-Establishment section?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) Yes, so far as the Secretarial duties connected with such matters are concerned, but the decisions do not rest with the clerical establishments.

(b) No.

(c) A statement is laid on the table.

(d) Yes. Eleven move to Delhi and eight remain in Simla.

(e) No.

(f) No.

(g) Does not arise.

(h) No.

Serial No.	Name.	Designation.	Service in Q-Est.
1	Mr. D. D. Bhardwaja, M.A.	Assistant-in-Charge.	10 years.
2	„ R. C. Dhowan	Junior Assistant	15½ „
3	R. S. Nem Das Jain	Cashier	24½ „
4	Mr. Chirag Din	2nd Divn. (Despatcher)	23 „
5	„ G. C. Bali	2nd Divn. (Distribution)	12½ „
6	„ Kehr Singh	2nd Divn. (Steno)	6½ „
7	„ G. M. Din	2nd Divn. (Typist)	14 „
8	„ A. S. Negi	2nd Divn.	4½ „
9	„ N. Robinson	2nd Divn. (Library)	8½ „
10	„ Zariel Hussain	2nd Divn. (Typist)	15 „
11	„ H. N. Bahl	2nd Divn. (Cash)	3½ „
12	„ Badri Nath	2nd Divn. (Despatcher)	3 months.
13	„ K. D. Pant	2nd Divn.	5½ years.
14	„ S. N. Saksena	2nd Divn. (Records)	1 year.
15	„ B. L. Murgai	3rd Divn. (Despatcher)	5 years.
16	„ M. D. Dalakoti	3rd Divn.	3 „
17	„ Farhat Ali	3rd Divn. (Typist)	3½ „
18	„ Fateh Mohd.	3rd Divn.	1½ „
19	Miss J. Adley	3rd Divn. (Typist & Despatcher).	1½ months.

Q-ESTABLISHMENT SECTION IN THE QUARTERMASTER GENERAL'S BRANCH.

745. *Dr. P. N. Banerjee: (a) Is it a fact that the questions relating to establishment, *e.g.*, control of the clerical and menial establishment including recruitment, service, payment, leave, transfer, honours and rewards, welfare and discipline, and supervision of the accounts, etc., etc., of the Quartermaster General's Branch, are dealt with in the Q-Establishment section? If so, are Government aware of the importance of this section from the point of view of the office administration?

(b) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of entrusting the charge of Q-Establishment section to a senior assistant?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) Yes, but orders on all these matters are passed by the officers of the Branch and not by the clerical establishments.

(b) The section is not in charge of a junior assistant.

DEBT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA UNDER CERTAIN HEADS.

746. ***Pandit Nilkantha Das:** (a) What is the amount of debt of Government of India under the following heads :

(i) productive :

- (1) Railway,
- (2) Irrigation,
- (3) other,

(ii) non-productive,

(iii) showing what amount in each head has been incurred on account of Provincial Governments, giving the figures province by province?

(b) What amounts on the heads of (i) and (ii) of part (a) above have been secured (i) from Indians, (ii) from Englishmen, and (iii) from others?

(c) What debt under the heads (i) and (ii) in part (a) above has been secured during the years 1920-21 to the present day and what amount of this has been secured from Indians?

(d) Has any public loan been converted into loans from Indians during the years from 1920-21 to date? If so, in which years and to what amount?

(e) What is the interest paid each year for the public debt of the Government of India :

- (i) on productive loans, and
- (ii) on non-productive loans ;

(f) What proportion of this interest is paid to :

- (i) Indians, and
- (ii) foreigners?

(g) Is there any plan to convert loans from foreign creditors to Indian creditors? If so, what is the plan?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) and (e). I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to Accounts 42A, 81 and 86A in the Finance and Revenue Accounts and to Appendix II to the Financial Secretary's Explanatory Memorandum on the budget for 1935-36.

(b), (c) and (f). The information desired by the Honourable Member is not obtainable.

(d) and (g). I would refer the Honourable Member to the proceedings of the Council of State for the 28th of August, 1934. As I then explained, the policy of the Government of India is to repatriate sterling debt whenever it is possible to do so, and, since 1923, there has in fact been a repatriation of about £20 millions.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: With regard to part (b), will an attempt be made to obtain the information?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: This is the question the Honourable Member asked me the other day, and I am not trying to avoid the supply of any information. I simply said the information is not obtainable.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it a fact that many Englishmen are investing largely in rupee loans floated in this country?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I do not know about that.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government be pleased to ascertain the facts?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

UNIFORM DISTRIBUTION OF SALT ALL OVER INDIA.

747. ***Pandit Nilkantha Das:** (a) Are Government aware that in places in India supply of salt is not regular and the price accordingly fluctuates?

(b) Are there any provisions in the Salt Department to see that distribution of salt supply according to local requirements is uniform all over India? If so, what are the provisions? If not, are Government prepared to consider the advisability of seeing that salt is sold to all Indian consumers at an uniform rate throughout the year?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) Except in entirely abnormal conditions, such as prevailed at the end of the Great War, there are no irregularities in the supply of salt or fluctuations in its value beyond what are the ordinary incidents of trade.

(b) No. The distribution of salt is left to the wholesale and retail traders. The Government regard it as impracticable that they should take over the distribution of salt down to the retail stage, which would be necessary if they sought to secure that salt should be sold to all Indian consumers at a uniform rate throughout the year.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I do not know to whom to address the question, as the Honourable Member may not be in a position to answer, but may I ask any Member of Government to state whether they will take steps to make the transport of salt easier and cheaper than it is today, in order to ensure, to the extent to which easy and cheap transport can ensure, the sale at uniform prices of salt throughout India?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: As the Honourable Member himself suggested, I think he had better address that question to one of my colleagues.

Pandit Nilkantha Das: My question was not exactly about uniform prices throughout India, but uniform prices throughout the year at a particular place, so that there may not be scarcity of salt in a particular place.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That question I have answered, if the Honourable Member will read my answer.

**MEANING OF THE HEAD OF THE RAILWAY AS USED IN RAILWAY RULES
AND REGULATIONS.**

748. *Sardar Mangal Singh: Will Government please state what is meant by the head of the railway as used in railway rules and regulations?

Mr. P. B. Rau: On State Railways, the head of the Railway Administration is known as the Agent.

Sardar Mangal Singh: Is not the Railway Board the head of the railways?

Mr. P. B. Rau: Ultimately, Sir.

Sardar Mangal Singh: Is not the Governor General in Council the head of the railways?

Mr. P. B. Rau: He is the head of the whole Government of India.

Sardar Mangal Singh: How many heads has the Railway Department got then?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Is this side of the House the tail of the railways?

PAY AND ALLOWANCE OF TICKET EXAMINERS ON CERTAIN STATE RAILWAYS.

749. *Sardar Mangal Singh: Has the attention of the Governor General in Council been invited to the open letter dated, Simla, the 9th October, 1934, addressed by the National Federation of Railwaymen, Delhi, to the Chief Commissioner, Railways, regarding the pay and allowance of the Ticket Examiners on certain State Railways in India? If so, will Government please state:

- (a) whether the statements and references quoted therein are correct;
- (b) if the reply to part (a) be in the negative, in what respect and to which extent they are incorrect or inaccurate;
- (c) whether the claim to average mileage allowance of 75 per cent. of the pay treated as pay is in order;
- (d) if the reply to part (c) be in the negative, how and why it is not in order;
- (e) what action has been or is likely to be taken by Government on this letter, if none; why not?

Mr. P. B. Rau: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part,

(a) to (d). The correct position has been explained by me more than once on the floor of the House. It is not possible for me in the short space of a reply to a question in this House to deal with all the arguments in the letter.

(e) The letter will be examined carefully by the Railway Board but, so far as I can see from a cursory examination, it brings forward no important points which have not already been considered.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know what was the conclusion arrived at by the Honourable Member? We do not want replies to arguments, but we want to know the decision.

Mr. P. R. Rau: That will be given in the reply to the next question.

Sardar Mangal Singh: Is the space of a question and answer limited according to rules which makes it impossible for the Honourable Member to give the information in the space of a reply?

Mr. P. R. Rau: It will take me half an hour to explain the whole position.

Mr. V. V. Giri: Will the Honourable Member place the details on the table?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have already explained it on more than one occasion on the floor of the House, and the answers will be found in previous proceedings?

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF TRAVELLING TICKET CHECKING STAFF ON THE EAST INDIAN AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAYS.

750. ***Sardar Mangal Singh:** With reference to an assurance given to this House by Mr. P. R. Rau in answer to a supplementary question to starred question No. 352, asked on the 6th August, 1934, will Government please state whether the case of the pay and allowance of the Travelling Ticket Inspectors (of the Accounts Department) now working as Travelling Ticket Examiners and Special Ticket Examiners on the East Indian and North Western Railways has by now been decided? If not will Government please state the probable date by which the decision is likely to be arrived at?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government hope to arrive at an early decision.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: As these men have been troubling the Railway Department and the Honourable Member, will the Honourable Member himself try to see that the decision is arrived at soon?

Mr. P. R. Rau: In answer to that, I should explain to the House that at present at least two hours a day of my time and a much larger proportion of the time of the officers of the Railway Board who are dealing with it are taken up in the researches necessary to answer various questions of detail on railway administration on the floor of this House.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will the Honourable Member, after this Session is over, take this up as the first question to be considered?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I hope to do so before the Session is over, if possible.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is it not a fact that I had innumerable interviews with the Honourable Member on this particular question and certain suggestions are pending for his consideration on this question?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am certainly able to congratulate my Honourable friend on the number of suggestions he has made on this question.

DEMOTIONS AND SUPERSSESSIONS IN CERTAIN DIVISIONS OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

751. *Sardar Mangal Singh: With reference to the reply laid on the table of this House on the 29th January, 1935, to starred question No. 440, asked on the 7th August, 1934, will Government please state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that an employee drawing Rs. 160 pay in the grade of Rs. 130—10—160 with about 15 years service has been demoted to the grade of Rs. 110—5—140;
- (b) whether it is a fact that an employee drawing Rs. 140 pay in the grade of Rs. 110—5—140, with about seven years service has been held senior to the employee drawing Rs. 160 and promoted to the grade of Rs. 150—10—190;
- (c) under what rule or order an employee in a higher grade and in receipt of higher pay and with much longer service is held junior to an employee in a lower grade drawing less pay with much length of service;
- (d) whether it is an accepted practice to determine the seniority on initial pay in the grade or permanent service; or both;
- (e) whether it is a fact that the claims of senior employees are superseded by junior employees in Howrah, Allahabad, Lucknow and Moradabad Divisions in the ticket checking branch;
- (f) whether it is a fact that supersessions have taken place in the ticket checking branch under the orders of the Chief Operating Superintendent, East Indian Railway, in Howrah, Allahabad, Lucknow and Moradabad Divisions;
- (g) whether on restoration of pay with retrospective effect and with the benefits of increments, the seniority of an employee is also restored;
- (h) whether it is a fact that the substantive grades, viz., Rs. 60—4—64—8—120 and Rs. 130—10—200, were restored to the Travelling Ticket Inspectors in December, 1932, with retrospective effect, i.e., from 1st June, 1931; if so, what are the equivalent or as near as possible in the Moody-Ward system;
- (i) whether they are prepared to lay a copy of the direction to the Agent that the holders of the restored substantive grades be absorbed in the new Moody-Ward system prior to their being passed out of service; and
- (j) whether they are prepared to lay a copy of the direction to the Agent that the holders of the restored substantive grades should not receive the stage advancement in their substantive grades?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

APPLICATION OF NEW LEAVE RULES TO JOURNEYMEN ON STATE RAILWAYS.

752. ***Mr. Fakir Chand:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if any orders have been issued regarding the application of new State Railway Leave Rules to journeymen on State Railways?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the considerations on which it was decided to exempt them from the operation of these rules?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state if this category of staff has to undergo an apprenticeship of five years and then has to wait for appointments?

(d) If the reply to part (c) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state if their date of appointment is taken as the date of joining the Railways as apprentices or the date on which they are appointed as journeymen?

(e) Is it a fact that sometimes this category of staff has to wait for vacancies after completion of their training, and are Government prepared to employ them safely in any other vacancies except those of journeymen till such time when they can be absorbed in the regular cadre of journeymen?

(f) Is it a fact that during the retrenchment period those apprentices who had undergone their training, had to wait longer, as even the normal vacancies were not filled, than in normal circumstances?

(g) Are Government prepared to lift the embargo of subjection to new Leave Rules and revised scales of pay, in the case of those of the staff who joined the Railways before the 15th July, 1981?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) and (b). Orders have recently been issued that Journeymen should be treated as subordinate staff and given leave under Annexure I of the State Railway Leave Rules. The reason was that they are in scales of pay generally rising to more than Rs. 100 per mensem.

(c), (e) and (f). Trade Apprentices and Apprentice Mechanics are required to undergo five years training under the rules for recruitment; no guarantee of appointment is given to them. It is possible that they may have to wait some time before they are actually employed. This period of waiting was probably prolonged owing to retrenchment, but this was unavoidable. The question of employment in other vacancies must depend on the circumstances at the time.

(d) The date of appointment is the date of joining as apprentice if there is no break in service, if there is a break, it is the date of appointment as journeyman.

(g) The State Railway Leave Rules apply to railway servants who were appointed on or after the 1st April, 1980, or who were appointed prior to that date on the condition that when the revised leave rules for State Railway employees were introduced, they would be brought under them. As regards pay, orders have been issued that apprentices who joined before the 15th July, 1981, would be entitled to the old scales of pay if they are appointed subsequent to that date without a break. Government do not see any reason to make a departure from the general orders referred to above.

OFFICERS OF INDIAN SERVICES.

753. *Bhai Parma Nand: Will Government be pleased to state the number of officers of Indian services, by communities and provinces, during the last three years:

- (a) appointed,
- (b) dismissed,
- (c) removed,
- (d) retired under retrenchment, and
- (e) retired under ordinary rules?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I regret that the information is not readily available and cannot be collected without an amount of labour which would be wholly disproportionate to the results. I would, however, refer the Honourable Member (1) to the statement laid on the table on the 13th February, 1933, showing the effect of retrenchment on the communal composition of the staff in the Government of India Secretariat and (2) to the statements showing the communal composition of the various services, etc., which are placed in the Library of the Legislature every year.

APPEALS AND MEMORIALS SUBMITTED BY THE OFFICERS OF INDIAN SERVICES AGAINST THE ORDERS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

754. *Bhai Parma Nand: Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of appeals and memorials submitted for individual grievances by officers of Indian Services against the orders of Local Government during the last three years, by provinces;
- (b) the result of each appeal or memorial;
- (c) the number of appeals submitted by officers of Indian Services to the Secretary of State in Council against the order of the Government of India and the result in each case; and
- (d) the period for which each appeal was kept by the Local Government or the Government of India before it was forwarded to the appellate authority?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) to (d). The information desired by the Honourable Member could not be procured without an expenditure of time and labour that would be incommensurate with its value and for that reason Government do not feel justified in collecting it.

DETENTION IN INDIA OF APPEALS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

755. *Bhai Parma Nand: Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) if it is a rule according to which appeals addressed to the Secretary of State cannot be kept in India for more than a month;
- (b) that there is no such rule limiting the period for which a Local Government may not forward appeals addressed to His Excellency the Governor General in Council;

- (c) if the reply to part (b) above be in the negative, whether Government are prepared to consider the advisability of making a similar rule about (b) as there is for (a)?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) The Honourable Member is referred to sub-rule (2) of Rule 10 of the rules for the submission of memorials to the Secretary of State.

- (b) There is no such rule.
(c) No.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if, when these appeals are kept back or decided, information is given to the applicant?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, I think that is so.

SUBMISSION OF APPEALS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

756. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if there is any rule according to which the appellant is given the right and opportunity to render an explanation about any matter, stated against him by the Local Government, in forwarding an appeal to the Government of India?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state if the Local Government are bound to submit all personal records of an officer who appeals to the Government of India?

(c) Are Government prepared to make a rule according to which the appellant should be supplied with a copy of the remarks made by the forwarding authority on his appeal so that he may, if he desires, submit an explanation direct to the authority to whom the appeal lies—or that the authority against whose orders an appeal is preferred should make no forwarding remarks but simply forward the appeal with all records of the case?

(d) Are Government prepared to make a rule so that every person aggrieved may submit his appeal direct to the authority competent to hear the appeal?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) No.

(b) When service and character books are maintained under the rules of a service, these must be forwarded with any appeal from a member of the service against an order of removal or dismissal. In other cases there is no definite rule on the subject but personal records are ordinarily submitted in disciplinary cases in which a Government servant's character is in issue.

(c) and (d). The answer is in the negative.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: When there is a new point in the appeal, are they given an opportunity to explain?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I should imagine yes; but I cannot say for certain what is the practice in every Local Government.

Mr. M. S. Aney: With regard to part (c) of the question, may I ask why the persons concerned are not given an opportunity of explaining their point of view in regard to such endorsement as may be made by the forwarding officers?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The appellant has a full opportunity of explaining his point of view in the appeal which he submits.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Why is he not given an opportunity, when the appeal is forwarded to higher authority, to explain with reference to what is written on that appeal by the forwarding authority?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I really do not see why he should be.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: If the Honourable Member does not know the practice in this matter of asking for an explanation on new points, will he acquaint himself with the rule or give instructions that on new points their explanation should be called for?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That is a large subject: I cannot decide a question of policy involving an alteration of these rules in reply to a supplementary question: I must have notice.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I am only asking the Honourable Member to know the practice: will the Honourable Member know it?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I say I am not familiar with the practice in every single Local Government; but, so far as I know, such an opportunity is given.

APPEALS ALLOWED TO MEMBERS OF ALL-INDIA SERVICES.

757. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that there are two appeals allowed to members of all Indian Services, one to the Governor General in Council and the other to the Secretary of State in Council against the order of Governor in Council, while there is only one appeal permitted to the members of the Provincial and Subordinate services, viz., to the Governor against the order of Governor in Council?

(b) Are Government prepared to give to the members of the Provincial Services the right of second appeal to the Governor General in Council?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) The Honourable Member will find the appeal rules set out in detail in Rules 56, 57 and 58 of the Classification Rules. The position is not exactly as stated in his question. A member of an all-India Service has, for example, no appeal whatever against an order of removal or dismissal, while a member of a provincial or a subordinate service has one such appeal.

(b) No.

FORMATION OF A PROVINCE OF KANARESE SPEAKING DISTRICTS.

758. *Mr. S. K. Hosmani: (a) Is it a fact that the Madras Legislative Council adopted a resolution in 1929, recommending to Government that urgent steps be taken for the formation of a Province comprising the Kanarese speaking parts of the Madras and the Bombay Presidencies and of Coorg?

(b) Is it a fact that a similar resolution was passed by the Madras Legislative Council in 1933?

(c) Is it a fact that the Coorg Provincial Council have also passed a resolution to the same effect?

(d) Is it a fact that a similar resolution was moved in 1929, in the Bombay Legislative Council?

(e) Is it a fact that all the members of the Kanarese speaking district supported the resolution?

(f) Have Government obtained the opinions of these Local Governments, and if so, what is the nature of those opinions?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The answer to parts (a), (b), (c) and (d) is in the affirmative and to part (f) in the negative. As regards part (e) I have no information as to which members of these Councils speak Kanarese.

Mr. S. K. Hosmani: Will the Honourable Member take the trouble of getting the information from Bombay as to which of the Members voted for the Resolution?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Is the matter really one of great importance? If the Honourable Member can convince me that it is really one of urgent importance, I shall be glad to make inquiries.

Mr. S. K. Hosmani: It is a matter of information: I want to know what Members of the Kanarese parts voted on the Resolution: I want the Honourable Member to get the information and let the House know.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I suggest that the Honourable Member should look up the proceedings of the Council concerned.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Do Government propose to take any action on these Resolutions?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The attitude of the Government was explained by my predecessor in a debate in July last.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: May I know what that attitude is?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The attitude was to leave the matter to the newly constituted Councils.

SUBJECTS OF INDIAN STATES PROCEEDED AGAINST UNDER THE FOREIGNER'S ACT.

759. *Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Honourable the Home Member be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of persons who are subjects of Indian States, who have been proceeded against by the Government of India under the Foreigner's Act;
- (b) the nature of the orders passed against them by Government;
- (c) the States to which they belong;
- (d) the periods during which the orders have been in force against them;
- (e) how many of these orders were passed against these persons in view of their connection with the civil disobedience movements; and
- (f) whether in view of the suspension of the movement, Government are prepared to withdraw the orders against such persons, and if not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) No action has been taken by the Government of India under the Foreigner's Act against subjects of Indian States since 1922.

(b) to (f). Do not arise.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are there any orders now subsisting, passed before 1922?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: There were three orders passed before 1922: whether they are still subsisting, I cannot say: I am not aware whether the three persons concerned are still alive or not.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Has any action been taken by the Local Governments under this Act?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That I cannot say.

Mr. B. Das: Will the Honourable Member kindly say under what Act the Indian States' subjects have been deported after they took part in the Congress disobedience movement from British India, after they came out of jail, if it is not the Foreigner's Act?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I am sorry I could not follow the Honourable Member's question.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: I will repeat the question: under what Act, several persons, being subjects of Indian States, who took part or were otherwise punished in the Civil Disobedience Movement, were externed after the expiry of their respective sentences?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I do not think that arises. I am asked only for the number of orders passed by the Government of India under the Foreigner's Act.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: I am not denying that the question in terms may not raise that in form; but the substance of the question that I am asking is this: if the Honourable Member says I must put another question, I will do so, unless he will take this as the question: will the Honourable Member find out whether the Local Governments have passed any, and, if so, what orders, against persons convicted or otherwise dealt with, being subjects of Indian States, in the Civil Disobedience Movement, after the expiry of their sentences and externed?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I think certain Local Governments have passed orders under local Acts which gave them power to pass such orders.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Will the Honourable Member be able to get the information?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I could; but the responsibility is the Local Governments' who have discretion to pass such orders.

HANDLOOM WEAVERS THROWN OUT OF EMPLOYMENT.

760. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashlingam Chettiar:** (a) Are Government aware that a large number of handloom weavers have been thrown out of employment during the last few years?

(b) Are Government aware that this unemployment is mainly due to the competition of Japanese cloth and mill woven cloth?

(c) Do Government propose to consider the advisability of taking steps to protect the handloom weavers?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) and (b) No.

(c) Government are already taking steps to assist the handloom weaving industry by giving grants-in-aid equal to the proceeds of an import duty of a quarter anna per pound on yarns up to 50s. for a period of five years.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Has the Honourable Member in view the weavers of Sind also or not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The amount is being allotted to the different provinces: I believe Sind is a part of a province.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: The Bombay Government is not fair in giving to Sind: will the Honourable Member, therefore, advise the Bombay Government to give a legitimate portion to Sind?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I hope the Bombay Government can be trusted to deal with Sind fairly, without any advice from the Government of India.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask whether the Government of India are aware that the Bombay Government receive much less from Sind than they spend on Sind?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: The reply to parts (a) and (b) was "No". May I know what is the meaning of this word "No"? Does he believe that the handloom weavers were not thrown out of employment or does he believe that they were thrown out of employment, but it was not due to competition from Japanese cloth and mill woven cloth?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The meaning of the reply is exactly what it says. Government were asked whether they were aware that a large number of handloom weavers have been thrown out of employment during the last few years, and their answer is "No". It is extremely difficult to get any definite information on that point owing to the fact that handloom weaving is largely a part time occupation.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: On what information do they say "No"?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: On their own information: if they are not aware, they are not aware.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Have Government ascertained from the Provincial Governments about the exact position?

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Have not the Provincial Governments brought to the notice of the Central Government that several handloom weavers were thrown out of employment?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No, Sir, I said we have no information on that point.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Have not the Madras Government asked for help to these handloom weavers?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Exactly; we are giving it.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: On what ground did they apply for it?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: On the ground that the handloom industry needed help.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Did they not mention the fact that several have been thrown out of employment?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the Madras Government scheme embodied in the Bulletin, and he will find therein all the information that the Madras Government gave us on this subject.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HANDLOOM INDUSTRY.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Sir, I beg to put the following Short Notice question:

- (a) Will Government be pleased to give the details of the expenditure of Rs. 1,77,000 and Rs. 4,74,000 provided for, respectively, in

the revised estimates for 1934-35 and the budget estimates for 1935-36 as grants-in-aid for the development of handloom industry?

- (b) Do Government propose to distribute the same among the provinces of British India? If so, what will be the share of each province?
- (c) Did Government appoint any public or private agencies in the provinces for giving assistance to the handloom industry in each province? If so, what are those agencies?
- (d) Have Government any scheme for the development of the handloom industry in the country as a whole? If so, are Government prepared to publish the same and circularise it among the members of the Central Legislature?
- (e) Are Government aware of the organisation known as the All-India Spinners' Association and its activities for the development of the handloom industry?
- (f) Do Government propose to take the advice of that body and work in co-operation with it in pursuit of the common object? If so, how and in what manner?
- (g) Was this grant placed before the meeting of the General Standing Finance Committee? If so, are Government prepared to supply the Members of this House with a copy of the memorandum, if any? If not, why was it not placed before them for sanction in the normal course?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a), (b) and (d). The Honourable Member will find the scheme considered at length on pages 94 to 116 of No. 52 of the Bulletins of Indian Industries and Labour, copies of which are in the Library. These pages record the discussion of the scheme by the Sixth Industries Conference which met at Simla in July, 1934, they give the criteria which have guided the allocation of the money, and they indicate the character of the individual schemes which were proposed by Local Governments. These schemes have been revised with regard to the criticisms made at the Conference and the funds available and I lay on the table a statement showing the amount allotted to each province for the financial years 1934-35 and 1935-36.

(c) No new agency has been created by the Government of India. The schemes will be administered by Local Governments, working through their Departments of Industries in most cases.

(e) I have heard of the Association and understand that its activities are not confined to the encouragement of spinning.

(f) No.

(g) Yes: copies of the proceedings of the meeting of the Standing Finance Committee, dated 31st August, 1934, containing the memorandum regarding the grant-in-aid for the development of the handloom industry were circulated to Members of this House as recently as last week.

	1934-35.	1935-36.
	Rs.	Rs.
Madras	26,500	59,500
Bombay	17,500	39,500
Bengal	35,500	80,000
United Provinces	32,000	72,000
Punjab	17,000	38,000
Bihar and Orissa	23,000	52,500
Central Provinces	7,500	17,000
Burma	7,500	17,000
Assam	7,500	17,000
Delhi	2,000	5,000
Estimated reserve with the Central Government		76,500
Total	1,76,000	4,74,000

Mr. B. Das: Is the amount allotted on consumption basis or on a population basis?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: It was extremely difficult, I may explain, Sir, to arrive at a suitable criterion for the distribution of this grant. The criterion finally adopted by the Conference was that half the grant should be distributed on the basis of consumption of yarn in the handloom industry, and the other half on the basis of what the provinces had been doing to help themselves in this matter, namely, on the basis of the average expenditure on handloom weaving in the last five years. That criterion was laid down for one year only, and it will be reviewed by the next Industries Conference which we hope will be held in the course of the next few months.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Why do not Government agree to co-operate with the All-India Spinners' Association, in respect of this work?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have already explained that this is not a matter for the Government of India. The Government of India are not administering any scheme themselves, and, so far as they are concerned, no question of co-operation arises.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Why do Government say in answer to Mr. Aney's question, that they are not prepared to work in co-operation with the All-India Spinners' Association?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have nothing to add to the answer I have already given.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the other activities of the All-India Spinners' Association which have been brought to the notice of the Honourable Member?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Obviously, Sir, the encouragement of weaving.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Has the Honourable Member got any figure in his office to show the number of handlooms in each Province?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I would suggest that Honourable Members should study the Bulletin to which I have referred which contains the very fullest information on this subject. As they can see for themselves, it is a thick volume, and two-thirds of it is occupied by the schemes put forward by the Local Governments for the encouragement of the handloom weaving industry and the discussions of the Industries Conferences thereon.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know, Sir, if copies of this memorandum were supplied to the Standing Finance Committee this year?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I said that the proceedings of the meeting of the Standing Finance Committee, dated the 31st August, 1934, containing the memorandum regarding the grant-in-aid for the development of the handloom industry were circulated to Members of this House as recently as last week. That obviously could not have been included in the Volume which was published some months before that.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is there any political reason why the Government of India will not co-operate in the matter, with the All-India Spinners' Association?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: On that point, I have nothing to add to the statement I have already made.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

ISSUE OF SHARES OF THE RESERVE BANK.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will Government state:

- (a) whether their attention has been drawn to the notification regarding the issue of shares of the Reserve Bank on the 27th February;
- (b) whether they are aware that according to that notification the lists will be opened on the 22nd March and closed on the 25th;
- (c) whether they are aware that the number of days that the lists will be practically and actually open will be only two days and three hours, as 23rd and 24th are Saturday and Sunday;
- (d) whether they are aware of the fact that considerable dissatisfaction has arisen because of the shortness of time allowed, which particularly handicaps agricultural people living in villages; and
- (e) whether in view of these facts, they are prepared to consider the necessity for extending the time during which the lists will be kept open?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a), (b) and (c). Yes.

(d) and (e). The Central Board of the Reserve Bank consider and Government agree with them, that the time is adequate in view of the facts that ample previous notice is being given throughout the country, and that applications may be lodged at the various centres in advance of the opening date. This will be abundantly clear if reference is made to the terms of the prospectus published in the press this morning. It does not, therefore, seem necessary to ask the Board to extend the time during which the lists will remain open.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will Government be pleased to issue orders to receive applications for shares on Saturday and Sunday also?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I think the Honourable Member had better read the prospectus first before he asks further questions on this matter. In the prospectus it is stated that applications sent in before the opening date will be accepted.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will the application forms be ready by then?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: All that is given in the prospectus, and I suggest that the Honourable Member should read it first and then ask whatever questions he wants to ask.

THE GENERAL BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*contd.*

SECOND STAGE—*contd.*

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): This is a day which has been allotted for the motions to be moved by the Nationalist Party. There are three motions on the paper, two standing in the name of the Honourable Member, Mr. Aney, and one standing in the name of Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta. The Chair does not know which of the two motions Mr. Aney wishes to move first. Perhaps he will make it clear. The Chair thinks both are under Demand No. 32—Home Department,—one is a token cut to discuss the repressive policy, and the other relates to the refusal of supplies in connection with the repressive policy of the Home Department. Which one does the Honourable Member propose to move?

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): I am going to move the motion reducing the demand by Rs. 100.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Refusal of supplies?

Mr. M. S. Aney: Token cut by Rs. 100.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik (Home Member): On a point of order, Sir. May I respectfully draw your attention to Standing Order No. 72 which provides:

"If notice of motion to omit or reduce any grant has not been given two clear days before the day on which the demand is to be considered, any Member may object to the moving of the motion, and such objection shall prevail, unless the President, in the exercise of his power to suspend this Standing Order, allows the motion to be made."

I have no intention whatsoever of burking discussion on this motion; and, of course, I take it that the Standing Order will be suspended. But I should like to draw your attention to the principle underlying this Standing Order, which is that, in regard to motions for cuts, at least two days' clear notice should be given. I should also venture to suggest that it puts the Government in a position of considerable disadvantage if that amount of notice is not ordinarily insisted upon. For example, I only knew by a casual enquiry from my Honourable friend yesterday that he was going to move this motion today, and so far as I am aware, Government have received no information at present yet as to what is the next motion to be moved when the debate on the present motion is concluded. I submit that that is hardly fair to the Government, and we do not get sufficient time to think over what the Government have got to say.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Of these three motions, the first one which the Honourable Member, Mr. Aney, wants to move is in Late List No. 1, notice of which was given by the Honourable Member on the 6th March at 2-36 p.m.,—very nearly two days.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Still, even that is not strictly two clear days' notice. The only notice I have received is of certain cuts of which notice was given yesterday, that is, on the 7th March at 11 a.m.

Mr. M. S. Aney: That is not the motion I am moving. I am moving the other one of which notice was given on the 6th, printed on Late List No. 1. That was received by every Member.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Even so, there has not been two clear days' notice. I am not objecting to this motion being taken up today, but I do think that it is only fair that Government should have sufficient time to think over what they have got to say on these important cuts.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair quite understands the significance of the objection that has been raised by the Honourable the Home Member. Undoubtedly, Government must have sufficient time in order to prepare themselves to answer the motions tabled. But the Chair also ought to explain to the House what happened in this particular matter. The Leaders of different Parties arrived at some arrangement with the Leader of the House and the Chair received information of that the day before yesterday and the Chair was told that these motions were going to be moved by different Parties on different dates. The Leader of the House knew the day before yesterday what were the motions that were going to be moved.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I thought that we only knew that Leaders of certain Parties were going to move a motion, and not the actual terms of the motion.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): As I was present in the room, may I say a word? My Honourable friends, the day before yesterday, or even yesterday, could not make up their minds as to which of the cuts they were going to move. We had no difficulty whatsoever so far as the Congress Party was concerned. We had no difficulty about the Independent Party; we knew that they would move on Tuesday.

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

And we had no difficulty about the European Group who would move their cut on Monday afternoon. But my Honourable friends could not make up their minds as to which they should move. Not that we object now, we are ready to go on.

Mr. M. S. Aney: If I mistake not, my Honourable friend was informed by me of both the alternative motions at the private meeting which we held. So, he had notice of both. It is my choice, and I can move either the one or the other.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair must say that it is extremely desirable that the Government should have sufficient notice, according to the Standing Order, of the motions that are going to be moved by different Parties. The Chair may here just point out to those Honourable Members who do not belong to any Party and who want to move their motions tomorrow, that they must let the Government Members know at once what are the motions they want to move; otherwise, they may find that they will not be able to move those motions at all. They should also inform the Government of the order in which those motions will be taken up.

DEMAND NO. 32—HOME DEPARTMENT.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): Sir, I beg to move:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,80,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Home Department'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,80,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Home Department'."

Repressive Policy.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Sir, I rise to move the motion that stands in my name, and that is:

"That the demand under the head 'Home Department' be reduced by Rs. 100."

This is a token cut and not a cut moved on the principle of refusal of supplies. In moving this motion, my object is to censure the Government for pursuing a policy of repression at a time when it is not at all justified. Before I deal with the various acts which, in my opinion, amount to repression, I should like to explain my position a little more clearly. I should like to expound briefly as to what constitutes repression. Many people think that acts of the Government done under extraordinary laws alone can be construed as repression. But I consider that every act of the Government which is in restraint of the elementary rights of citizenship of the individual or the society is an act of repression, whether that is done under the normal law or done under an extraordinary law or an emergency law. Anything that detracts from the rights of citizenship is an act of repression, and it can be justified only on the ground of emergency and not otherwise. The times under which we are living are such as will not, in my opinion, justify the Government in pursuing a policy which they had taken to some years ago, and that is the main reason why I am moving

this cut. I can quite understand that repression becomes at times necessary, but that is justified only on the ground of certain extraordinary circumstances. What is the position today? The country is, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the Government also, enjoying complete peace and there is no disturbing factor whatsoever. Even according to the admission of the Government, the situation has so far improved that they do not apprehend any untoward events to take place during the present time. If that is so, it is clear that the Government must be content to rule this country by normal laws and not by the force of any extraordinary laws. The great agitation that was going on in this country since 1930 is now withdrawn. The Civil Disobedience Movement is now withdrawn. The party which started that movement has come here to carry on a constitutional struggle with the Government of India, taking a chance to see whether in that constitutional struggle the Government of India behave with them and with the people of this country in a manner to inspire some confidence in their beneficent motives. They are here for that purpose. When the movement was going on, it was frequently given out that so long as there was this movement, and a spirit of lawlessness was being encouraged, there was no reason for the Government to take a lenient view and to slacken their policy of repression. An excuse to this effect cannot be put forward by the Government today. The Civil Disobedience Movement was no doubt a disturbing factor; but I want to assert that we consider it as a legitimate weapon and also a legitimate method to assert our rights and to carry on the struggle for our liberty. It, however, has now been withdrawn.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It is in abeyance. It has not been abandoned.

Mr. M. S. Aney: For the purpose of the Government, it is sufficient that the movement is withdrawn. Whether it will be revived or not will depend on how the Government behave with the people during the period that the movement is withdrawn. The responsibility will be on the Government for not having responded to the demands of the people in the spirit in which they ought to have done during the time when the campaign of Civil Disobedience was ostensibly and practically withdrawn. You cannot, therefore, draw a distinction between abandonment and withdrawal and make that as an excuse for persisting in methods and measures which are unwarranted and unjustifiable. That indicates a mentality of obstinacy which is certainly not creditable to the Government. The point is this. If after the withdrawal of the movement, Government are persisting in a policy of repression, then I submit that they have got to give very cogent justification for that. Very often questions have been asked here to elicit information in regard to various acts of repression, but the replies given have at any rate not satisfied me. One of the most striking facts is that even after the withdrawal of the movement, we find that some persons who were convicted of civil disobedience are still rotting in jail. In answer to a reply given today by the Honourable the Home Member, we understand that there are still 69 persons thus rotting in jail. I don't understand it. Unless there are specific reasons for not releasing them, it is impossible to conceive why they should rot in jail even for a day after the movement has been withdrawn

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Some of them were convicted after the movement was withdrawn.

An Honourable Member: Convicted of what?

Mr. M. S. Aney: I will come to that later on. I find that although the movement has been withdrawn, the Government have not responded in the manner and the measure they should have done to inspire more confidence in the new method which the popular party wants to try. They are behaving as if they are not quite sure as to the *bona fides* of those who have come to have a constitutional fight with them. The author of the movement himself has not been given permission to visit certain tracts of the country for the sake of satisfying himself about the conditions which exist there. An atmosphere of suspicion and distrust is still present in the mind of the Government. What is the reason? Today we are told that several civil disobedience prisoners are still rotting in jail, for which I at least do not find any excuse. I also find detention of persons convicted during the Civil Disobedience Movement. After the movement has been withdrawn, cases of sedition have been launched against some of them, and they are important leaders, and they have been sent to jail. What does that indicate? It means, in my opinion, that Government are suspicious of the conduct and the movements of those persons. The power of sanctioning prosecution is in the hand of the Government. Even if sedition is technically committed, it is not imperative on the part of the Government to prosecute a man for sedition. The power of sanction is vested in the Local Government and that means that the Government have got to see whether it will serve any useful purpose in prosecuting men for sedition at a particular time. Considerations of time and considerations of policy are of paramount importance in launching and sanctioning prosecution for sedition against anybody. After the movement is withdrawn, prosecutions for sedition have been launched against persons who represent that movement. It means that the Government do not want to deal with them as respectable citizens or gentlemen. They want to treat them, as far as possible, as felons or men with a criminal bent of mind. These things go to create a spirit of hostility amongst the people and the day of reconciliation and mutual co-operation is thereby retarded. The responsibility for the retarding of that day will in my opinion, rest on those who have not been able to respond to the gesture made by the Congress and certainly not on those who once stood for and carried on the Civil Disobedience Movement, but have now withdrawn it. After the movement was withdrawn, I thought that the Government would really come out liberally and try to begin with a clean slate before them and give a complete assurance to the people who have come here to argue with them on the floor of this House. We have abandoned the movement for the time being. You may say that it is not a permanent abandonment. There can be no such thing as a permanent abandonment so long as a desire for getting liberty is present in the mind of the people. So long as people are fired with a desire for emancipating their country from foreign bondage, you cannot expect them to permanently abandon their methods, unless they are assured that by pursuing other methods they can come nearer the goal they have in view. How can the Government assure them except by making a liberal gesture in response to what they have done? It is inexplicable to any man of common sense how they can assure the people by taking an obstinate and perverse attitude.

Sir, we find that the devil of repression is a hydra-headed one. Somebody put a question on this point. This hydra-headed monster manifests itself in a thousand and one ways; you cannot imagine how many forms proteus-like it assumes and how many forms it can assume. (Hear, hear.) I think since the Civil Disobedience Movement was withdrawn, Government should have taken stock of all that they had done to meet and suppress agitation when it had been going on, all the steps that they took with a view to curbing and to destroying the agitation. Immediately after the agitation was withdrawn, one would have thought they would regard it as their first duty to examine all the injuries they had inflicted by way of punishment upon the people concerned in the movement with a view to removing them all as far as it was practicable for them to do so. We find, however, that although the Civil Disobedience Movement has been withdrawn, properties that were attached and confiscated are still unreturned and no steps are taken. For instance, the Guzerat farmers and the Carnatic farmers are suffering from the loss of their confiscated property. Government do not think it worth while even to consider as to whether such forfeited property can be restored to them or not. Sir, so long as Government will persist in keeping those wounds unhealed, the people's mind will harp on them and they will not be reconciled to co-operate with the Government. It was rather with a view to prominently bringing out to the notice of the Government the facts relating to the loss or damage sustained by those who had been punished during the past agitation that the leaders of the movement having withdrawn that agitation have now come forward here. A considerable number of those who are here in this House represent the people who helped and participated in this agitation. Now, they have come here and have extended the hand of co-operation. (Hear, hear.) Are you grasping that hand, or rejecting it? You can grasp that hand in two ways. You can merely utter empty words and empty assurances and simply say: "We welcome you in this House, and so on and so forth". That is no assurance. But if you want to extend a loyal and sincere welcome, then you should try to undo the grave wrongs which you had done them during the agitation as also the other acts of repression which you have been consistently pursuing since the withdrawal of the movement. (Hear, hear.) Do not punish them permanently or maliciously. If you really want those people to be your loyal subjects hereafter—loyal not in the sense that they shall be made permanent slaves under a foreign and alien rule, but loyal in the sense that they are the subjects of a State which can be felt by them as their own State, with that idea present in mind—then you should behave accordingly. The Government and those representing them cannot imagine that the people, after one struggle is over, will give up their ideals and try to remain with them as loyalists who have no political ideals before their minds but those of slaves. Now, how can you punish men for having political ideals, when the nation's conscience is awakened and the nation feels the rancour of living under foreign bondage? People, Sir, for the sake of gaining their political ideal, will ever be ready to renew and redouble their efforts every time there is an impediment thrown in their way to reach that goal. That is bound to come and you cannot gainsay that. Sir, every nation's struggle, every political power has always had its ups and downs, victories and reverses, and has also always had its revivals also. Such revivals will be there. We take the present period as one in which we have, of our own accord, voluntarily stopped

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

our agitation and have given you a chance to demonstrate whether you would allow people to tread the constitutional path only as the proper one; so that within a reasonable time the people can have their goal. It is now for you to create confidence in the minds of the people in this matter. And if you want to create it, then it is not by merely giving empty assurances and promises in the form of welcoming us and making felicitous speeches and shaking hands with us. It is not by these shadowy things and forms, but by tangible things and substantial gestures that you can win our confidence, such as making sincere and genuine efforts to undo the wrongs that you have inflicted on the people during that period of trouble and turmoil. Sir, I may point out that during the time when the agitation was going on, the Government made the Ordinances. These were ultimately enacted as laws, and they are still the laws of the land on the Statute-book. You will find that the Local Governments of Bombay and Bengal and certain other provinces also have re-enacted these as permanent laws. All this shows that the power they have got of summarily dealing with things is so dear to them that they do not want to part with it. They do not want to lose the advantages which they have got in dealing with men whom they dislike and suspect. They have lost all patience, patience that is necessary for acting justly, and why? On account of being allowed to exercise such arbitrary powers and to behave in this manner for the past few years, they have lost all balance and faculty of circumspection and the patience that is necessary for them to rule over this vast country on lines of justice and equity in conformity with approved jurisprudence.

Sir, my first complaint is this. All the lawless laws, all the weapons which had been forged by the Government during the period of the agitation are now still in the armoury of the Government—weapons ostensibly designed for the purpose of meeting the situation which the Civil Disobedience Movement had created. Now, all these should have been repealed by the Government of India. I regard the continuance of these laws on the Statute-book as a proof of an attitude on their part of treating those who have been carrying on that agitation as rebels even after the agitation is withdrawn. They have that spirit of distrust, hatred and suspicion in their mind. I also find that Government are pursuing their policy of externing and interning all sorts of persons. There are persons externed, there are persons interned even now. Some persons are not allowed to go beyond certain limits of some province, others are not allowed to come within certain limits, and in that way this externment and internment policy is going on. Extraordinary powers are given to District Magistrates. And what do we find? Hundreds of young men are today externed, they are served with notices, they are not allowed to go out of their province—by saying “hundreds” I mean—I won’t say that the number comes to many hundreds, I want to say positively that it exceeds at least one hundred.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Under what Act is this?

Mr. M. S. Aney: That was the very question which was put and which the gentleman over there expected the Honourable Member to answer this morning, *viz.*, how many persons were externed under the Foreigners’ Act, and the Honourable Member said that certain Provincial Governments had proceeded on that basis, but that he did not know exactly and could

not give the exact information. The point is this. These Acts are being used arbitrarily and people are being extened or interned without any inquiry. For example, I may mention the case of my friend, Barrister Savarkar. This young man has served many long years of imprisonment in the Andamans. After having served his full term there, he was released, only to find himself interned in the district of Ratnagiri, and, after three or four years, a fresh notice is issued and his period of detention is prolonged for the last ten years and more.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would remind the Honourable Member that the House will rise today at a quarter to one, it being Friday.

Mr. M. S. Anēy: Yes, Sir. (*Voices*: "Continue afterwards.") Now we have got a terribly long list of detenus—a list which was given by the Honourable Member himself on the 14th February, 1935, when he said:

"The information in my possession under these three heads relates to persons now detained or extened. The figures are as follows:

(ii) 1,653.

(iii) 48.

(iv) 179 in jails in Bengal, 974 in detention camps in Bengal and 500 in detention camps or jails outside Bengal."

The number of detenus in Bengal is increasing all along even after the campaign has been withdrawn. My point is this that by keeping a large number of young men in jail, you are denying them the liberty and you are also denying the opportunities of serving the country in the normal way when the whole atmosphere is changed on account of the withdrawal of this movement. You are thus creating a situation in that province which is getting from bad to worse. I am now talking of the repressive policy in general; I am not necessarily confining myself to the civil disobedience policy only. I am saying that the Government are pursuing a policy of repression even when the situation has changed on account of the withdrawal of the Civil Disobedience Movement. Government should deal with them more leniently in this case. Now, Sir, after the civil disobedience campaign was withdrawn, Government should have similarly allowed all the bodies, which were declared illegal, to function normally. Now, there are at least, to my knowledge, two or three bodies—very important political institutions in the country—which are still under the ban. For example, the Hindustani Seva Dal. Now, that is a volunteers' institution and it is incomprehensible for us to know as to why it has not been allowed to function normally. It is a body of volunteers pledged to work on non-violent, peaceful and legitimate lines. It is a body of volunteers which has been working as a part of the Congress organisation for many years, and when Government have allowed all the Congress bodies to function normally, how is it that this body has not been treated similarly? Then, we have a body known as Khudai Khidmatgars. I do not want to say much about this body, as much has already been said about it. Whatever may have been the reasons to suspend the activities of this body at one time, today we have got the stalwart of a representative here who is definitely telling us what it is and what it stands for. Government should accept his word and remove the ban from this body also. They should be allowed to take their proper places in the civil administration of the country and also to do the civic duties as respectable citizens of their province.

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadian Rural): What about the Abhayashram of Comilla, Bengal?

Mr. M. S. Aney: That is also a body of non-violent persons in Bengal and it is an institution which is known all over the province. The members of that Ashram are highly and rightly respected as persons who stand for non-violence and truth. Sir, the way in which the Government are trying to deal with these persons and with these institutions indicates, in my opinion, that they are unnecessarily labouring under suspicion and distrust. The policy which they are now pursuing will not create any confidence in the minds of the people as regards the utility of proceeding on constitutional lines. Do they want the people to move on constitutional lines or not? That is a straight question which I want to put to the Honourable Members on the Treasury Benches. Do they want the people to continue their faith in this method or do they want them to go back to other activities? If they find that they are up against a stone wall against which it is no use dashing their heads, what will be the result? My Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, has been saying that we are carrying several measures and motions on the strength of majority. But no response is made by Government. Even repression which was taken up as a method to meet certain situation is being persisted in when there is no excuse for doing so. The result is that people's minds will refuse to remain steady on the path on which for some reason or other they have decided to walk for the present.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the Honourable Member want to speak for some time more?

Mr. M. S. Aney: I will take about five minutes more and will then finish.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House stands adjourned till quarter past two.

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at a Quarter Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Sir, I was on the point when we dispersed last for Lunch that the continuance on the Statute-book of laws which were intended for a particular period and to meet a particular situation is unjustifiable. I will just read out a list of these laws brought together in one Bill by my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti. These are the special laws that have been made and are now the Acts of this Legislature. They first came into existence as Ordinances and are now the Acts of the land. These laws are:

The Indian Press Emergency Powers Act, 1931,

The Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1932,

The Indian States Protection Act, 1934.

Then, there are the Acts of the Bengal Legislative Council to which I need not refer here, though the same plea will hold good in the case of those laws also. Immediately after the reformed Constitution came into existence in 1921, a Committee was appointed, called the Repressive Laws Committee, which had gone very carefully into all the repressive laws that had been made till that date and it had made certain recommendations. The fact is that all the old laws which had then been made are still in the armoury of the Government and their number is increasing from year to year. The one lesson that we can derive is this. Did these repressive laws really do away with the necessity of repression or create a situation in which you no longer feel it necessary to have any repressive measures. On the other hand, I find that these repressive laws have a tendency to multiply without materially curing the disease for which they are intended to be a remedy. Otherwise, to my mind, there is no meaning as to why the laws should have gone on multiplying to this extent. The real cure against a situation which the Government have to face is not by repressing the people or making an attempt to suppress their legitimate aspirations, but by consulting public opinion and meeting their aspirations in a proper way. So long as the latter remedy is not taken, you may add any number of laws to your Statute-book you like, you may add more to your armoury, yet the popular aspirations will assert in one form or another and a new situation will be created. That is the lesson of history. I would ask the Honourable Members on the Treasury Benches to reconsider the whole position and take stock of the situation that is now created on account of a certain attitude adopted by the most dynamic political party in the country and try to make an attempt to reconcile public opinion. I have read out the list of these Acts which now disfigure the Statute-book of this country and the first thing the Government are expected to do is to repeal these Acts. The second thing is to release these prisoners who are unnecessarily detained now, and, thirdly, those prisoners who have been prosecuted after the Civil Disobedience Movement was withdrawn should be released. What is the propriety of detaining men like Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru or Khan Abdul Ghafoor Khan now? I do not see any propriety of doing that. That they have been found guilty of certain offences is, to my mind, no excuse for continuing their detention till the last date for which they were awarded imprisonment. This power to release the prisoners is possessed by the Government and they can exercise it without any loss of prestige. The only thing that is needed is a genuine desire to create a situation in which a harmonious working of the popular and official forces will be possible. That is a situation which can be brought about only by the Government and it cannot be done by anybody else. If the Government do not do that, they will be called upon one day to read the writing on the wall which they refuse to read now. History has taught us this lesson that repression has failed everywhere and that the righteous cause has, in the long run, succeeded in spite of repression. This is the writing on the wall and the Government must read that. By persisting in the present policy of repression, the Government will not be able to bring about a situation in which the progress of the country can be achieved by a harmonious working of the popular forces and of the official elements. If it is the desire of Government to bring harmony into this distracted country, then they ought to repeal all the repressive laws now and immediately.

In conclusion, I will say one word more about the repressive policy. I have already mentioned three things. The fourth thing that I want to refer to is the treatment meted out to the prisoners in jails. I do not mean

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

to say that everything that appears in the press in regard to this matter, is necessarily true, but, at the same time, it can't be denied that in many cases the rights, which are due to the political prisoners, as belonging to any particular class, are not carefully looked into and they are put to a considerable hardship. Even their health is not properly cared for, and every now and then, we come across instances reported in the press, which create a good deal of sensation. About the accuracy of all such information we cannot vouchsafe, and it is for the Government to enquire carefully into such complaints. I only desire to remind the Government that it is also a matter on which public opinion is very keen, we get instances of the sufferings of these prisoners in the press, and, so long as these things go on and so long as the people feel that Government are not taking measures to redress these wrongs, the rancour is left in their minds. It is up to the Government to remove that idea from the minds of the people by resorting to proper steps in time. If the Government only desire to continue the fight with those who have laid down their arms for the time being and who look forward to the Government clasping their hands in fellowship, and if the people realise that there is no hand forthcoming to clasp theirs, then the people will be forced to do nothing else than to take up arms again at the proper time to assert their rights and continue the struggle till they succeed one day.

In conclusion, I wish to make one appeal to my Honourable friends sitting by my side over there. This is a motion in which I am asking the Government to do nothing else than what is dictated in the best interests of the country. That is the only proper course for the Government to adopt in order to ensure our future march towards our goal on peaceful and harmonious lines. In considering a motion like the one I have moved, I am sure that no considerations of communalism will influence my Honourable friends over there in their judgment. There is no such consideration underlying this motion which they can possibly think of. If the Government give up their repressive policy, then our progress towards our goal will be easier. The only point of view from which this House should look at my motion is one of purely a national point of view. I have no doubt that whatever may be the grievances of my Honourable friends on the Benches over there for any mistake, real or imaginary, committed by me or by any one else belonging to my Group, I hope and trust that they will forget it now and look at the present motion purely from a national point of view. I want to appeal to them now as I am now asking this House to vote upon a proposition on which nobody could afford to look at except from a purely national point of view and not at all from any communal point of view whatsoever. I hope my Honourable friends will see that the necessity of the hour is that the repressive policy must stop, in order that our progress might be on peaceful and harmonious lines hereafter. I have no other consideration in making this motion, and I hope no other consideration will influence my Honourable friends in their judgment, and I trust that all of us, who have got the best interests of the country at heart, will vote together by going to the same lobby and thus assert with one unanimous voice that the time has come for the Government to put an end to their repressive policy. If the Government are not prepared to give an undertaking to stop their repressive policy, immediately, I appeal to the House to unanimously carry this censure motion on the Government. (Applause.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Home Department' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, if my Honourable friend will not consider me audacious, may I be allowed to congratulate him on a speech worthy of a man of his high character and standing? Sir, times have changed, and when an Honourable Member like my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, can get up in this House and make a speech of the character he has made, asking Government to forget the past and only look to the future, I feel sure that that appeal cannot fall on deaf ears, be it either on this side or on the opposite Benches. Sir, one point of importance was brought forward. My Honourable friend said that the Civil Disobedience Movement had been withdrawn. My Honourable friend, the Home Member, interjected that it has not been abandoned. Now, Sir, that is a question that I remember having discussed and heard discussed in this House. What is the meaning of abandoning a programme and what is the difference between withdrawing it and abandoning it? If my Honourable friend, the Home Member, means that those who believe or believed in the Civil Disobedience Movement should now come forward and say that under no circumstances in the future will they ever go back to the movement during their lifetime, I think he is asking too much of them. And, Sir, if I mistake not, his distinguished predecessor gave on behalf of Government his views with regard to the Civil Disobedience Movement. So far as my memory serves me, I believe he said that he did not expect on behalf of Government any Congressman to undertake that he would never go in for civil disobedience again in his life; he would be satisfied if the movement was withdrawn without any limit of time. And that, Sir, I consider a very wise, a very logical and a very equitable decision. Sir, the time may come, we can never tell, when any class of men may have to go in for stronger measures than constitutional methods. The time may come, we can never tell, when my Honourable friends of the European Group even may consider it necessary to go in for methods which are stronger than what may be called constitutional. The point for decision for everybody and for all parties is whether constitutional methods will pay better in the long run than other methods; and that can only be a question of opinion. And today, as the world stands, with conditions as they are even in Europe, you cannot expect men of any school of political thought to bind themselves for all times in the future as to what action they will take or what methods they will adopt in conditions and circumstances we cannot foresee. And, therefore, if the Congress have withdrawn the Civil Disobedience Movement, they have gone as far as any school of thought can do under the conditions and circumstances of today. I would appeal to my Honourable friends opposite to grasp this hand of fellowship that Mr. Aney has voluntarily extended to them today and to understand the true significance of that gesture, for it does not come from an insignificant person like myself, but it comes from a man, who, in this part of the world, holds a position of influence and standing.

Now, Sir, there was one remark that my Honourable friend made with which I cannot agree. He suggested to the Honourable the Home Member that all those who had been prosecuted for sedition after the Civil Disobedience Movement was withdrawn should be set at liberty. Well, sedition is sedition whether it be before the Civil Disobedience Movement

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

was withdrawn or after. The law must take its course, and if a man deliberately chooses to be seditious, he must pay the penalty of the law. And, therefore, I would most respectfully suggest to my Honourable friend that that was going a little further than what could be expected to be yielded by a responsible Government and that when one day he himself may take the seat of the Home Member, I think he will never agree that a man, who is guilty of breaking the law of the land, should be set at liberty. Sir, I do agree with my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, that those who are today in prison for having resorted to civil disobedience should no longer remain in prison. I am not talking of any other class of prisoners, but those who were imprisoned for the Civil Disobedience Movement should be set at liberty. Why, Sir, there are many of my Honourable friends here who are perhaps in the eye of the law and in the eye of Government just as guilty, and in their opinion just as innocent, as many who are not present here today. And after the gesture that has been made by the Congress and by my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, openly in this House today, I sincerely trust that Government will give this matter their most serious consideration. After all, it has been the declared policy of Government to hold out the hand of friendship to those who were at one time against them. It is their policy, and I have heard that policy declared in this House when the Civil Disobedience Movement was at its height. Surely they can now implement that policy when that movement has been withdrawn? I am not one of those who close their eyes completely to dangers that may still be lurking in the distance. I realise that there may be many in this country who may have given up civil disobedience, but who still believe in the principle of civil disobedience. Well, to continue the same policy as if civil disobedience was in existence is a sign of weakness in a powerful Government. When times change, when circumstances change, surely the policy of the Government must also change: and is there no difference in this country today in the conditions that prevail and in the conditions that prevailed three or four years ago? Should the policy of Government remain the same, although conditions have so radically changed? Perhaps I will be informed that the policy of the Government has changed. I trust it has changed, but let there be a tangible and a complete sign of that change. I have heard the Honourable the Home Member give figures of the number of men that have been released since the withdrawal of the Civil Disobedience Movement. I have heard him give figures of the number of men that are at liberty today who would otherwise not have been so, had it not been for the withdrawal of the Civil Disobedience Movement. That may be all correct, but are there not men still in prison who are there for having gone in for the Civil Disobedience Movement. And if there are any, will the Honourable Member on behalf of Government give us a definite answer as to what is to become of them? We shall await a reply. If I believed, conscientiously believed, that there was any real danger in adopting the policy suggested by my friend, Mr. Aney, in some parts of his speech, I would not get up here to support him. It is because I believe that it is in the best interests of Government themselves to fall in with the views of my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, that I stand to support him and to urge strongly that Government do now declare their intention of adopting many of his suggestions. I should certainly have liked to have spoken after hearing some Honourable Member from the

Government side, but that is a privilege we rarely have. It is a point that I have brought up times without number in the past, and I have very often pointed out to Government that they would be well advised to follow the practice of at least my Provincial Government, where the Government point of view was expounded at the earliest opportunity during the debate and Honourable Members on the other side were given an opportunity of hearing how good or how bad the Government case was. I would once more make this appeal to the Honourable the Leader of the House to see that Government's point of view is placed before this House on all subjects early in the debate. It may not necessarily be done by the Member in charge: there are very able Secretaries who sit behind the Honourable Members who could intervene in the debate. Why, I see very able Members of the Civil Service who come here from the Provinces, but whose voices we rarely have the privilege of hearing. I have brought up this point more than once before. Surely they are here to tell us from first-hand experience the position in their provinces: they are here to help this Honourable House; but, alas, ever since I have been a Member of this House, hardly ever have I seen any of those Honourable Members who come from the various provinces of India open his lips because he is not allowed to do so; but in a debate like this their intervention would be of considerable service to Government and to this Honourable House; and I would again appeal to Government for a change of policy in this connection. If they are here merely to vote and to go into the lobby, Government could have men with less experience, men to whom they could pay much less salary, men who will do the work of walking into the Government lobby, just as efficiently as the Honourable Members opposite are capable of doing; and in a debate like this, I think it would be of some service to Government and to us all if they were allowed to tell us from first-hand knowledge the conditions in their own provinces. With these words, I support the motion of my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, unless I find that a really satisfactory answer is forthcoming from the Treasury Benches.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, my Honourable colleague will wind up the debate, but in response to the statement of my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, that they ought to know at the earliest stage the view—although it may be briefly put—of the Government in this matter, I would like just to speak for a few minutes. Either I have misunderstood my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, or he is under a misapprehension as to facts. I am making a distinction between the speech of my Honourable friend and that of the Honourable the Mover of the motion, Mr. Aney, for this reason: Mr. Aney said that people who after this Civil Disobedience Movement had been withdrawn—and I am making no point about whether it has been withdrawn or abandoned or suspended—those who have been convicted of sedition should also be let off. That is quite a different proposition from that of Sir Cowasji Jehangir who does not require that to be done. But I do not exactly understand what my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, is driving at when he says that the hand of fellowship, the hand of friendship, should be extended or that the angle of vision should be changed. What is it exactly that he wants to be done? I may inform my Honourable friends what the position today is. There are, I believe,—my figures may not be as accurate as those which will be given by the Honourable the Home Member a little later, but they will be fairly accurate,—I believe

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

there are 69 prisoners who have been loosely called civil disobedience prisoners still in jail, and, of these 69, the largest contribution is from my Honourable friend's province. . . .

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Very naturally.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Very naturally? Yes. Now, about 30, I should say—(*An Honourable Member:* "40"),—I am told about 30. . . .

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I have been informed that the number is 41.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Very well, I will make it 35 and let us proceed as the exact figure really does not matter,—but the point is this,—if I am making any inaccuracy, it is because I have got up rather unexpectedly and my colleague, the Home Member, will correct me as regards the exact figures,—but of these 69 prisoners, the position, shortly speaking, is this. When the policy was indicated by the Government of India that the Civil Disobedience Movement having come to its end, the civil disobedience prisoners should be released and the matter should be expedited as much as is possible consistent with the examination of the cases of such a large number of persons and having regard to the local conditions, and so on, a distinction was made between people who had been in jail or convicted, if I may use that expression, for acts done under the Civil Disobedience Movement, that is to say, because they have been advocating the Civil Disobedience Movement, or doing things generally known under the Civil Disobedience Movement,—and those people who, though they might have been guilty of what is called civil disobedience activities, were also guilty of crime or violence. A distinction was made between these two classes of people. A man might have been a civil disobedience prisoner in the sense that he did nothing more than what was urged by the movement, namely, disobeying laws, picketing and other things,—I shall not go into all these details now,—I call him a civil disobedience prisoner, but there were some prisoners,—and I admit they are a small fraction of the 14,000,—who, in addition to what may be called the offence of civil disobedience as it was then understood, were also guilty of crimes of violence, though not necessarily of murder. Now, Sir, the release of the 69 prisoners who are now in jail, or of a very large proportion of them has been delayed on account of this complication, namely, that in the view of the Government, having regard to the information which they have obtained as regards those 69 prisoners, they had either generally been guilty of violence before they were imprisoned or they were connected with revolutionary activities, or, thirdly, they were those who, after the disappearance of the Civil Disobedience Movement, had committed offences subsequently. Under these three heads will be found the cases of these 69 prisoners who are still in jail. Probably my Honourable colleague has more information about it. And even as regards these 69 prisoners, judging by a recent answer given by my Honourable colleague, I gather that their cases are being reviewed with a view to seeing whether they can be released. Coming back, therefore, to the point on which my friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, wanted information, the position seems to

be this. There is now no one in the jails because he believes in the Civil Disobedience Movement; there is now no one in the jails because it is suspected that at some later date he will follow the methods of the Civil Disobedience Movement; there is now no one in jail,—I again say,—simply because he was guilty of what is compendiously called civil disobedience. Now, when the facts have been correctly placed before this House, I don't think there is really any issue between my friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, and ourselves. There is nothing more to be done. We have not kept anybody in jail now, because we suspect that he will take part in the movement if and when it breaks out. We are not playing on the words suspension of civil disobedience, withdrawal of civil disobedience or the final abandonment of the Civil Disobedience Movement,—there is no point in debating on the niceties of these words,—but, in practice, so far as punishing or keeping people in jails is concerned, no such point has been raised. We are proceeding on this footing, that people, who have suffered imprisonment or who have been punished simply because they boycotted or picketed or took part in other activities generally known as civil disobedience, should be released, and most of them have been released, and the few whose release has been delayed so far is due to the fact that they are mixed up with either violence or they had connection with terrorism or some other thing. . . .

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Is that violence in connection with the Civil Disobedience Movement or other violence independently of the Civil Disobedience Movement?

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): There has been no violence in connection with the Civil Disobedience Movement.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: How many of them are there who committed violence in connection with the Civil Disobedience Movement?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I will not attempt to answer my friend, Dr. Deshmukh, because there are people in this House who can deal with it better than I can do, but my Honourable friend's assumption that people who were guilty of civil disobedience had nothing to do with violence is wrong. I admit that a vast majority of them,—as Honourable Members will see from the figures that out of 14,000 there are now only 69 prisoners still in jail,—a vast majority of them had nothing to do with violence, among the cases I know there has been a case in Bengal in which a man attempted to murder and caused grievous hurt to a police officer,—I am answering a question whether any violence was committed in connection with the Civil Disobedience Movement. I shall give a hypothetical case,—I cannot give the facts of every case. Supposing in connection with picketing a shopkeeper asked these people to go away or a policeman turns up and tells these volunteers to allow the customers to come in, and suppose that leads to rioting, and in the melee either the shopkeeper or the police officer is assaulted or hurt or an attempt is made to murder either of these people, that comes under violence, and that is the kind of case we have in mind. Although in one sense the origin is the Civil Disobedience Movement, yet in these very few cases they were complicated by crimes of violence, that is what I meant by saying the two may be connected with each other. Therefore, I will not take up further time of the House on the question of the merits; there are other people to deal

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

with it. If I may give my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, a fairly lengthy notice, I shall deal with this matter at great length when I deal with his Bill when it comes up for discussion.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): You have already made up your mind to oppose it!

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: That Bill has only to be read to lead to one conclusion. I will not deal with any of those subjects now. I really got up to answer my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir. I can assure the House, including my Honourable friend, that it is not the policy of the Government at the present moment to keep anybody in jail because he was guilty of the activities connected with the Civil Disobedience Movement or because it is suspected that if he is let loose he will again indulge in those activities. That is the position, Sir, shortly, of the Government.

Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal (Agra Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to accord my wholehearted support to the motion that is before the House. But before doing so, I would like to say one or two things. The first thing I want to say is that, as a punishment for having picked up some acquaintance with English, I am compelled to speak in a language, in which I have not spoken, either publicly or privately, for the last eight or nine years. The second thing which I want to say is this, that if I use strong language, it is not because I want to hurt the feelings of anybody, but because I feel that I will not be true to myself and to those whom I represent if I do not give vent to the feelings which are innermost in our hearts. Especially after the reply which the Honourable the Leader of the House has given to the appeal of my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, there can be no moderation on a subject like this. Faced with a similar situation, a great American, William Lloyd Garrison, said:

"I am aware that many object to the severity of my language; but is there not cause for severity? I will be as harsh as truth, and as uncompromising as Justice. On this subject I do not wish to think, or speak, or write, with moderation. No! No! Tell a man whose house is on fire to give a moderate alarm; tell him to moderately rescue his wife from the hands of the ravisher; tell the mother to gradually extricate her babe from the fire into which it has fallen—but urge me not to use moderation in a cause like the present. I am in earnest—I will not equivocate—I will not excuse—I will not retreat a single inch—and I will be heard."

I cannot do better than to quote him in justification of the attitude I am going to take today.

Coming to the repressive policy of the Government, repression is the only remedy in the vast medical store of this bureaucracy, as
 3 P.M. a cure for all ills, economic and political, from which this country suffers. But, I say, this repression is a remedy which is worse than the disease. The verdict of history is against it. Repression has failed in America; it has failed in South Africa; it has failed in Ireland; it failed miserably in Russia; and it is not going to succeed in India. ("Hear, hear" from the Congress Party Benches.) But the bureaucracy like the House of Bourbons will neither learn anything nor forget anything. (An Honourable Member: "They will die.") (Laughter.) I will

not refer to the reign of terror that swept over the country from the 1st April, 1930, to the first quarter of 1934, that is, for four years. I will only deal with the repressive policy that is going on even today, when civil disobedience has been withdrawn. The press of the country remains muzzled, and while the bureaucracy has reserved to itself the liberty of lying, it won't allow us even the freedom of speech, freedom to speak out our own thoughts. My Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, has already referred to the fact that the Hindustani Seva Dal is still an unlawful organisation. We know that this institution is a part and parcel of the Congress and every volunteer enrolled in the Hindustani Seva Dal has to take a vow that he will be non-violent in word, deed and thought. And that institution remains unlawful, because the Honourable the Home Member the other day said that it had been found guilty of having committed revolutionary acts in certain provinces! But the House has not been taken into confidence in this matter. We do not know in what provinces those acts were committed and what were those acts which are described as revolutionary. The case of the Prem Maha Vidyalaya, Brindaban, is another instance in point. This is a purely educational institution. It was founded in 1909 for imparting technical and vocational training. It is the gift to the nation by that prince among patriots, Raja Mahendra Pratap. He has donated a large portion of his landed estate in order to keep up and maintain that institution. But, Sir, the only crime that this institution committed was that some members of the staff and some of the students of that Vidyalaya took part in the Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930. The world was given to understand that the sins of omission and commission on either side in that movement came to an end after the Gandhi-Irwin Pact. But, Sir, this institution, the Prem Maha Vidyalaya, Brindaban, has been banned for no other offence than that of taking part in the civil disobedience of 1930. In the movement of 1932, it has done nothing. Before the movement started, that is, on the 7th January, 1932, the trustees of the institution met and decided to close the institution *sine die*. They also disposed of the services of their staff so as to absolve themselves from the liability of paying them when the institution was closed. Even after that, on the 16th January, the institution was banned and that ban has not been removed. In March, at the instance of the District Magistrate, Muttra, the trustees met together and passed a resolution that they would not allow the staff and the students of that institution to take part in any unlawful activities. Even after that assurance, the institution still remains banned. I may make it clear that, though this is the gift of Raja Mahendra Pratap, he has now nothing to do with that institution.

Then, there is the case of Khudai Khidmatgars, about which this House has recorded its vote and given its opinion. But, Sir, not only does that organisation remain unlawful, but its great leader, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, has been awarded a vindictive sentence of two years. (*An Honourable Member from the Congress Party Benches*: "Shame!"). . . for placing their side of the case before a select audience of Christians in Bombay.

All these acts of repression amount to nothing when compared to what is happening in Bengal. If truth were to be told about the British bureaucracy's reign of white terror in Bengal, the tales of Hitler's brown terror would pale into insignificance.

[Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal.]

Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru has been thrown into jail for daring to tell that truth. Sir, I read in this morning's paper that he is going to be released conditionally provided he is prepared to go with his wife to foreign countries for treatment. We do not know anything about it, except that report in the newspapers. We do not know whether if he is allowed to go outside, he will meet the same fate as Subhash Chandra Bose met and whether he will be made an exile not being allowed to come back to his country. We do not know about the Government's intentions. We cannot say what is going to happen to him. But I can say this much from my personal knowledge of Panditji that he will be the last man to accept such conditions.

It may be said, and it was said just now by the Honourable the Leader of the House, that because certain persons have been guilty of violence they are being given differential treatment and it may be said that, so far as detenus and other terrorists are concerned, they are guilty of violence. Sir, I can understand Mahatma Gandhi, the apostle of non-violence condemning violence, but, Sir, it does not lie in the mouth of this Government whose very existence depends upon violence to condemn the violence of these youths who, out of sheer desperation of the policy of this Government, take to this path. These youngmen, however strongly we may differ from them, can plead in their justification the sense of shame they feel at the condition of their country, but what is the justification for the violence of the Government? Sir, the violence of the Government to subjugate a whole nation is a sin against God and a crime against humanity. And a Government which is guilty of that sin and that crime cannot and should not condemn others for their violence. And, then, who is responsible for driving these youths to the path which they have taken? Who crowns them with the glory of martyrdom? I do not know how bombs are made, but, as a student of political movements, I know how bomb throwers are made, and I say that the system which obtains in India at present is the greatest manufactory for manufacturing bomb throwers. The Government deny to the sons of the soil the rights of citizens. They deny to them the rights of human beings. They starve them to death. They herd them like cattle. They beat them like dogs, and when they turn round and bite them in the leg, they look surprised and shocked. Yesterday, the Honourable the Leader of the House blamed us for not keeping an open mind and he also blamed us for not listening to reason. Well, Sir, he is a lawyer and lawyers have to keep their minds open, because they do not know which side will engage them. (Laughter.) But, Sir, if he thinks that we are not misled by his professional reasoning, and, therefore, we should not reason out things for ourselves, he is mistaken. The real fact is that every fibre of our being reasons against him. The hunger of the people reasons in their stomach. The burning sense of shame reasons in our heart against the system which keeps us in its grip. The thousands of detenus behind the prison walls make a tremendous appeal to our minds.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has only two minutes more.

Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal: I will try to close as soon as possible. In the face of all these reasons, how can he expect to hear any more

of his reasoning. If he is so very enamoured of his reasoning, let him go and reason with Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru and ask him why he prefers to live in jail when his wife and his aged mother are lying in their sick beds in different hospitals. Let him go and reason with Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan and ask him why he prefers the life of a prisoner to the Chief Ministership of the Frontier Province. Let him go and ask Bhagat Singh why he preferred gallows to the whole vista of human life. Let him go and reason with the brave Bengali girls and ask them why they have taken to the path of violence, and then, and then alone he will be able to understand why his professional reasoning falls flat upon our ears. Sir, I know that the Honourable Member will do nothing of the kind. In their pride of power, the gentlemen sitting over there do not care at all about the opinions expressed on this side of the House. But, Sir, their ill-concealed glee at their seeming victory over the Congress is also ill-conceived. They are labouring under false sense of security; if they think that everything is all right in this world. Let them remember that it is the darkest before the dawn and who knows that the calm which we see today may not be the calm which precedes a serious storm? Sir, the pangs of hunger and the burning sense of national dishonour are dangerous forces to cope with and I warn the Government that they play with fire in playing with them. We do not need a Gandhi to lead the nation in its non-violent struggle for Purna Swaraj. We do not want a Jawahar Lal Nehru to galvanise the people into action, nor do we need a Bhagat Singh to preach the cult of violent revolution. The Third Internationale may save themselves the trouble of sending emissaries to preach communism here. The British bureaucracy is doing the task of all these people more thoroughly, more efficiently and more effectively by the policy which they are pursuing. Yesterday, Mr. James, who belongs to the European Group, asked us as to why we have come to this House? My answer to his question is that we have come to save the Government from the suicidal policy which they are following, and I appeal to every section of the House to help us in this task. I appeal to the loyalists especially and say that if they are really loyal, let them bring the Government to a sense of reality by voting with us on this motion.

Mr. N. R. Mukerje (Bengal: Nominated Official): Sir, my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, just said that it is time that some of the officials from the provinces spoke. After the speech that I have heard from the Honourable Member who has just spoken, mentioning the affairs of Bengal and of Bengal women, I think I should be failing in my duty if I did not speak on this motion. I am a Bengali first and an Indian afterwards. (*Voices from the Opposition Benches*: "We are all Indians.") Yes, I know, but, then, there is something nearer than our country, and that is our home. When we talk of repressive policy, we generally do not care to think what brings about that repressive policy. What originates them? Sir, when the situation becomes too acute to allow of a calm thinking of the root cause, it becomes necessary to take immediate action. (*Interruption from the Opposition Benches*.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Honourable Members on the non-official side have been constantly demanding that more Members on the Government Benches should speak during the debate and tell them what they think about particular subjects, and therefore, the Chair hopes, when they get up to speak, they will be patiently heard.

Mr. N. B. Mukerje: I will take a simile from the doctor's treatment. When the homeopaths' slow symptomatic treatment with its root causes has to make room for the Surgeons knife, this so-called repressive policy becomes necessary. I am not a man who does not believe in the root cause of the disease being removed. I fully believe that no radical or permanent cure can be possible unless the root cause of the disease is removed, but at the same time I equally firmly believe that when gangrene has set in, and a particular limb has become so poisoned as to bring about the risk of death to the patient, it is for the surgeon to cut the limb off. At the same time, I must say that it is for the surgeon not to stop there, but to go on treating the disease proper and try to cure it. But, Sir, the work of the doctor, the progress of the cure, is bound to be slow, and unfortunately at times or as I should say oftentimes the patient becomes impatient of the slow progress. With healthy blood running through his vein, his appetite increases, and he wants to eat, without caring whether that eating will bring about complication and death. The same is the experience of people who try to infuse new blood, new forms of Government into an old country where the autocratic reigns have prevailed for hundreds of years and sapped the vitality with its many complications, with its various intricacies of castes, sub-castes, religions, sub-religions and the latest one, the Harijans,—features which make the work very complicated indeed. Naturally, the pace has to be very very slow. Sir, India is a very very old country. We are proud of our motherland (Laughter from the Opposition Benches), she reached the highest pinnacle of perfection and greatness when many of the foremost nations of the present day were just peeping out of primitive condition. But, Sir, the system of Government in India from time immemorial has always been autocratic. The king, no matter whether he was good, bad or indifferent was the king. From the times of Rama down to those of the Great Mughals the same thing prevailed, namely, the rule of the one autocratic king! If Rama was a great king and a good king, he was the king. If Akbar was a great Emperor, he was the Emperor. They selected their own councillors, they selected their own advisers, they selected their own ministers, the people had no voice in that. (Ironical Opposition Cheers.) There could be no contradiction. (Interruptions.) Sir, the time given to me is very short, but if any of my brethren wants to discuss the point with me later, I am willing to give him even a whole day. (Laughter.) Well, Sir, as I was saying, if they were great men, they were great men themselves. We had among others great poets, great philosophers, great warriors, great administrators and heroes, but it was all the individual achievements of individual great men. Taking the nation as a whole, that great popular conception of "patriotism", as used in the present day sense, did not exist. And that was because the people never know or never were given any opportunity to feel that it was their country in the sense as their hearth and home was very much their own for which they would lay down their lives if necessary. To them a kingdom was the King's own property. If the king was defeated, he had to go, it did not matter much to the people. They remained only idle spectators, and that was because they had no hand in the management of the country and never thought it their own.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is not speaking to the motion before the House, which is the "repressive policy of the Government".

Mr. N. R. Mukerje: I am on that point, Sir.

An Honourable Member: Why do you not get straight to it?

Mr. N. R. Mukerje: I must have to step it on before I can reach Delhi. Well, Sir, it was with the advent of the British that the people began to wake up from their long, long slumber. At first we were asked to look after and manage the affairs of our towns, and municipal committees were formed. We then began to cast our eyes beyond the environment of our homes over the whole town. Then, we were called up to go to the Councils of Lieutenant-Governors and to the Council of the Governor General. We thus came to know our neighbours in the districts in the provinces and gradually in the other parts of India. The India of the present day began to be shaped. But, Sir, this progress was bound to be slow, and the patient began to be impatient, and, in 1905, a boycott movement was launched. It was an ill day that brought that boycott movement, with its race hatred and all the attending evils. (Hear, hear.) I know my brethren will deny that it was ever the aim of the sponsors of that movement that there should be any race hatred and I concede that, but when you call up young lads from the schools and illiterate people from the villages and ask them to go on boycotting the goods of any particular nation, it cannot but bring in the personal element, and race hatred is sure to be created. The next step was, the boys were asked to leave and boycott the schools. Hundreds of boys were thus let loose, out of control of the teachers and out of control of the parents, who unfortunately could not boycott their stomach, but had to be away in the offices, and these boys fell into the hands of dishonest and designing persons, for in all movements for every small band of a few good men there come up hundreds of bad men. Now, these men gradually began to instil into the minds of these boys young, honestly believing, inexperienced youths that every thing done for the country was bound to be good. That the work for their country required money, and there were people who had more money than they had a use for and that money was required for the country. Gradually dacoities were planned, and we know of the dacoities that began to be committed. And with the dacoities came bloodshed and a callousness to the feelings of, and injuries caused to, others and the next step was direct act of violence and murder. Many people began to think that the more bitterly they could speak, the more notoriety would they gain. One Brahma Bandhab, began to write of "*mā kdlir homā*" in the *Sandhya* newspaper of Calcutta. This Government, Sir, which is always blamed for what is called its repressive policy, kept quiet. It did not act, as the old indigeneous Indian Governments would have acted straightaway. The result was that these murders and dacoities continued till the physician found that the gangrene had so set in, the disease was so acute that it had to be stopped at once without waiting any further for the root cause, and we find, Sir, that in 1908, Sir Harvey Adamson moved the Criminal Law Amendment Bill. I shall quote a passage from his speech, because it gives in short the exact thing as it happened in those days:

"The following are some of the more prominent instances of anarchical crime which have occurred in Bengal and Eastern Bengal during the past year. On the 6th December, 1907, an attempt was made to assassinate the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal by means of a bomb exploded under his train near Midnapore. Two other abortive attempts of a similar nature on Sir Andrew Fraser's life had already been made on the railway line near Chandernagore. On the 23rd December, 1907, Mr. Allen, the

[Mr. N. R. Mukerje.]

District Magistrate of Dacca, was shot with a revolver at Goalundo. On 4th March, 1908, Mr. Hickenbotham of the Church Missionary Society was shot near his house at Kushtia. On 11th April, an attempt was made to assassinate the Mayor of Chandernagore by a bomb. On the 30th April, a bomb intended for Mr. Kingsford, who had been Presidency Magistrate at Calcutta, was thrown into a carriage at Muzaffarpur and killed Mrs. and Miss. Kennedy. On the 2nd May, the Manicktolla Bomb Conspiracy was brought to light. On the 2nd June, a serious dacoity was committed near Nawabganj in Dacca District by a large band armed with guns and revolvers, in which two persons were killed. On the 21st June, a bomb was thrown into a railway carriage at Kankinara and injured an English gentleman, and there have been several similar attempts in the same neighbourhood. On the 31st August, an approver in the Manicktolla case, which is under trial at Alipore, was murdered by a revolver. On the 17th September, a serious dacoity was committed at Serampore. On the 20th and 30th October, similar dacoities were committed in Malda and Faridpore districts."

I would not go into all the details. (A Voice: "Finish the catalogue and read out the years also".)

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah (Sind Jagirdars and Zamindars: Landholders): All this is a tale of repression against officials; I want to hear something, some allegations of repression against others.

Mr. N. R. Mukerje: I was just going to say that; not only it were the officials whom they killed, but, as many a man of that time will remember, they shot down a well known citizen, Babu Ashutosh Biswas, a famous lawyer of the district bar at Alipore, whose only crime was that he conducted Government cases.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): All this does not throw any light on the present question before the House.

Mr. N. R. Mukerje: I am coming to that, Sir, from the past on to the present, showing the whole connection. (Laughter from the Opposition Benches.)

As I said, Sir, it was these things which made it necessary to pass these Acts which they call repressive Acts and for the passing of which they themselves were responsible. As I was saying, Sir, Government did not sit idle with this Act which is called a repressive Act. They went forward; like the wise doctor they tried to get to the root cause. We know of the Morley-Minto Reforms; we know of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms and we know also of the Round Table Conferences that were called, but all these required time, and unfortunately our people would not have the patience and started the Civil Disobedience Movement. It is said that the Civil Disobedience Movement was non-violent. True, it starts with the word "civil". But, Sir, this movement which sounds quite innocent from a distance is nothing but violent. Violence does not consist in beating a man on the back with a stick; there is such a thing as violence to your feelings and doing act that is sure to lead violence. I want to go to a shop to purchase a thing. A man comes and stands before me and says: "I will not allow you to go to the shop. I beg of you please do not go." "But I cannot wait? I have got to purchase the thing?"—"No, Sir, please don't" says the man and even falls on my feet and catches hold of my legs. My urgency being great, I push him aside, at once a hue and cry is raised that a non-violent man has been assaulted and I find myself in trouble. This is how this thing went on. Following this began again the old old things, dacoities, loot and murder. Sir, my friend over there spoke of the brave girls of Bengal. The worst of it is that such brave girls came

from Bengal. I know of brave girls whose names I have read in the history who sent their sons and husbands to fight in honourable wars. But I can never be proud of girls who shoot down unarmed men and even women who have done no harm to them. It was a girl who attempted on the life of the Governor at the Convocation, two other girls in their teens shot the Collector at Comilla. It was a girl that led the raid on the Chittagong Pahartali Railway Institute killing an elderly woman and injuring others. I was in Chittagong and speak from personal knowledge. Then, we had the murder of the Collectors of Midnapore, particularly Mr. Burge, who was particularly fond of Indians and was at the time leading an Indian team at football. It is these things which compelled the Government to have laws which they call repressive.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal: Landholders): What about Sarat Chandra Bose?

Mr. N. R. Mukerje : Sarat Chandra Bose pales before whole of India. When the question of the whole of India is concerned, one man does not count, particularly as I do not know the details.

As I was saying, all the laws that have been passed in Bengal were passed by a vast majority of the Bengal Councillors. People who knew Bengal and who knew the necessities of Bengal more than those friends of mine who come from Southern India and such far off places and talk of brave girls of Bengal, were responsible for the passing of these laws by a regular big majority, because of the condition of Bengal, where, I may mention, there have been as many as 286 cases of violence from 1930 to 1934, including robberies, dacoities and murder.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Mr. N. R. Mukerje: Considering the way in which I have been interrupted, I hope you will be good enough to make some allowance for it. I have not yet answered some of the specific points raised.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair will give the Honourable Member two minutes more.

Mr. N. R. Mukerje: Well, Sir, they spoke of the Associations from which the ban should be removed. In Midnapore, at the present moment, there are about one hundred such associations. There is a regular network of them all over the districts with their headquarters at each Thana which go by one name or the other of Congress Institution. Among the members, there are also school teachers. Their whole business was to corrupt boys and send them out to commit murders and dacoities. These people who have not the courage to face the music themselves but seduce and misguide bright innocent boys who would be otherwise ornaments of any country to commit acts that bring shame to their race are asked to be released! They ask for the release of non-violent civil disobedience prisoners. As has just been explained by the Honourable the Law Member, no Civil Disobedience Movement prisoner is in jail, but those who are in the jail have committed acts of violence in the sense of physical violence. It was said that they are badly treated in jail. I can vouch as a visitor to the Tippera, Chittagong and Midnapore jails that nowhere have they been treated badly.

[Mr. N. R. Mukerje.]

Then, Sir, we were told about the Abhay Ashram as a non-violent Ashram. I have personal knowledge of it also. I was at Comilla, and my friend, the Deputy President, Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta, who is from Comilla, will bear me out when I give only one instance of the non-violence of this Ashram. It was the Janmashtami procession at Comilla. It was the first time that the Hindus at Comilla, advised by the Congress Party, decided that they should have the Janmashtami procession because the Muhammadans were having their Muharram procession. It was arranged that the main procession was to be led by the Ashram people. In the morning at about 9 o'clock, just as I had finished my bath, some police officers ran up to me and said that two murders had been committed near the Abhay Ashram. I ran up at once taking a bus with me for emergency. When I reached there, I found that one Muhammadan had been killed and three wounded. The man that was killed had a spear wound and the spear was lying there with the paper flag of the processionists on it. The Government pleader, Rai Bahadur Bhudhar Das, was with me and Kamini Babu also came up. I told Kamini Babu that the procession of Janmashtami ought to be stopped in deference to the feelings of the Muhammadans owing to this murder. As the man murdered was a Muhammadan, they might think that the leading Hindus were callous to their feeling and were in sympathy with people forming the procession. The procession was then going to start from the house of a gentleman whose name I forget at the moment. This gentleman has got a big business in homœopathy medicines. Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta, our Deputy President, can help me with the name of this gentleman. (Pause.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member should go on.

Mr. N. R. Mukerje: Well, Kamini Babu agreed with me that the procession should be stopped. (Interruptions.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair hopes Honourable Members will not go on interrupting as it wastes the time of the House.

Mr. N. R. Mukerje: As I was saying, he promised to go and stop it. The processionists told him that they would not stop the procession. The Ashram people would not hear him. In the meantime, Muhammadans in large numbers were gathering there round the dead body and wanted to take it on a bier. I knew that there would be a horrible fight if the body was carried like that, and I had to get into the *mêlée* and get the corpse taken in the bus. Then I ran to the other place where the Ashram people were gathering. I was surprised to find that the procession, in spite of the occurrence, was starting. They carried flags which were not quite innocent flags. Some of them were on iron spears and some of them were on sharpened bamboos which could be used as spears. I went there and told them what had happened and asked them to stop it in the name of humanity. They asked me to pass a formal legal order; they would not obey my verbal order. So, I had to enter the house where I wrote out an order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code. By the time I came out, they had started again. I ran after them again and caught them and

read out my order to them. Some pleaders, who were in the procession, came out with members of the Ashram and said: "This is not a valid order, because it has not been promulgated with the beating of the drum". I said this order is meant for people who are standing in front of me. While they kept me talking, they again stole a march over me and I found the main procession had proceeded. I had to run and stop it personally by barring its way bodily. That is how things happened there, Sir, all non-violence.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has already exceeded his time limit.

Mr. Akhil Chandra Dutta: What is the result of that case?

Mr. N. B. Mukerji: Well, Sir, if you give me time, I shall be able to answer the question put by your Deputy.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has already exceeded his time.

Mr. N. B. Mukerji: Then, I will close by saying that I have clearly showed to the House that this repressive policy, as it is called, is not at all a matter of policy with the Government. It is an act of necessity. It is the surgeon's lancet which has to be used per force. The Government never had recourse to repression and stopped there. They always forged ahead with the Constitutional Reforms for the good of the country. For the time my Honourable friends opposite may not agree that the Government mean doing any good to the country. They might complain that the Government are moving very very slow. As an Indian, I say that I would like to see my country progress as fast as possible, I would like to see my country reach the highest pinnacle of glory. Only I do not agree with jumping the heights that are meant to climb nor appreciate forced roses that may look well but never smell and sweet.

Sir, I oppose the cut motion.

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity of addressing this House after a month's silent waiting. I am a new recruit to this House, and I have not yet been able to know my exact vocation here. Sir, I have been a dreamer, a dreamer all my life, a dreamer for a free and a happy India. Sir, yesterday the Honourable the Leader of the House, Sir Nripendra Sircar, said he was dreaming, he dreamed for a moment, and I say I have been dreaming all throughout my life as freedom was my cradle song, and, consequently, if today I go beyond my measure, I hope you will show me some indulgence.

Sir, in speaking about this budget, I beg to state that I never think piecemeal about my country, I always think of my country as a whole. I never care as to what this House had to say on the budget, because I know it is a dogmatic assertion of forced realisation of taxes and revenue and prodigal spending of the same, and it is not based on any sound and healthy policy, because the British Government, since their advent into India, had no other policy except one policy, and that is of exploitation, and all the acts and laws and activities of the Government which sit over

[Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya.]

the destinies of three hundred-fifty millions of people of the country are proof positive of that policy, which has been pursued from beginning to this day. I admit that repression has to be resorted to by all Governments when there is a revolt, but when a Government takes up repression as the normal day to day policy, that Government forfeits its claim to be called a Government. When the British Government in India adopt a policy to keep the entire population of India in eternal bondage and for that resort to continuous coercion, then the whole country has, as a matter of course, the right to rise against it. In 1757, in Bengal, i.e., since the British fought the battle of Plassey, they started this policy of repression; this policy is not a thing of today or yesterday. The people of India co-operated with the British unknowingly and unconsciously and the people then, who had all the necessities and luxuries of life easily supplied to them, when the land was flowing with milk and honey, and when the people in the villages were all well fed and well clothed, when they were full of vigour, without much thought about the world events, they fought for the British Government and handed over the country to the Britishers. Sir, the Britishers had no trouble in founding an Empire in India. They found a people easily co-operating and the Britishers took full advantage of the co-operating spirit of our forbears and founded an Empire. But all the same they began to pursue a policy of repression. The policy of repression led them in the beginning not so much to exploit the people as to exploit their wealth. They had one and only one idea of getting as much money from the people of India for themselves and their country as possible. When the British took over the *dewani* they began to loot the country by way of revenue and profits in trade. After 40 years of such exploitation, they themselves felt ashamed of it in England and then they sent Governors who gave us this permanent settlement. With due deference to my zamindar friends, I say, I look to this permanent settlement system as a policy, as one of the engines of repression in this country. That is only another disguised policy of repression, because, by this process, the Government weaned away a lot of intelligent Indians and made them slaves to Government, and these poor zamindars were made to do all the dirty work of the Government in the way of exploitation of the masses and the Britishers took all the spoils out of this.

An Honourable Member: What about our friend, Mr. Lahiri Chaudhury?

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: I do not say that permanent settlement has nothing in its favour. I was only pointing out how this permanent settlement was responsible for weaning away our best men from the cause of the country and for making them the supporters of Government from the very beginning of the advent of the British into this country. This is the second item of repressive policy pursued by the Government in this country.

Then, came the third, Sir, namely, the educational policy. I will say, before 1833, i.e., before the Charter Act, the British Government had been trying to pursue a repressive policy which had become quite intolerable to Indians. Since then, by a slow process, the Britishers have been pursuing a dual policy in the country. They tempted us by giving us something in the way of reforms and privileges and from behind they pursued

the reverse policy of taking away our manhood and our sense of self-respect and thus demoralising us gradually. Today, Sir, we are speaking of the repressive policy contained in these Repressive Laws. I do not see much in these as they are only effects of the policy, Laws and Acts. I say the policy has been continuous and constant from the very beginning, and, therefore, I do not ask that these laws should be repealed. The cure lies in the Government changing their mentality and their policy altogether. They must trust Indians who have nourished the Britishers, who have enriched England by giving them their blood and life. The Indians fought for the cause of the British in the earlier days hoping that civilised people, as they were, co-operation would change their hearts in the long run. Unfortunately the Britishers never cared to take any sound and good advice of any body in India during all these years. Great Englishmen there were who gave them sound advice,—advice if followed would at any rate exonerate them from many acts of commissions and omissions, but all these fell on deaf ears. The English lost America, because they did not pay heed to the advice and warning of Burke and Sheridan and similarly they will lose India if they do not listen to the advice of Indians. It is a pity that they have no friends in England in these days like Burke and Monstuart Elphinston, Sir Thomas Munro, Sir Malcolm Ludlow and others, and today, Sir, they have to take the advice of Indians and act up to them, if they mean to remain in India. Sir, I have heard the speech of my Honourable friend, Mr. Mukerji. I never could believe that a man who called himself a Bengali could speak in that strain and dare speak so lightly of Upadhyaya as *one* Upadhyaya by name, one of the greatest men of Bengal who gave a new life to Bengal. Well, Sir, how can a pampered Government servant appreciate the services of this eminent man of Bengal? Sir, since 1839, the British Government tried to give us something in lieu of our happiness tempting us to tolerate all their repressive actions. We lost our trade, we lost our industries, we lost our food and we lost our health and everything which might keep us on and we lost our sense of disgrace which made us meekly accept their rule. I shall quote only one passage from the speech of Dr. Alexander Duff of blessed memory. This speech was delivered in 1837 and this will give an idea of what good and pious men of England thought:

“There have been deeds perpetrated by sons of Britain in the plains of Hindusthan, deeds that in number cannot be reckoned in order, deeds of unutterable infamy, deeds that are engraven in character of blood in the ineffaceable pages of history and registered as eternal memorial against us in the book of God's remembrance.”

This speech gave a summary of all the activities of the merchant Government till 1837.

Next I shall come to the Mutiny of 1857. Sir, why did that Mutiny at all take place in India? Why did the sepoys revolt? The reasons are to be found in the pages of history. The annexation policy of Lord Dalhousie, and, apart from that, the social, religious and economic actions of Government all tended to make the sepoys revolt. And since then what have we got? We have got the oft-vaunted *rule of law*, after disarming the whole Indian population, insulting their manhood, depriving them of the power to hold arms to defend their own hearth and home and their country against foreign aggression, leaving them absolutely under the protection

[Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya.]

of the British army which Sir Henry Gidney is so fond and proud of. Sir, has any nation in this world dealt with another nation of much less than 350 millions of people in this way? Did England, after King Charles was beheaded, take away arms from her youths? If England did that, what would have been the result? The Indian people were sober, the Indian people were moderate, the Indian people subjected themselves to all sorts of tyranny, and yet they are given these repressive laws. Sir, all this tended to bring in these secret societies. I say I know about the so-called charges against these detenus much more and better than the Honourable the Home Member knows. They are as false, even false, than the persons who brought them against the victims of suspicion. I have myself suffered, and I know how false charges of dacoity and murder were brought against me, charges which were as false as the persons who brought them. Sir, I ask the Honourable the Home Member, whom does he believe? Does he believe in those ill-fed and ill-paid informers? Are they truthful men and can he vouch for the truth of the information which has sent 2,500 young men of Bengal, blooming and patriotic young men of Bengal, on suspicion only as detenus? Does he mean to say that he could have done this in England? No. And, Sir, because it is India, because it is unarmed India, there is no second Mutiny again. I ask him again to think thrice and to consider this matter. Sir, I can vouch for many of them that they are not men of violence, and, with due deference to the Leader of the House, I can say that most of those who are now in jail in connection with the Civil Disobedience Movement are not at all connected with violence. I know many of them thoroughly and very familiarly, and I can say that they never thought of violence and can never think of violence, and still they are in jail for the Civil Disobedience Movement, even after its suspension or withdrawal as you may choose to call it.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: Will you kindly give me some more time?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair will give the Honourable Member two minutes more.

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: Sir, as it is my first speech here, you will show me some consideration.

Sir, nobody has said anything as regards the causes that led to this terrorism. This country was once a happy country and people never looked to what was going on outside this country. They were affluent, their fields were full of crops and they had everything that was required for their domestic happiness. That country has been rendered desolate in every way. Education has gone. Hundred thousands of indigenous village schools only in Lower Bengal had been suppressed when Lord Macaulay's system of education came; and, that I say from their own book, *vide* Marriot "The English in India", page 201. Sir, we have got education

which does not tally with our life; we have got education that has taken away from us the very sense of self-respect. We study for our bread and not for the sake of getting education. We have to depend upon the British Government for our bread, and that is another way of slow poisoning that has overpowered us. Sir, from all points of view I feel that we are helpless. It is a sheer sense of helplessness, it is a sheer sense of despair, that send our young men to form themselves into secret societies. When they see young British sailors coming out of their ships and men of war and merchant vessels, when they see young British soldiers walking in the streets of Calcutta and Bombay, they feel the shame of living a life like this. Why do you not trust them and make them soldiers? Why do you not give them scope to prove their worth? Sir, the spirit is there, but where is the scope? If you deprive young men of the scope of showing their worth, you are responsible for secret societies. India never knew this, it has come from the west and it is their own creation. And, now, having created causes of all these secret societies, they say that this spirit must be curbed. It cannot be curbed in this way; repression cannot curb this spirit.

You know what sort of repression is going on in Midnapore. Have you any idea as to how your laws are being executed there? I do not quarrel with the laws, I quarrel with their execution. I know Magistrates like Mr. Mukerji go beyond the law, to the eternal shame of British prestige and British civilisation. And I can give you one incident which I ought not to have brought before this House. During the Civil Disobedience Movement, there was a murder in Midnapore, and, for the sake of one suspected absconder, a whole village was punished. Men and women were brought out stark naked into the streets (*Cries of "Shame"*), and when they closed their eyes in shame the police said: "We will pull out your eyes if you do not look at one another". You never know these incidents. I know you can never think of this or imagine this, but these things do happen.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No.

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: I am quite prepared to hear that "No" and I know you will say "No". But my own people are there and they say "Yes".

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: Why not have an inquiry?

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: No inquiry can be started on these points, it is impossible to hold an inquiry into all this. Sir, can you imagine that a wife has been outraged before her husband? Can you imagine that a son has been taken away from the father and thrown into a neighbouring tank and beaten with regulation *lathis* to death? But these things have happened, and do you mean to say that men's blood has become so cold that they will accept this for ever? No. I, therefore, request the Honourable the Home Member to consider my appeal to him. My brother is an externee and I lost a brother in internment. I do not mind that: but I tell this Honourable House to give the best consideration to this matter, this simple request, this simple proposition: repeal these Acts, change the policy and win the affection of the people. (Loud and Prolonged Opposition Cheers.)

Mr. J. Monteth (Bombay: Nominated Official): Mr. President, in the ordinary course it would have been neither my desire nor my duty to intervene in this discussion or to explain why I consider it undesirable to give my vote in support of the motion for this cut. But the Honourable the Mover has made certain references to the action, or rather the inaction, of the Government of the Presidency by which I am deputed to appear in this Assembly, and my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, has also suggested that he would be in a better position to know how to vote sometimes if he had certain facts given to him by the people who come from the provinces in the position in which I am now. The Honourable the Mover, I say, referred to the hesitation of the Bombay Government in removing the ban previously, during the campaign of the Civil Disobedience Movement, imposed on certain associations which came into existence during the process of that campaign or in restoring to those associations certain buildings or property which had been attached and which they previously possessed. And it is only in connection with the attitude of the Bombay Government in regard to this particular matter that I am now presuming to address this august Assembly and to attempt to explain shortly what might be otherwise obscure to some Honourable Members.

I think that I can suggest, at any rate by certain information that I have received from Bombay recently, that this tardiness on the part of the Bombay Government is not really very striking. These associations existed and still exist in name in certain areas of the province and I should like in the first place to ask what they are and in some cases what they are called. Some of them are *prabhat feris*—bands of youths who, I think, march in the morning generally and sing songs in praise of revolution. Many of them are called *chaonis*, which, in Guzerat, and, probably, in other parts of Bombay and India, is taken to mean sheds erected for troops, encampments intended for resistance to authority. One at least of them goes by the name of the Kayadabhang Mandal, which, for the benefit possibly of my European friends, I may explain means an association to accomplish breach of law. These associations may be the off-shoots of the recent Congress campaign, but they are not constituent elements of the Congress body. I think I am right in saying that.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta).]

I ask you, would any Government be wise if it were to allow, without consideration, associations of such a nature and such a description to function without some restriction? It is this kind of association which enabled the revolutionary elements in society in the recent past to hamper, with the discipline which they had inculcated in their members, the efforts of constituted Government to preserve peace in the Presidency of Bombay; and the Bombay Government is still considering how far it can give some of these associations further liberty. Meanwhile, the Bombay Government has removed the ban and restored the property of no less than 225 associations which formed and which still form constituent parts of the Congress. It has released Congress funds which were attached during the movement to the amount of approximately Rs. 1½ lakhs, and it is now considering in detail to what further associations which are not constituent parts of the Congress body it could safely restore facilities, and I believe it has already

removed the ban on more than 80 of them. Now, Sir, can you blame them in view of past recent experience if they consider carefully before they return freedom to revolutionary associations? I would suggest that they are acting prudently, not only in their present interest and in the present interests of the public, but also in the interests of the well-being of those who are to follow them in achieving tranquillity in the country. They move slowly in the removal of restrictions on bodies whose avowed purpose, when they came into being, at any rate, was to break the law and to disturb those who desired to pursue their legitimate avocations peacefully and in many cases to advance communism.

I said I would be very short, and I propose to say nothing more since I am speaking on one particular subject. These are some of the reasons why I personally at any rate on this occasion do not propose to vote with the Honourable the Mover of the cut, and possibly it may help the Honourable Members of this House to make up their minds, if they have entertained any doubts as to the facts concerning the question at issue.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin (Punjab: Landholders): Sir, it is a matter of regret to me that the first time I am to have the honour of addressing this Assembly, I have to differ from my Deputy Leader. However, I am very glad, in his speech he was very restrained and said that he would keep an open mind to the last. I think it is the inherent right of every Legislature to judge the acts of the Executive and to pass opinions on it; there can be no doubt on that account; and I hold that the Executive who are sitting on the Treasury Benches are responsible to us: even though not legally, they are certainly morally responsible to us. That is because they are the public servants and we are the elected representatives of the people.

Now, Sir, the only criterion by which we should judge this Government so far as their policy in the matter of so-called repressive laws is concerned is in what circumstances they used repression or force. Was there really any necessity to enforce those laws or was it only a case of over-imagination on the part of those gentlemen whom we only yesterday accused of the lack of imagination? Sir, my submission is, that so far as the Punjab and Bengal are concerned in the conditions which then prevailed the ordinary laws were of no avail at all, because, in those days, a good many murders were committed in both these provinces. I really cannot understand the mentality of the terrorists, whose victims ranged from the highest officials to an ordinary school master. I cannot understand the mentality of a man who in the name of patriotism murders a school master. What does he hope to gain by such an act? Does he hope that the foundations of the British Empire will be shaken by such a foul deed? There is no point in it. There is only one thing that the terrorists did achieve by the murder of this poor man, and it is this, perhaps there is a widow somewhere in a Bengal village,—and we all know what the plight of Indian widows is,—the poor widow whose world crashed around her. Perhaps there is also a bereaved mother who may be mourning the loss of her son, and the children who every evening await in vain the return of their sire.

Now, Sir, turning to my own province, I may say that the victims of these terrorists were generally those people who were popular in the country. Sir, a dastardly attempt was made on the life of our popular Governor, Sir Geoffrey de Montmorency, and I can tell the House what sort of a person he was. He served our province for thirty years, and

[Mr. M. Ghiasuddin.]

for nine years, I believe. he was the Deputy Commissioner of Lyallpur district, which is one of our most prosperous districts, and before he laid down the reins of his office he went to bid farewell to Lyallpur,—and I can assure you, Sir, there was genuine grief among the people, because they were losing a friend (Cheers from Punjab Members),—and I think all the elected Members from the Punjab and also the Honourable the Home Member who had the privilege of acting as a colleague of Sir Geoffrey de Montmorency will bear me out when I say that he was really loved by the people. Now, when such a nice and sympathetic man, when wearing the sacred robes of his office as Chancellor of the Punjab University, came out of the Hall, he was shot at. Thank God, Sir, he was not hurt, but certainly his feeling must have been hurt, because he must have felt that that was the reward he got from the country which he served for 30 years. Sir Geoffrey de Montmorency is still alive today, thank God. What sort of work is he doing today? He is still fighting for the cause of India. He is an active member of an Association in London known as the British Indian Union, the object of which is to educate the British public opinion, so that India could get self-Government. That is the type of man who was shot at and that was the reward such a man got at the hands of the terrorists. A lady was also hit at that moment, and a gallant sub-inspector of police gave his life in defending his superior officer and enhanced the reputation and prestige of his service. This thing was followed soon after by an attempt on the life of our popular ex-Viceroy, Lord Irwin, who is now Lord Halifax. We all know that Lord Halifax was quite unpopular with the ultra die-hard opinion of the British public, and I distinctly remember that when he laid down the reins of his high office and arrived at the Victoria Station, London, a hostile demonstration was staged against him, because they thought he was too friendly with Indians, because he was always praised by Mahatma Gandhi. Further, Sir, I must say that this very Honourable Assembly, whose representative chair you are occupying today with such dignity and such impartiality, this very sacred building was bombed, and I really cannot understand the mentality of these murderers who throw bombs into such august Assemblies as this, because, after all, it is supposed that the best brains of the country,—and I hope the present company is not excepted,—are gathered there. If the object of the terrorists was to kill one of the Members on the Government Benches, were they quite certain that Pandit Motilal Nehru, who was also sitting in this Hall as a Member, and was probably occupying the same seat which the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is occupying today, would not have been hurt by that very bomb? But, Sir, these murderers do not care for anything

An Honourable Member: It was not a bomb; it was a cracker.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): This is the maiden speech of the Honourable Member, and, according to convention, he should be allowed to go on without interruption.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: These murderers did not understand that in attempting to kill one person they were endangering the lives of so many innocent persons, some of whom were great patriots.

Now, I come to another point. What was the attitude of those who today are the loudest in their demand for the repeal of these repressive laws? I have very great respect for the Leader of the Opposition. I have worked with him for a little while, and, broadly speaking, I can call myself as his colleague, but in that brief space of time I can assure you, Sir, that he has gained my respect, and I am looking forward during these three years term of the Assembly to the privilege of hearing his wonderful orations. I have for him the same respect as I have for Mahatma Gandhi, but when these outrages were being committed, when both the civil and military officers, Indians and Europeans, were being shot down by these terrorists, when many prominent citizens emphatically condemned the activities of these terrorists in most unequivocal language, what was the attitude of the Congress? I know, Sir, that the creed of the Congress is non-violence,—and I sincerely believe that all my Honourable friends who are occupying some of these Benches strongly believe in the creed of non-violence, and so does Mahatma Gandhi, who is the soul of non-violence,—but if a non-violent man preaches to violent people, and they do not listen to him,—because murderers have a mentality peculiar to themselves, what happens? I think, Sir, the duty of the Congress at that juncture was to co-operate with the police and to issue a whip to all the Congress organisations to hunt down the murderers wherever they were found. Mahatma Gandhi himself admitted that these murderers were putting back the hands of the clock. Therefore, if these murderers did not listen to the advice of non-violent workers, they should have been paid back in their own coins. (*An Honourable Member*: "It is not allowed.") I do not know why the Congress people failed in their duty. If they had done it, today Members on the Government Benches would have listened to the demand that is made now, with greater sympathy. Anyway, before I conclude my observations, I should like to say just one thing. As soon as Government are convinced that there is no real danger,—and we must leave it to their good sense of judgment (*Laughter from Congress Party Benches*), I hope Government will use clemency and release all people who have been detained, but, at the same time, I feel, Sir, it will be wrong for this House to force the hands of the Government in asking them to release these prisoners when normal conditions have not yet been restored. Therefore, I would ask Honourable Members to vote against this motion.

Mr. Shri Krishna Sinha (*Gaya cum Monghyr Non-Muhammadian*): Sir, there are moments in the life of a man when it is very difficult for him to restrain his feelings. I had a shrewd suspicion of what was passing in Bengal in the name of law and order. My Honourable friend, Amarendra Babu, has tried to lift the veil, and what little glimpse we could have into what is happening in that province leads me to believe with my Honourable friend, Mr. Paliwal, that the moment has arrived when it is very difficult for one to restrain one's feeling. But I assure the Treasury Benches that I have made up my mind not to give vent to feelings of anger and resentment in what I have to say as regards this motion.

Sir, I support the motion moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, the Leader of the Nationalist Party, and I do so on grounds more than one. I support it not only because the state of affairs in this country has changed, but on higher grounds. I say that, even if the state of affairs in India had not changed, even if the Civil Disobedience Movement had

[Mr. Shri Krishna Sinha.]

been going on in full swing throughout the country, even if the jails in British India had been full of civil disobedience prisoners, even then a Government, much more a Government which claims itself to be a civilised Government, should not have adopted all those measures of repression which this Government had recourse to during the last three or four years. At this moment, when I rise to support a motion for censuring the policy of the Government, I cannot but be reminded of those painful days in the years 1930-1933 when innocent youths were shot down in the streets in a town in my own district in the name of law and order. (*Cries of "Shame" from the Congress Party Benches.*) I cannot forget how a whole village was penalised and two lakhs of rupees were realised from the inhabitants of that village simply for one fault, and that was, the youths of that village took to the lessons which Mahatma Gandhi wanted to teach them, defied this Government and rushed to the jails in large numbers. It is because of this that I say that I support this motion on a higher ground. I support this motion on a still further ground. I say this Government has been impervious to public opinion in this country. It was in the beginning of this century that the nationalist movement was born in this country, and, simultaneously with the birth of nationalism in this country, this Government started on a policy of repression. Within the short time at my disposal it is not possible for me to give this House the history of the policy of repression which the Government have adopted towards this country. I remember the days when I was a student, Government raked up an archaic law, the Regulation III of 1818 and deported under that Regulation one of the foremost patriots of India of that time, I mean, the late Lala Lajpat Rai. (*Cries of "Shame" from the Congress Party Benches.*) I remember the flutter which that deportation caused in the country. I remember the resentment which that deportation caused in the country. My Honourable friend from the Punjab who had just now risen and recounted all the acts of crime committed by some terrorists—I can assure him that so long as I am under the banner of the Saint of Sabarmati who wants to lead us on in the path of non-violence, I can have no sympathy with a man who wants to murder another human being, much less the Governor of a Province. (*"Hear, hear" from Official Benches.*) But I want to assure him that what I object to is the recourse of the Government to archaic laws to suppress the growth of nationalism in this country. I charge this Government with having regularly and consistently flouted public opinion in this country. Since the time the Government initiated the policy of repression, there has been a volume of public opinion against that policy. But day by day Government have been intensifying that policy of repression, and though public discontent against this policy has been growing, Government have been impervious to public feeling against that policy.

Yesterday, there was the unique sight of a legal luminary from Bengal rising from his seat and quoting one of those plain sections of the Government of India Act simply to remind this House that the Government of India were responsible to the Secretary of State and not to the people of this country. I think the Honourable the Leader of the House entertains the same opinion of us and perhaps he too thinks that we belong to that same class to which another Honourable Member has relegated us. But because he is not connected with the military department,

therefore he, like a military man, did not blurt out his feeling. I can assure the Honourable the Leader of the House that we are not oblivious of the fact that the Members of the Treasury Benches who sit there are responsible to a Government which is six thousand miles away from here. But I may tell him that even this Government of India Act expects them to respect public opinion in this country.

My Honourable friend, Mr. James, from Madras said that in our attempt to censure the Executive Council of the Government of India in order that they might act according to the opinions of this House, we were against the spirit of the Government of India Act. Only the other day we were told by Members occupying the Treasury Benches that we should look behind the proposed Government of India Bill and look to the intentions which have impelled the framers of that Bill to propose that measure. Acting on that principle, I hope the Honourable the Leader of the House will not now take recourse to the plea that he is to be guided by the letter of the law and not by the intentions which impelled the framers of the present Government of India Act. If he cares to read the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, he will find that the one object of reforming the Central Legislature and the India Council was to make the Central Government here and the Government in England responsive to public opinion. The authors of the report have distinctly said that it was impossible that while in certain fields Government were made responsible to the people in the provinces, the Government at the centre should remain impervious and irresponsible to public opinion. I know the distinction between irresponsible and irresponsible Governments. The Government of India Act intends that those who occupy the Treasury Benches should be responsive to public opinion. In that Report, it is distinctly laid down that autocracy is to come to an end, and, by enlarging the Central Legislature, the authors of that Report hoped that public opinion would influence the Government of India and the Government in England in their works of administration. That was the message that was conveyed to India by the Duke of Connaught. Only the other day, the Finance Member in the name of a pledge given to the Civil Service has saddled India with the expenditure of crores of rupees. I would ask the Honourable the Finance Member to remember another pledge which the Duke of Connaught gave to this House. He said that autocracy was definitely to come to an end. No sooner the new Central Legislature met, a motion was brought by the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri in the Council of State.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

According to that Resolution, a Committee was appointed to consider the question of repealing the repressive laws of this country. For the information of the House, I may say at the very beginning that in that Committee were included two prominent Members of the Government, one of whom was Sir William Vincent. If you read that Report, you will find that four things prominently emerge out of that Report. That Report is unanimous. It has been signed by Sir William Vincent and Mr. Hammond. It says that the Regulation of 1818 and other allied Regulations required to be amended, so as to make them conform to the original intention with which they were enacted. According to them too the Regulations ought not to have been applied to the cases to which they were being applied. The

[Mr. Shri Krishna Sinha.]

next point which they mention in the Report is that the retention of these arbitrary laws was more dangerous than the evils which they are meant to cure. The third thing which they mentioned is that the powers of arbitrary imprisonment is bad for the country, especially after the new Constitution had been inaugurated in the country. After the Constitution embodied in the Act of 1919 had been inaugurated, though the Government of India remained responsible to England, yet by it a new policy had been inaugurated in India and the retention on the Statute-book of laws and regulations like Regulation III of 1818 and other similar laws, which still encumber the Statute-book of India, was inconsistent with the new principle thus inaugurated. Last of all, they say that the presence of these arbitrary Acts will be a cause of resentment to the people. With these objects in view, the Committee recommended that the Regulation of 1818 and other allied Regulations were to be amended so as to confine their application to cases for which they were originally meant. They recommended that all the repressive laws were to be repealed save and except two, the repeal of which were to be deferred for the time being. From this it is clear that the authors of the report intended that the Government of India should be responsive to public opinion. The Committee on which two prominent Government Members sat recommended that the Regulations should be amended so as to limit their operation.

Now, Sir, the other day, the Honourable the Commerce Member told us in what ways Government were trying to meet the wishes of this House. He told us that he was going to meet the wishes of this House so far as their desire to get redressed the grievances of the third class passengers was concerned. We are all thankful to him for this. But I ask the Honourable Member, as a Member of this Government, to tell me how far Government have been able to meet the unanimous demand of the people so far as these repressive laws are concerned. There was a Committee which condemned these Regulations. If we have to make a choice between the redress of the grievances of third class passengers and the repeal of these laws, then I can tell the Honourable the Commerce Member that we would rather travel in the present dirty third class carriages than allow our liberties to be touched.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Mr. Shri Krishna Sinha: I am sorry, my time is up. Then, I have to give up many of the points that I wanted to raise. A friend from Bengal said that he is a Bengali first and an Indian afterwards. He has recounted some stories. My friend from the Punjab has recounted certain stories. I want to assure Members of this House and those who fight shy of terrorism that we on this side of the House deprecate murder. We deprecate murder whatever the motive might be. But we know that national affairs are not to be guided in a short sighted fashion. When that gentleman from Bengal was speaking, I was reminded of what I have read in books on the American revolution. It is the Government servants who sent false reports to England, misguided the Government of England into a policy of repression which resulted in the loss of America to England. I want that the Honourable Sir Henry Craik should take recourse to a higher policy. I ask the Government if they are sure that there is a net work of revolutionary organisations in the country. Are they sure of the fact that the whole of the Bengali population is so seized with the idea of violence that it has

become necessary to establish military rule in Bengal? Then, it is time to **very halt and take stock** of the situation to find out some remedy. It has been **one of the most perplexing problems** for political philosophers to find out what it is that makes men submit to a rule which is not based on popular will and they have come to the conclusion that it is the natural disinclination of man to court imprisonment and suffering and they desire to lead a life of ease. In spite of this natural instinct in man, there is to be found in this country **a large number of men who march to the scaffold**, mount it smilingly with the cry of "Bande Mataram" on their lips, of which the Government are so much afraid and thus make the most suffering. In the cause of truth and non-violence for which Mahatma Gandhi stands, more than a million men have gone to jails. It is now time for the Government to think over the whole thing, come to grips with the situation and find out some conciliatory policy.

I know that autocracy has got its own way. It is blind. Autocracy contains the germ of ruin in itself. Louis of France had to pay the penalty for the sins committed by his ancestors. He had to mount the scaffold. Matternich, the greatest despot of the 18th century, who made the whole of Austria tremble, had to flee from his capital when faced with popular discontent, hiding himself in a cart. I know this Government will meet the same fate if it pursues that policy. I know that this Government has lost its foresight. Only the other day, the Honourable the Commerce Member was preaching thus to this side of the House: "What will you do if you reject this Joint Parliamentary Committee Report?" He seemed to think that the movement for freedom was dead and that India was helpless. If we reject the Report, what was the alternative, he asked? He meant to say, **we are a helpless race**. Sir, I know the atmosphere in which he works, has bred in him this mentality. The same mentality was displayed by the Honourable the Leader of the House yesterday in retort to the point raised by Mr. Satyamurti. He said that the Congress was dead. Now, we did not hear anything. We heard only the noise created in this House and the repercussion which this noise creates outside. I say, Sir, this shows that this Government is short-sighted. I want to tell this Government that a revolution is never dead. Once a nation wakes up, it can never be put down.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Are you supporting or opposing the motion?

Mr. Shri Krishna Sinha: I am supporting the motion.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Your arguments are all for opposing it.

Mr. Shri Krishna Sinha: I am sorry if that is the impression created. Sir, revolution is like a tidal wave. It has receded now, but the murmurs are still there. I know from a circular letter issued from the Home Department that the Government expect their officers to go to the villages. If these servants of Government do go about and see things correctly, they will find the murmurs there. It is gathering strength. If this Government in its short-sighted policy does not hear that murmur, then it will come back with added strength, will deluge them all, will sweep away the last vestige of autocracy in this country and leave the ground free for the construction of that magnificent edifice of Swaraj under which India will rise to the height of its being and come to its own. India will, thanks to the Almighty, celebrate its day of emancipation. (Loud and Prolonged Applause.) There is, I say, Sir, still time for the Government to

[Mr. Shri Krishna Sinha.]

retrace their steps, to discard the principle of autoeracy, to discard the principle and policy of repression. It has never succeeded in old days. It will never succeed here. Let the Government take the people into their confidence, take that great apostle of non-violence into confidence and thus stem the rising tide of a revolution. Otherwise, that tide will come, sweep them off their feet and take the course dictated by history. Conciliate, I say. Repeal the repressive laws and do your duty to the country. (Loud and Prolonged Cheers.)

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Sir, before I address myself to the subject of the motion, there is one statement that has been made in the course of this debate which I want to take the first possible opportunity of contradicting, and contradicting in the most emphatic manner possible. It is a statement that, so far as I know, ought never to have been made; it is an attack on persons who are not here to defend themselves, and it is a completely *ex parte* statement which I for one refuse for a moment to believe. The Honourable Member who sits over there stated, gave some story of a whole village having been stripped naked by troops in Bengal. Now, Sir, I find that various allegations were made against the conduct of troops in Bengal in a debate in this House about a year ago by Mr. S. C. Mitra

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: That was before the troops had gone there—that was by the police.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Who committed these outrages?

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: The police.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Sir, this is the first time any such charge against the police has been made, so far as I am aware. I was under the impression that the Honourable Member mentioned the troops. If he did not, then I apologise to him, but even so far as the police were concerned, I can find no mention in any of the charges of this nature that have been investigated in Bengal at the instance of the Government of India, of any kind of charge of that sort ever having been made, much less substantiated.

Now, Sir, I will address myself to the motion before the House, and, in doing so, I find myself in a state of some confusion, because the debate wandered over a very large field, and because I am not sure whether the intention of the Honourable the Mover of the motion is in any way the same as that of the various speakers who have followed him. My Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, confined himself in his very eloquent and very restrained speech to what he called the repressive policy of Government towards those who had taken part in the Civil Disobedience Movement. He made only a very passing reference, to the best of my recollection, to what he called the detenus, that is the terrorists or suspected terrorists. . .

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Quite right.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: And I understand that his motion was confined entirely to what he thought or what he thinks, no doubt with perfect sincerity, to have been the repressive policy of Government towards persons who took part in the Civil Disobedience Movement. Now, Sir, in regard to that part of the motion or to the motion as a whole, if that is the whole of it, I plead not guilty. I do not admit for a moment.

that Government have shown any spirit of vindictiveness or repression towards people who have taken part in the Civil Disobedience Movement. Long before the Civil Disobedience Movement was withdrawn or suspended or abandoned or whatever you may like to call it, long before Mahatma Gandhi made his statement, which was, I think, on the 7th of April of last year, the Government of India had instructed Local Governments to expedite the release of persons convicted of offences connected with the Civil Disobedience Movement; and the figures actually show that the number of such prisoners in jails had fallen from something like 13,000—I give round figures only—to under 1,500, before the Civil Disobedience Movement was withdrawn at all. Now, if that is repression, I wonder what generosity is! It is idle to say that that was repression; and immediately civil disobedience was officially suspended, the process of release was expedited. I don't use the word "withdrawn", that is not an accurate expression for it was made perfectly clear by its leaders that it was suspended only, because it might be revived again in more favourable circumstances. (*A Voice*: "Why not?").

An Honourable Member: Nobody ever said that.

The Honourable Sir Henry Crick: An Honourable Member says: "Nobody ever said that". May I remind him of the words of Mahatma Gandhi in this connection? In an exclusive interview given to the *Statesman* less than a fortnight after he had made his statement regarding the suspension of the Civil Disobedience Movement, Mahatma Gandhi was asked whether it was correct to say that the suspension of Civil Disobedience was only temporary or whether he meant that it would have to be resorted to in the near or distant future. His answer was as follows:

"He had no notion when the call would come to him to ask his co-workers to resume the struggle."

And, a month later, he said: "by suspending civil disobedience"—this is from his speech at Patna—"by suspending civil disobedience, he had saved this weapon for the country for future use when the country would be ready".

Now, my friend, the Honourable Baronet from Bombay, asked me what I understood by the word "withdrawal". Well, to my mind, "withdrawal" means, in the case of a weapons like this, "to cast it aside altogether". It is perfectly obvious from these and from a dozen similar utterances I can quote, and also from half a dozen remarks made in the course of this afternoon's debate that there is no intention that the Civil Disobedience Movement should be finally abandoned. Speaker after speaker has said that they would be within their rights to resume civil disobedience whenever their conscience calls them. That may be their theory of the duty or the privilege of a good citizen; it is not mine. Anyhow, that is a matter of abstract theory, and it is not important. But what is important is this that the civil disobedience is no more abandoned than I abandon my coat when I take it off to go to bed. The Civil Disobedience Movement is there and its leaders have stated quite plainly that it is within their rights to revive it at a suitable moment and they have further hinted that when it is revived, the struggle will be more acute and more severe than hitherto. Now, Sir, in spite of those utterances, my claim is that the Government, when the Congress announced the suspension of the Civil Disobedience Movement, took it literally at its word and that was made perfectly plain in the communiqué that was published early in June, 1934, in which it was stated that the ban on purely Congress

[Sir Henry Craik.]

organisations would be removed and that the process of releasing prisoners, which had already been in force for more than a year, would be expedited. The only reservation made was that revolutionary organisations which had been proscribed, and which were distinct from the Congress, though they had been working more or less in close association with the Congress, would not necessarily have the ban removed. It was left to Local Governments to decide when the ban on such revolutionary organisations could safely be withdrawn.

Sir, I maintain that that policy has been faithfully and sincerely carried out. There remain today, as the Honourable the Leader of the House explained, only 69 out of the many thousand prisoners who were convicted in connection with the Civil Disobedience Movement. Though I have not got exact details of all those cases, the House may take it from me that these persons are either persons who were convicted of offences of violence, or who were convicted after the formal withdrawal of the movement, because they had attempted to revive it against the directions of their leaders, or who are known to have been connected with revolutionary that is, terrorist, organisations and possibly a few more whose conduct in jail has been particularly objectionable. Even as regards these few remaining prisoners, I am assured by the Local Governments that their cases are being again reviewed with a view to expediting their release. As regards the revolutionary organisations, some have been mentioned by name in the course of this debate, especially one, the Hindustani Seva Dal. That organisation is not banned throughout India. It is a banned organisation in four provinces only. The four Local Governments in question have retained the ban upon it, because they are certain that it is a definitely revolutionary organisation, that many of its leaders are intimately connected with the terrorists and that in the case of this organisation, or, at any rate, most of its branches, the profession of non-violence and peacefulness is absolute pretence. One of the principal activities of that particular association is drilling in military formation and teaching youths the use of weapons. How can it be claimed that in those circumstances it is a peaceful organisation?

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena (Lucknow Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): May I ask, Sir, what weapons they are trained to use?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Any weapons they can get hold of, including in one case at least the use of the rifle.

Now, Sir, it is perfectly well known that when the Central and Local Legislatures passed these special Acts, they were intended only partially to deal with civil disobedience. They had other objects too. There are other and far more dangerous organisations than the Civil Disobedience Movement with which the Government are called upon to deal. In particular, I refer to those organisations which I have in a previous speech styled as public enemy No. 1, that is, the terrorist; and public enemy No. 2, that is, the communist agent. My case is that since the suspension of the Civil Disobedience Movement, those special Acts have been used, to the best of my belief, not against anyone simply for activities in connection with the Civil Disobedience Movement, but only against terrorists and communists agents. I do not for a moment admit that we have been repressive towards people who were concerned in the Civil Disobedience Movement. I recognise that it has been suspended and I recognise that that suspension is a gesture in the right direction. Another gesture is the

decision of the Congress to take part in the elections and to enter the Legislatures. We have been told—I think again by my friend, the Honourable Baronet from Bombay—that we should hold out our hand to grasp the hand of co-operation offered to us. I sometimes wish as I listen to the debates in this House, that the hand offered to us was a little more conspicuously offered. I think my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, said yesterday in the course of the debate, “We have come to this House to co-operate with Government”, but almost in the same breath, with that inconsistency for which he is so famous, he said: “Our object in coming here is to smash the prestige of the Government”.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On a point of personal explanation, Sir. I said we have come here to co-operate with the Government, but if the co-operation is returned in the contemptuous terms in which it is being returned, our object then will be to destroy the prestige of this Government. It is on the Government whether they are going to extend their hand of co-operation or not. I am convinced after coming here, that they have no intention of grasping our hand of co-operation. It is, in that sense, that I said, and I repeat it again, that, if they do not respond, we are here to destroy the prestige of the Government.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I am sorry my recollection does not agree with that remark. His expressed determination to smash the prestige of the Government was absolute and not conditional. However, if he is really genuine in his desire to extend the hand of co-operation, he will not find Government slow in grasping that hand.

Now, Sir, I have dealt with the attitude of the Government towards the Civil Disobedience Movement. I now come to the attitude of Government towards a more dangerous and a more sinister movement, the terrorist movement. I confess that I felt considerable regret when so many of those practised orators on the back Benches opposite took a less wise line than the Honourable the Mover of the motion, and were so insistent in expressing their sympathy for the terrorist detenu. That sympathy has been expressed time after time in questions, in speeches, and particularly in this debate. But I should be sorry to think that it reflected the genuine attitude of the responsible Congress leaders towards the terrorist. I should have hoped that occasionally, at any rate, there might have been some word of sympathy for the terrorist victims, for that dreary and pitiful procession of widows who returned to their homes leaving their murdered husbands behind them, for the policeman who was bombed and who lingers in agony for months before losing his eye-sight and his career and for a hundred other cases as heart-rending and as tragic as these. But no, the sympathy of the Honourable gentlemen opposite is reserved for these well-fed detenus, on their Rs. 2 a day food allowance and their Rs. 35 a month personal allowance. With them, I have no sympathy. I say that the Government are entitled to take any measure, even more severe measures than they have taken hitherto, to stamp out this terrible evil.

Sir, I would remind the House of the words used in a Royal Proclamation many years ago when this dreadful evil of terrorism was just becoming prominent in India. Speaking in a Proclamation to his Indian people, His Majesty King Edward VII said:

“It is a paramount duty (that is of my Government) to repress with a stern arm guilty conspiracies that have no just cause and no serious aim. These conspiracies are abhorrent to the loyalty and faithful character of the great host of my Indian subjects and I will not suffer them to turn me aside from my task of building up the fabric of civilised security and order.”

[Sir Henry Craik.]

Those words were spoken, Sir, many years ago, but they seem to me to be equally true today as they were when they were spoken. It is still the duty of the Government to repress with stern arm those crimes which have brought such ill-fame to one part of India and they will not be deterred from carrying out that task by mis-begotten sympathy with the terrorists.

Sir, my case is this: that as regards civil disobedience people, we have not shown repression, we have shown clemency in that we started releasing from jail before this subversive movement which is a breach of the law was stopped. Towards the terrorists, we cannot show any mitigation of our policy till the evil is crushed. At the moment, the position is this, that there has been a considerable improvement, but still the recruitment of young men to that movement is going on. The poison is being spread and there can be no relaxation of our efforts in that direction until the situation is far better than it is now. (Applause.)

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Mr. President, I regret very much that my

5 P.M.

Honourable friend, Mr. James, yesterday thought that I could ever be guilty of expressing either venomous sentiment or using a venomous language, and I want him to be reassured, if ever assurance is needed, that in any observation that I make before this House, I will always venture to firmly express my opinion, but it is not intended to convey and there is not behind it any tinge of bitterness of any kind, an assurance which I am obliged to give by reason of the way in which he appeared to have been moved yesterday and it becomes appropriate because of the nature of the motion before the House today so that in anything that I say, I will attempt to weigh every word that I speak to the best of my ability, but I want to be weighed in a balance a little less difficult than the one by which I was weighed yesterday.

Sir, in supporting the motion of my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, there are two things which I wish to make clear inasmuch as constant reference necessarily had to be made to the Congress, its attitude and its policy. It is not my desire to take a historical review beginning with the *Ram raj* as some of the more ambitious Honourable Members on the other side attempted to do. I am one of those who believes that after all is said and done, there is such a thing as considering a living question and it is to that that I address myself in the few minutes that I want to occupy. The first point on which there should be no disagreement between me and any Member on the Treasury Benches at all is that every State must draw a line both in the matter of any law making or their enforcement between men's opinions and their expression in words or translation in conduct of the assertion of those opinions by either of these methods. For indeed, I think that even the boldest of Kings, however autocratic he may be, would attempt to eradicate from human mind principles which that mind believes in as being right. For one thing we shall never accept as a condition of any agreement or imposition that we should forswear our belief in "Satyagraha" as a true instrument of our deliverance and this no more and no less than the Germans, when they were defeated, forswore in the Treaty which had to enter into that war and a war of force as an instrument they would not resort to in the future for the purpose of their deliverance. The real issue between the State and its citizens is always on what occasions and under what circumstances the principles in which you believe are actually to be put into operation in

our words or by our conduct. I have never yet heard that principles by which you live have got to be forsworn as a condition of your being readmitted to the confidence of those with whom you have every right to deal and be dealt with justly, equally and fairly. That clears, I hope, the ground between us, and whatever language may have been used, notwithstanding the passages which have been read by the Honourable Sir Henry Craik, the passages only indicate what might have occurred in any other document whether expressed or unexpressed, if ever circumstances are such that this country, according to the conception of those who believe in it, is not getting a fair deal by and after an appeal to every sense of reason, every sense of justice, to every sense of what are called inherent ideas of freedom, I dare say there may arrive a time, sooner or later, when my countrymen and countrywomen may feel it their duty to carry on a movement of direct action in order to attain their deliverance. I do not think that passages written in that historical sense can ever be called up by a Government, even a too-cautious Government for the purpose of continuing a policy which was embarked upon for the purpose of meeting a movement while it was going on. I am here to tell them that passages of this kind ought not to be stressed in the manner in which they are stressed and I wish them to understand that they express a historical truth to which they could not take any objection and that they should not be perverted. I know that they are not perverted in any insincere sense, and should not be construed so as to be a justification or an excuse for a continuation of the policy which may have been justified (whether I agree or disagree, this is not the occasion for the purpose of discussing that issue). Ever since last April, so far as the body of Congress opinion is concerned, it has made it plain that the Satyagraha struggle has been suspended for more reasons than one. I hope and trust that this termination may become final if circumstances alter, of which alteration there are few signs at present.

The other day, I heard the Archbishop of Canterbury ordering a prayer throughout England and the English Churches in order that England and India may understand each other better. I am quite certain, His Grace was quite sincere in the appeal that he made. So are we sincere in the manner in which we offer our hand of friendship. But I am here to say that we believed and still believe that unless circumstances materially alter undoubtedly without direct action there seems to be no deliverance for India. But we shall avert it, and when we say that, we mean every syllable and every letter of that syllable. Every strength that I can put into it, every earnestness, every sincerity that I can put into it, is at your disposal, but beyond that nobody can say more.

My Honourable friend, Mr. Monteath,—I had not the pleasure of personally knowing him except here,—referred to the Bombay Presidency. And it is with reference to that Presidency of which I can speak with personal knowledge and with confidence as to the aftermath, if I may say so, of what is left at the end of the Civil Disobedience Movement, that I make also a further appeal. I am aware myself of at all events a long list with which I will not trouble you, but the typical lists I will present to this House through you, so that my Honourable friends on the other side may consider it not merely in terms of a general progressive policy of revision, but in terms of the attention which they deserve. I happen to be myself a trustee of an educational institution over which we spent some lakhs of rupees, and in which 150 boys and some girls were being housed

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

and educated. This Anavil Ashrama in Surat is a most enviable institution in every sense. Its education was of the best, its discipline was perhaps even better. That institution was declared an illegal Association under the Criminal Law Amendment Act which came in very handy. And I am not here to go into the past history of how these Acts were used, whether they were intended for the purposes for which they were used. This law was professedly and admittedly made with a view to meeting every form of violence, murder and dacoity. The words used were that the Government might in its discretion, in the event of a breach of the peace, declare any Association illegal. It was not even dreamt by the framers of these laws how these words would be used after a period of 23 years from the time they were actually used. And every single institution came in handy during the course of the Civil Disobedience Movement. All that the Government had to do was that the formula having been used before, only the name had to be inserted. And one of the institutions whose name was inserted was this Anavil Boarding School and for no other offence than the fact that the Warden of that institution was one of the persons who was sentenced during the course of this Civil Disobedience Movement. Even today, I happened to visit Surat only less than about 10 weeks ago, and that house there lies unoccupied, unused to any useful purpose, and for all that I can see, for no visible offence. I can give also further instances to Mr. Monteth, because it is not the number that they have discharged or disbanded which matters; what matters is what is left and why it is left. It is not a matter of proportion. There is another boarding school next door equally belonging to a similar institution of which any country might have been proud. Indeed I must speak a little more modestly for the simple reason that these two institutions in Gujerat have served as a great model for boys and girls to be trained up in every form of education including, of course, preserving, maintaining, and, if possible, strengthening the national spirit and nationalised point of view. But that is all their offence. Then, I pass a little further on in the same territory. I will remind my friend that he will also see in Bardoli, there is no question of revolution, unless the word "revolution" means a desire, which I have already expressed as a matter of belief, that we deserve to be a self-governing people. If that is revolutionary, everything is revolutionary; and in that case it is not possible to draw a line between civil resistance and revolution. But if by revolution is meant a change of government by sheer physical force then, of course, I can understand the word "revolution". For, in India, these phrases are easily used and very easily abused also. It is not that my friends here individually are aware of these things, but the fact remains that when formulas are provided, by many a formula many a sin can be easily covered. And I will, therefore, remind my friends that throughout the Bardoli taluka in which there is Satyagraha in its best form of non-violence in thought, word and deed, and its best form of truth, every single institution in that taluka is still in the possession of Government, entirely unused, entirely uncared for and the buildings in some places are almost on the point of falling down. All that you find in that place is a few policemen squatting just for no other purpose than for the pleasure of seeing that these institutions are still under a ban. That has been the response from April 7th last to April 7th which we shall presently reach. All that I can say is that either those who are here are not well informed, or, if they have their sympathy with

this kind of thing, they cannot very well ask themselves to be acquitted. There are many other institutions in Gujerat a little further north of which Mr. Monteath might well have been informed. There are some schools, and in as much as they bear the name of Mahatma Gandhi or Vallabhai Patel, for that offence only these institutions are still under a ban. Of the 69 prisoners that the Leader of the House spoke about, I can at all events personally testify to several of them, name by name if he had that list here, and I should be able to show that there is not a single one of those who has been guilty of any violence; they were guilty of no violence of any kind during the course of the Civil Disobedience Movement. Those remain still in gaol for no other purpose than that probably they have specially incurred the wrath of the particular officers who are in charge of reporting upon them. I was one of them who personally attempted to get in touch with the District Officers of all the districts in the constituency which I represent. I went not in a spirit of wrangling, not in a spirit of recrimination, I went in no spirit of arguing the past; I went only to inquire as to what could be done as to the future. And the only reply I got from the District Officers was, "We do not know, it is a matter of the policy of Government". That, Sir, is the position in so far as the response in my part of the country is concerned.

As regards the last moving appeal that my Honourable friend, the Home Member, made, I am sure, I can only endorse what Mahatma Gandhi has always said that it is not with us a matter of policy

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Sir, I am sorry to interrupt my Honourable friend, but I have a letter from a very high authority in Bombay dated only the other day which says that there are not more than 30 prisoners left in Bombay.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: I will accept that correction. It may easily be that 10 or 11 have been released in the interval of my information.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Supposing there are 30 left, can the Honourable Member satisfy us that they were non-violent?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: I can certainly testify to it. I was one of those who have been in the midst of at least 800 prisoners in the Nasik Jail, and it became our business seeing that we had plenty of time, seeing that we had established a real genuine democracy and equality between ourselves, to know every single one of them as the meanest was as good as the best of us. I also know many of some sixteen hundred odd persons who were in jail in Visapure near Ahmednagar, and I can testify to every single one of them that he was not guilty of any violence during the course of Satyagraha movement.

I do not wish to keep the House very much longer. Coming to the last moving appeal that the Honourable Sir Henry Craik made, I am not, as I said, perhaps as fit as Mahatma Gandhi to join with him in the appeal that he made: in fact, I happened to be in England at the time when one of the officers—I believe it was Mr. Burge—happened to have been shot in Bengal: and I remember the appeal made by Mahatma Gandhi at the time, not merely personally to his own countrymen, but all over the world, because, as I said, with us it is not a matter of mere expediency: I know we can easily be judged by a lower standard: I know

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

we can easily be told "Oh, you have not the strength, and, therefore, non-violence suits and befits you". But we are of those who believe—whether we are right or wrong in our belief will be tested by the future. Most civilized minds believe that evolution must be on the lines on which we believe, whether the evolution would be near enough in practical politics is another matter—I ask them to believe in the sincerity of the belief that we profess that it is not a mere question of expediency or a case of having nothing else to do, of merely trying the method of non-retaliatory measures, so that even those who are armed may be disarmed: but we sincerely and genuinely believe that all arms are disarmed when a person refusing to retaliate bares his breast against attack, in order only to assert what he believes to be right. That is what we believe, and, therefore, every form of violence we shall agree with him in condemning, not merely as I said as a matter of expediency, but as a matter of genuine and sincere belief: and although he will always have ample co-operation, I cannot very well agree with another friend—I must guard against him—to be a police informer or to take up violence for the sake of fighting violence along with the Government, because that was the kind of appeal which one of my friends made on my side of the House

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: On a point of personal explanation, Sir. I never said that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition can degrade himself to the level of becoming a police informer: what I meant to say was that if these violent people did not listen to the appeals made by Mahatma Gandhi and to the appeals of men like my Honourable friend, Mr. Desai, the Congress should have joined hands with the police to fight the terrorists and hunt them down.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: I am obliged to my friend for his explanation, but I hope he will allow me to continue.

What I was saying was this: with us it being a matter of principle, our sympathy is not merely verbal, but is real and genuine. In what form and to what extent it could be expressed in our conduct is a matter on which we may easily differ. But you may be certain that in so far as it is otherwise consistent with our beliefs, it is not merely lip sympathy, but it can be easily expressed at least up to a point.

Before I sit down, there is one more word I have to say: I recognise that in this particular matter I cannot separate myself from you: we are only separated by a form of Constitution: we cannot separate members of a State much too long; and if we continue to be separated as members of a State much too long, it would be deplorable, and it is, therefore, our duty to come together in condemning all forms of violence. While undoubtedly putting down every form of violence, we should be careful not to exceed such limits in the process of extirpation as would probably aggravate and propagate the disease itself. It is a warning which has a meaning and which has a sense; and I have not the smallest doubt that my friends, who are immediately in charge of these matters, will see to it that the measures which they take to fight violence are adequate and just adequate, that the men and areas they strike at adequate and just adequate, so that there may be no occasion for any complaint in this House that liberties of the innocent persons have been restricted in the prosecution of even of a campaign against violence. I do, however, say that the response,

which we have got, after a period of nearly a year now, is in halting and poor measure; and all I can say is that I hope and still hope that the revival of direct action to which reference has been made may never be necessary. The other day, I read in a book by Mr. Keynes in which he said that the British Empire was disintegrating almost by mutual consent as the result of the Statute of Westminster, and that the British Empire is now represented by India: and, therefore, irrespective of abstract theories, if self-Government is established in this country making consistent the interests of both India and England. I am quite certain a revival of direct action may be avoided and become a thing of the past. I have, therefore, not the smallest doubt that, in a matter of this kind, it is wise to be generous, but it is dangerous to be ungenerous. (Applause.)

Maulana Shaukat Ali (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): Can I speak for one moment?

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is that the question be now put.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Home Department' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—63.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.
Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
Anev. Mr. M. S.
Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
Ayvaugar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.
Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
Ba Si, U
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
Banerjee, Dr. P. N.
Bagui, Mr. M. A.
Barda'oi, Srijut N. C.
Bhagavan Das, Dr.
Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra
Nath.
Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam.
Das, Mr. B.
Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
Deesai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.
Fakir Chand, Mr.
Giri, Mr. V. V.
Govind Das, Seth.
Hosmani, Mr. S. K.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Jedhe, Mr. K. M.
Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Khan Sahib, Dr.
Khare, Dr. N. B.

Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
Mangal Singh, Sardar.
Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
Muhammad Ahmad Kasmi, Qazi.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
Syed.
Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.
Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Datta.
Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
Parma Nand, Bhai.
Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.
Rajun, Dr. T. S. S.
Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.
Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
Sant Singh, Sardar.
Satyamurti, Mr. S.
Sham Lal, Mr.
Sheodass Daga, Seth.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Shri Krishna.
Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
Sri Prakasa, Mr.
Thein Maung, Dr.
Thein Maung, U
Umar Aly Shah, Mr.
Varma, Mr. B. B.
Vissanji, Mr. Mathuradas.

NOES—58.

Abdoola Haroon, Seth Haji.
 Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
 Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan
 Bahadur Nawab Malik.
 Anwar-ul-Azim, Mr. Muhammad.
 Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A.
 Venkatarama.
 Bewoor, Mr. G. V.
 Bhagchand Soni, Rai Bahadur Seth.
 Bhoré, The Honourable Sir Joseph.
 Russ, Mr. L. C.
 Chatarji, Mr. J. M.
 Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.
 Drake, Mr. D. H. C.
 Fazl-i-Haq Piracha, Khan Sahib
 Shaikh.
 Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya
 Ananda.
 Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
 Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.
 Gidney, Lieut. Colonel Sir Henry.
 Graham, Sir Lancelot.
 Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
 Hockenhull, Mr. F. W.
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.
 James, Mr. F. E.
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur
 Sardar Sir.
 Kirpalani, Mr. Hiranand Khushiram.
 Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur
 Chaudhri.
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
 Mehr Shah, Nawab Sahibzada Sir
 Sayad Muhammad.

The motion was adopted.

Metcalfe, Mr. H. A. F.
 Milligan, Mr. J. A.
 Monteath, Mr. J.
 Morgan, Mr. G.
 Mukerje, Mr. N. R.
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya
 Charan.
 Nayar, Mr. C. Govindan.
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
 Owen, Mr. L.
 Raisman, Mr. A. J.
 Rajah, Raja Sir Vasudeva.
 Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
 Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur
 Makhdom Syed.
 Ram Chandra, Mr.
 Rau, Mr. P. R.
 Richards, Mr. W. J. C.
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
 Sarma, Mr. R. S.
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
 Scott, Mr. W. L.
 Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain
 Sardar.
 Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib
 Nawab.
 Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.
 Sinha, Raja Bahadur Harihar Prasad
 Narayan.
 Sircar, The Honourable Sir
 Nripendra.
 Sloan, Mr. T.
 Swithinbank, Mr. B. W.
 Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.
 Yakub, Sir Muhammad.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Before the House is adjourned, the Chair has to inform Honourable Members that as regards tomorrow and the morning of Monday which have been allotted to motions standing in the names of Honourable Members who are not attached to any Party, the Chair does not find that they have been able to come to any agreement or to notify to the Government Members which are the motions they want to move and in what order. The Chair has received a representation from Captain Chaudhuri Lal Chand, Shaikh Fazl-i-Haq Piracha and another gentleman that they want to move four motions in the time allotted, one about labour grievances, another about Baluchistan, a third about the grievances of rural population in respect of services, and a fourth about horse-breeding conditions. (Laughter.) But there are some other Members who have not signified their assent to these motions being moved or in any particular order. Government Members will find it very difficult to prepare their case and to be ready

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah: I understand they have agreed to the order in which

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The Chair does not find, for instance, the signature of Mr. Anwarul Azim, Mr. Baijnath Bajoria (he is not here), or Dr. Thein Maung, who also, the Chair believes, has given notice

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah: But he does not want to move . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Unless Honourable Members who have motions in their names can persuade Government that they will not object to their motions being taken in a particular order, that is to say, they will be ready to reply to them tomorrow, what the Chair proposes to do is to take those motions in the order in which notice has been given.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: May we hear again what the motions are?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair proposes to take the motions which stand in the names of the Honourable Members who are not attached to any Party, in the order in which notice has been given.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Saturday, the 9th March, 1935.