

Tuesday, 8th November, 1932

**THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES**

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

VOLUME VI, 1932

(7th November to 28th November, 1932)

FOURTH SESSION

OF THE

FOURTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,

1932



SIMLA
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1933

Est. B. L. A. N. H.

Legislative Assembly.

President :

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

Deputy President :

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

Panel of Chairmen :

SIR HARI SINGH GOUR, KT., M.L.A.

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

MR. G. MORGAN, C.I.E., M.L.A.

MR. MUHAMMAD YAMIN KHAN, C.I.E., M.L.A.

Secretary :

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

Assistants of the Secretary :

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

Marshal :

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

Committee on Public Petitions :

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

MR. G. MORGAN, C.I.E., M.L.A.

MR. C. S. RANGA IYER, M.L.A.

SIR ABDULLA-AL-MAMUN SUHRAWARDY, KT., M.L.A.

MR. B. SITARAMARAJU, M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME VI.—7th November to 28th November, 1932.

	PAGES.
MONDAY, 7TH NOVEMBER, 1932—	
Members Sworn	1677
Questions and Answers	1677—1718
Short Notice Question and Answer	1719—22
Death of Sir Ali Imam	1722—26
Governor General's Assent to Bills	1726
Statements laid on the Table	1727—31
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill—Presentation of the Report • of the Select Committee	1731
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa—Discussion not concluded	1731—62
TUESDAY, 8TH NOVEMBER, 1932—	
Questions and Answers	1763—1803
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa—Discussion not concluded	1803—45
WEDNESDAY, 9TH NOVEMBER, 1932—	
Member Sworn	1847
Questions and Answers	1847—89
Statements laid on the Table	1890—96
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa—Discussion not concluded	1896—1938
THURSDAY, 10TH NOVEMBER, 1932—	
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa—Discussion postponed	1939—70
Statement of Business	1970
MONDAY, 14TH NOVEMBER, 1932—	
Questions and Answers	1971—2020
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2020—29
Statements laid on the Table	2029—33
The Indian Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill—Presenta- tion of the Report of the Select Committee	2033
The Bengal Suppression of Terrorist Outrages (Supplementary) Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider adjourned	2033—48
Appendix	2049

TUESDAY, 15TH NOVEMBER, 1932—

Questions and Answers	2051—87
The Bengal Suppression of Terrorist Outrages (Supplementary) Bill—Consideration postponed	2087—90
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill— <i>Continued</i>	2090—2101, 2102—32
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa	2101—02

WEDNESDAY, 16TH NOVEMBER, 1932—

Questions and Answers	2133—67
Presentation of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee	2167—83
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill— <i>Continued</i>	2184—99, 2200—30
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa	2200

MONDAY, 21ST NOVEMBER, 1932—

Members Sworn	2231
Questions and Answers	2231—74
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2275—82
Statements laid on the Table	2282—85
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa—Time for submission of Report extended	2286
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill—Motion to consider adopted	2286—2321
Appendix	2322

TUESDAY, 22ND NOVEMBER, 1932—

Questions and Answers	2323—53
Short Notice Questions and Answers	2353—59
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill— <i>Continued</i>	2359—2401

WEDNESDAY, 23RD NOVEMBER, 1932—

Questions and Answers	2403—12
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill— <i>Continued</i>	2412—62
Committee on Petitions	2432

THURSDAY, 24TH NOVEMBER, 1932—

Short Notice Question and Answer	2463—68
Statements laid on the Table	2468—77
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill— <i>Continued</i>	2478—2528

MONDAY, 28TH NOVEMBER, 1932—

Member Sworn	2529
Questions and Answers	2529—64
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2564—66
Statements laid on the Table	2566—67
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill— <i>Continued</i>	2568—2610
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa—Presenta- tion of the Report of the Special Committee	2610

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 8th November, 1932.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

DISCHARGE AND RE-INSTATEMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONS OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT.

942. *Mr. Nabakumar Sing Dudhoria: (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact:

- (i) that recruits who had passed Appendix 'B' in the East Indian Railway Accounts Department were discharged with effect from July, 1932;
- (ii) that they were re-instated after a month in accordance with the orders of the Controller of Railway Accounts; and
- (iii) that the order of re-instatement was subsequently cancelled and that they were treated as re-appointed?

(b) Are Government aware that the discharge of these men who had passed Appendix 'B' was purely due to misapprehension and they were recalled before the expiry of a leave due to them?

(c) If so, do Government propose to reaffirm their re-instatement and treat the period of their unemployment as special casual leave? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) (i) and (ii). Yes.

(iii) No. The men were considered as on leave, and their service was treated as continuous with their previous service.

(b) Yes.

(c) Does not arise in view of the reply to part (a) (iii).

RETRENCHMENT IN THE RAILWAY ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT.

943. *Mr. Nabakumar Sing Dudhoria: (a) Is it a fact that the recruitment in the Railway Accounts Department is done through the channel of an All-India competitive examination as prescribed in Appendix 'B' of the Financial Commissioner of Railways' Memorandum No. 5585-F., dated 31st July, 1929, unlike the system in vogue in the executive departments under the control of the Agent, East Indian Railway?

(b) If so, is it a fact that the length of service is the sole deciding factor in the matter of discharge in the Railway Accounts Department? If so, why?

(c) Is it a fact that an employee may be *senior*, in accordance with departmental rules, to others who have longer service at their credit?

(d) If so, do Government propose to issue instructions to the effect that future block retrenchments in the Railway Accounts Department should begin from the *junior-most* irrespective of length of service?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) Yes.

(b) During the present retrenchment, it was decided by the Government of India to accept the recommendation of the Railway Court of Enquiry that the length of service principle should be the sole criterion. Consequently, except in the case of such temporary employees as were engaged for purely temporary purposes whose service would be terminated in the ordinary course on the cessation of the work on which they were employed, and temporary employees appointed on or after the 1st January, 1929, who were appointed on the definite understanding that they were employed on a purely temporary basis, pending recruitment of permanent staff under rules, retrenchments have been made on the basis of short service.

(c) Yes.

(d) The question of the rules to be adopted in respect of future block retrenchments will be considered if and when the necessity arises for such retrenchments.

RETRENCHMENT IN THE RAILWAY ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT.

944. ***Mr. Nabakumar Sing Dudhoria:** (a) Is it a fact that permanent employees entertained against permanent vacancies, which have not been declared as superfluous, cannot be treated as surplus so long as there are temporary men of the same category available?

(b) Is it a fact that permanent men in the East Indian Railway Accounts Department were discharged during the recent retrenchment campaign although there were temporary men available in the same category?

(c) Is it a fact that permanent employees in all other Government Departments are not discharged retaining the services of temporary men, except on the grounds of inefficiency, misbehaviour or superannuation?

(d) Do Government propose to review their decision in the matter? If not, why?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) and (c). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply to question No. 943 in which I have explained the procedure laid down for retrenchment in the Railway Department.

(b) I understand that the permanent men who were served with notice of discharge in preference to temporary men have been taken back.

(d) Government do not propose to reconsider, in connection with the present retrenchment, the principle of discharge according to the shortness of service which, as already explained, they have adopted according to the recommendations of the Railway Court of Enquiry.

RECRUITMENT OF QUALIFIED CLERKS AS ACCOUNTANTS, ETC., IN THE RAILWAY ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT.

945. ***Mr. Nabakumar Sing Dudhoria:** (a) Is it a fact that 50 per cent of the posts in the grade of Sub-heads in the Railway Accounts Department is to be reserved for qualified clerks who have passed the Appendix 'D' or 'E' or Part II of the Subordinate Railway Accounts Service Examination?

(b) Do Government propose to issue orders for giving the first chance for promotion to the above class of qualified clerks in the grade of Class I or Class II clerks, pending occurrence of vacancies in the grade of Sub-heads or Accountants?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) Yes.

(b) No. Government consider that the interests of those so qualified are amply protected. Besides 50 per cent. of sub-head's vacancies being reserved for them, they are granted enhanced rates of yearly increments of pay while they remain in the clerical grades.

The rules for promotion in the clerical grades lay down that subject to satisfactory work, promotion to Class II is not dependent on the passing of any departmental examination while promotion to Class I depends only on passing (Appendix C) examination.

APPLICATION OF THE NEW STATE RAILWAY LEAVE RULES TO THE ACCOUNTS STAFF.

946. ***Mr. Nabakumar Sing Dudhoria:** (a) Is it a fact that the new State Railway leave rules have been made applicable to Accounts staff confirmed from a date prior to the introduction of those leave rules?

(b) Is it also a fact that the employees referred to above were not required to give any declaration that they would come under the new rules on their introduction?

(c) If so, do Government propose to give the option of remaining under the old set of leave rules to the class of staff referred to above?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a), (b) and (c). On the 5th September, 1928, the Railway Board issued a Circular to the effect that all subordinate staff, who may be recruited on or after the 1st September, 1928, should be required to sign a declaration that when the New Leave Rules for Railway Establishments, which were then under consideration, are promulgated, they would be liable to be brought under their operation. The Leave Rules were published on the 20th February, 1930. The required declaration could not be obtained from the staff in some of the Accounts Offices and the question of allowing such staff the option to remain under the old leave rules is under the consideration of Government.

†947.*

†948.*

†This question was not answered as the Honourable Member (Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney) has since resigned.

PASS RULES OF THE MADRAS AND SOUTHERN MAHRATTA RAILWAY.

949. *Mr. K. P. Thampan: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact:

- (i) that according to rule 67 (b) of the pass rules of the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, lady typists are entitled only to second class pass irrespective of their pay;
- (ii) that a lady typist in the service of Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway by name Miss K. Schembry was enjoying a second class pass all along;
- (iii) that after the acting Agent of the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway took charge, he ordered that a first class pass should be given to her;
- (iv) that when a second class pass was issued to her as per rules to enable her to travel from Bangalore to Madras in June, 1932, he altered the second into a first class pass?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether a first class pass to a lady typist is admissible under the rules and, if alteration of a second class pass to first class is warranted by the pass rules of the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 949 and 950 together.

The issue of passes is a matter within the discretion of the Railway Company, and Government do not consider that in the cases, mentioned by the Honourable Member, their intervention is called for.

PASSES GRANTED TO PERSONS OTHER THAN RAILWAY EMPLOYEES ON THE MADRAS AND SOUTHERN MAHRATTA RAILWAY.

†950. *Mr. K. P. Thampan: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact:

- (i) that the Andhra Desa Railway Passengers Association at Chirala helped the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Administration through the District Traffic Superintendent of Bezwada in doing publicity in the villages in regard to Pushkaram;
- (ii) that the Association requested the Agent to give a pass in favour of two of its workers to go and assist pilgrims in the Pushkaram festival; and
- (iii) that the Agent refused to comply with the request as not being admissible under the rules?

(b) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a list of persons who are not Railway employees but have been granted passes by the Agent of the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway?

LOANS ADVANCED BY CERTAIN INSURANCE COMPANIES TO THEIR DIRECTORS.

951. *Mr. K. P. Thampan: (a) Are Government aware that certain insurance companies in this country have advanced large sums as loans to some of their directors and to business concerns in which they are interested with the result that the very solvency of the companies is threatened?

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 949.

(b) Will Government please state whether, with a view to safeguarding the interests of the policy-holders, they propose to take any immediate action, executive or legislative, to prevent this abuse?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: (a) Government are aware that certain Insurance Companies in this country have advanced loans of varying amounts to some of their Directors and to business concerns in which the latter are interested, but they cannot say whether the solvency of these Companies is threatened thereby.

(b) Does not arise.

REDUCTION IN THE NUMBER OF OFFICERS IN THE GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY.

952. ***Mr. K. P. Thampan:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) if it is a fact that in pursuance of the retrenchment policy the number of gazetted officers in the Great Indian Peninsula Railway was reduced from 245 in 1928-30 to 230 in 1930-31;
- (b) whether their number was further retrenched in 1931-32;
- (c) if the direct effect of the reduction of the 15 officers was an increase in their cost by Rs. 33,688; and
- (d) what the increase would be in the cost of the gazetted officers in the Great Indian Peninsula Railway in 1931-32 over their cost in 1929-30?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) and (c). No such reduction was made.

(b) The gazetted cadre of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway was reduced in 1931-32.

(d) The number of officers has been decreased and there have been no increases in scales of pay consequently, except for automatic increases due to the time-scales of pay, the cost should decrease rather than increase.

ERECTOR OF A RICKSHAW SHED NEAR ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SIMLA.

953. ***Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what arrangements they have made during the Assembly Sessions at Simla to protect the rickshaw coolies from rain and sun, who bring in the Members to the Chamber, and stay on for the return journey?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the negative, do Government propose to erect a shed somewhere near the Council House?

Mr. T. Ryan: In the unavoidable absence of the Honourable Member in charge of the Department, I wish to answer, with your permission, Sir, the questions for him.

(a) and (b). No special arrangements are made, but the rickshaw coolies, bringing Members to the Legislative Assembly building, may take shelter during wet weather in the shed in the compound of the Industries and Labour Department office building which is close at hand. There is no suitable place near the Assembly building for a special rickshaw shed.

ERECTORION OF A MOTOR SHED NEAR COUNCIL HOUSE, NEW DELHI.

954. ***Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan:** (a) Is it a fact that there is no shelter for the motor cars of the Members of the Assembly near the Council House, New Delhi, to protect the cars and drivers from rain and sun which cause great inconvenience to the Honourable Members?

(b) If so, do Government propose to erect a motor shed at the parking place to protect the cars and charge reasonable rent from the Members?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) There is so little rain in New Delhi during the winter that it is not thought that the inconvenience mentioned by the Honourable Member can really be very great.

(b) The garages provided for Members of the Legislative Assembly near their quarters in New Delhi are within a short distance of the Council House, and, as most Honourable Members employ drivers, it seems to Government hardly necessary to provide covered motor sheds at the parking place near the Council House. Government are naturally anxious, particularly at the present time, to avoid expenditure on projects which are not absolutely essential.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: Do the Government realise that there can be protection from the rain, but there can be no protection from the sun in the month of March when it is very hot and the drivers of the motor cars burn themselves in the sun the whole day?

Mr. T. Ryan: I can undertake, Sir, to have the matter further examined with reference to the observations the Honourable Member has just made.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: May I ask, Sir, whether it is not possible to provide sheds all round where the motor cars now stand?

Mr. T. Ryan: I think that to provide a shelter which would be in keeping with the neighbouring building would probably be rather expensive. The Honourable Member's suggestion will, however, be considered further.

Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan: Has any recommendation been made by the House Committee on this subject?

Mr. T. Ryan: I have not dealt personally with this matter, but I believe there has been some reference to it.

FREE SUPPLY OF PUBLICATIONS OF THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CENTRAL LEGISLATURE.

955. ***Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan:** (a) Are Government aware that the Members of the Central Legislature from Bengal get all the publications of that Government free, viz., the *Calcutta Gazette*, the *Civil List* and their Administration and other Reports, together with the proceedings of the Bengal Council?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, are Government prepared to issue instructions to other Provincial Governments as well to follow Bengal in the matter of the free supply of their publications to their respective Members of the Central Legislature?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: (a) The Government of India have no information.

(b) The Government of India are not in a position to issue instructions to the Local Governments on the subject, but a similar request from an Honourable Member of the House was brought to the notice of the Local Governments in 1921.

CONSOLIDATED ALLOWANCES OF TICKET COLLECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

956. ***Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state why the old ticket collectors utilised in the crew system were not paid a consolidated allowance during station duty?

(b) Is it a fact that in the last days of the system the Railway started giving them the same?

(c) Is it a fact that it has now been ruled by the Agent, East Indian Railway, that those ticket collectors who did not accept crew scales of pay are not eligible for the consolidated allowance?

(d) Was any option given to them to accept the crew scales?

(e) Is it a fact that according to the correspondence embodied in the Secretary to the Agent's docket No. A. E.-2293, dated 20th January, 1931, to the Chief Operating Superintendent, the old ticket collectors on being designated as crewmen and crew incharges were entitled to this consolidated allowance on station duty?

(f) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a copy of the whole correspondence embodied in the said docket?

(g) Is it a fact that according to the Chief Accounts Officer's minutes, No. E.-36-241/83, dated 22nd December, 1930, and E.-95-241/83, dated 13th January, 1931, the old ticket collectors, whether governed by old Company's rules or new crew rules, were entitled to consolidated allowance whether on the line or on station duty?

Mr. P. E. Rau: With your permission, Sir, I reply to questions Nos. 956, 957 and 958 together. I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table, in due course.

IGNORING THE CLAIMS OF OLD TRAVELLING TICKET INSPECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

†957. ***Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state why on the East Indian Railway some of the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors are utilised as Ticket Collectors and many crewmen who never handled excess fare ticket books have been given preference as Travelling Ticket Examiners?

(b) Is it a fact that those Travelling Ticket Inspectors who are now utilised as Ticket Collectors were recommended by the Operating Department for the job of Travelling Ticket Inspectors as acknowledged in reply to question No. 1110 (d) in the Legislative Assembly, dated the 18th March, 1929?

(c) On being reverted back to their own Department, why were they not utilised as Travelling Ticket Examiners?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state how many of the Crew Inspectors with temporary service were utilised as Ticket Collectors on the inauguration of the Moody-Ward system?

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 956.

DISCHARGE AND RE-APPOINTMENT OF SOME TRAVELLING TICKET INSPECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

†958. *Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that on the inauguration of the Moody-Ward system on the East Indian Railway, four old Travelling Ticket Inspectors were given notice of discharge in the Lucknow Division, but that the notice was subsequently cancelled?

(b) What was the cause of the discharge and subsequent cancellation of the same?

(c) On what job and pay have those Travelling Ticket Inspectors now been utilised?

(d) Are there same or different rules concerning the staff on different divisions of the East Indian Railway?

RECRUITMENT OF MUSLIMS IN THE SIMLA POST OFFICE.

959. *Shaikh Fazal Haq Piracha: (a) Will Government kindly state what was the strength of the permanent Muslim officials in the Simla Post Office in the cadre of lower division clerks, head postmen, postmen, packers and runners before the issue of the Director General's General letter No. Am.-516/12/27?

(b) How many vacancies occurred after the issue of this letter up to this time?

(c) How many of them were given to Muslims, and in what proportion?

(d) If none was given to Muslims, why, and what action do Government propose to take in the matter?

(e) Is it a fact that all the recruiting officers such as Telegraph Inspectors, Inspectors of Post Offices, Accountant and Appointment Clerks and Head Clerk Correspondence have been non-Muslims for the last ten years? If so, what action do Government propose to take to replace them by Muslims to ensure Muslim recruitment in future?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) Seven.

(b) 109.

(c) Three posts were abolished and 11 are vacant. 55 vacancies were filled up by the promotion of departmental officials, of whom one is a Muslim and 54 non-Muslims. The remaining 40 vacancies were filled up by direct recruits, of whom one is a Muslim and 39 are non-Muslims.

(d) Government are enquiring into the matter and will place on the table a report of the action taken, in due course.

(e) There is no Inspector of Post Offices or Telegraph Inspector attached to the Simla Post Office, and none of the remaining officials mentioned in the first part of the question has any power of recruitment. The latter part of the question does not, therefore, arise.

HEAD CLERKS OF THE OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, LAHORE.

960. *Shaikh Fazal Haq Piracha: Is it a fact that the Head Clerks of all the branches of the Post Master General's Office, Lahore, are Hindus?

Mr. T. Ryan: Yes, except that the Assistant Manager, Circle Stock Depot, whose status is that of a Head Clerk, is a Muslim and that the appointment of another Muslim to one of the Head Clerks' posts has recently been ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF MUSLIMS AS HEAD CLERKS, ETC., IN THE OFFICE OF THE POST MASTER GENERAL, LAHORE.

961. ***Shahk Fazal Haq Piracha:** (a) Is it a fact that the Muslim Head Clerk of the Appointment Branch in the Post Master General's Office, Lahore, who worked there less than two years has recently been removed from there in spite of the fact that he had not completed the prescribed period of three years?

(b) Is it a fact that second and third clerks of the Post Master General's Office, Establishment Branch, are non-Muslims?

(c) If the answer to these questions be in the affirmative, what action do Government propose to take to replace them by Muslims?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) and (b). Government have no information.

(c) Head clerkships are selection grade posts and, as has been frequently stated on the floor of this House, appointments to such posts are regulated without reference to communal considerations. As regards the other posts, Government are not prepared to take any action except to see that in direct recruitment to Government service their orders for the protection of the rights of minority communities are properly observed. The Honourable Member's attention is also invited to the reply given by the Honourable Sir James Crerar to Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim's starred question No. 840 in the Legislative Assembly on the 16th September, 1931.

DELAY IN THE DESPATCH OF A NEWSPAPER OF BERAR DUE TO SHORTAGE OF POSTAGE STAMPS IN THE POST OFFICE.

962. ***Dr. Zaidullah Ahmad** (on behalf of Mr. S. G. Jog) (a) Is it not a fact that an issue, dated the 2nd August, 1932, of a leading newspaper of Berar named *Udaya*, printed and published at Amraoti, could not be despatched on account of shortage of postage stamps in the post office?

(b) If so, will Government state whether such contingencies occur in other branches of post offices?

(c) Do Government propose to get over such difficulty by empowering the Post Master to take cash and despatch the issue?

(d) If not, are Government prepared to enquire into the matter with a view to finding out some other remedy to get over such difficulty?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) Yes.

(b) No

(c) and (d). The Post Office rules prescribe that the postmaster is responsible for maintaining a sufficient stock of postage stamps of all kinds for sale to the public. The situation complained of by the Honourable Member was a very exceptional occurrence and Government do not propose to adopt any special measures to meet such exceptional cases, nor do they consider it desirable to empower all post offices to accept cash payment in lieu of postage, as such a course would be open to abuse.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Since the time notice of this question was given, has the Department of my Honourable friend taken any steps to give a warning that the postmaster in question should not be negligent like this in future?

Mr. T. Ryan: It is so very exceptional an occurrence that special steps hardly seem necessary; but we have taken up the particular case to make certain that no misunderstandings such as led to it shall recur.

FUTURE STATUS OF BERAR IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION.

963. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** (on behalf of Mr. S. G. Jog): (a) Are Government prepared to make any statement now as to the future status of Berar in the new constitution?

(b) If not, when do Government propose to make a statement on the above matter?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: (a) No, Sir.

(b) The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply given by Sir Evelyn Howell in this House to a similar question by Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh on the 25th January, 1932. The position has not changed since.

ATTENDANCE OF POSTAL OFFICIALS ON SUNDAYS AND GAZETTED HOLIDAYS.

964. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** (on behalf of Mr. S. G. Jog): (a) Is it a fact that some departments of the Bombay, Madras, Calcutta and Rangoon General Post Offices remain closed on Sundays and other postal holidays and clerks attached to those departments are not required to work on Sundays or postal holidays while clerks working in other departments are required to work on Sundays and Post Office holidays?

(b) Is it a fact that clerks who work in no-delivery sub-offices in Bombay, Madras, Calcutta and Rangoon are similarly exempted from attending office on Sundays and postal holidays, while clerks working in delivery post offices are required to attend office on Sundays and postal holidays?

(c) Will Government please state why the clerks working in the same department are treated in different ways, why a section of clerks enjoy all holidays while others have to attend office?

(d) Do Government propose to order the clerks who now enjoy all holidays to attend office on some holidays in order to give some more relaxation to those who are now required to attend office on holidays? If not, why not?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) and (b). The facts are substantially as stated.

(c) and (d). Work on Sundays and holidays is recognised as a condition of service in the Postal Department; but in order to minimise the disability, instructions have been issued that a rotation of duties should be arranged, as far as the exigencies of the service permit, among the whole staff of an office, so that the turn for any individual to work on Sundays and holidays may recur as seldom as possible.

PERIODICAL TRANSFER OF CERTAIN POSTAL OFFICIALS.

965. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** (on behalf of Mr. S. G. Jog): (a) Is it a fact that clerks attached to the Appointment Branch of the Bombay, Madras Calcutta and Rangoon General Post Offices are working for many years in that particular department while other clerks are transferred frequently?

(b) Is it a fact that under orders of the Director General, Head Clerks of the Appointment Section are transferred after three years? If so, why are other clerks not similarly transferred?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) Government have no information: the matter is within the competence of the Postmasters-General concerned.

(b) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, Government do not consider that the periodical transfer of the whole clerical staff of a Section is either necessary or desirable in view of the confusion and dislocation of work which would result.

MIGRATION OF SOME RESIDENTS OF THE ALWAR STATE TO BRITISH INDIA.

966. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** (a) Are Government aware that some residents of Alwar State have migrated to British India?

(b) Have Government enquired as to how many persons have so migrated, and why? How many of them have come to Delhi?

(c) Are Government aware that these emigrants from Alwar are staying in a maidan to the west of the Juma Masjid, Delhi? Will Government please state their number?

(d) Are all these emigrants Muslims or do they belong to any other community also?

(e) Are Government aware of the arrangements for their boarding and lodging?

(f) Have Government rendered any kind of help to them?

(g) Are Government in a position to state whether these persons have come to settle permanently or temporarily in British India?

(h) Have Government entered into any correspondence with the Alwar State on this matter?

(i) How many persons, to the knowledge of the Government, have gone back to Alwar and how many are still in British India?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: (a) Yes.

(b) Government have no accurate information.

(c) Yes. Their number alters from time to time, but at one period there were perhaps eighty to a hundred.

(d) It is believed that they are all Muslims.

(e) Government have no accurate information.

(f) No.

(g) No.

(h) Yes.

(i) The information is not available.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Have Government seen the book called "Alwarnama" printed at *Alaman* Press and compiled by Abdul Akhtar Khizary and published by Hakim Mohamad Ishaq, Secretary, Anjuman Rhuddame Mahajirins, Alwar?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: I personally have not seen it and I do not know whether it has been seen by the Government of India.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Do Government propose to see the book, because there are very serious allegations in that book against the Alwar State?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: If the Honourable Member will send me a copy of that book, I will see that it is sent to the Department concerned.

MOSQUES AND TEMPLES IN POSSESSION OF GOVERNMENT.

967. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Will Government kindly state how many (i) mosques and (ii) temples are still in their possession in which religious worship is entirely forbidden?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Religious worship is not forbidden in any of the mosques and temples belonging either to Government or to private persons or bodies, which are protected under the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act, 1904 (VII of 1904) and maintained from Central revenues.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Are Government aware that a mosque named Nawab Khan Jahan Mosque near Qutab Road, Delhi, has been converted into a hospital under the Municipal Committee and many such mosques and temples are unjustly and improperly used by Government and by local bodies?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Government are not keeping information about every mosque in the neighbourhood of Delhi. The Honourable Member's question related to mosques protected under the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act and my reply deals with such mosques.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Do Government propose to consider the desirability of holding an enquiry regarding the number of mosques and temples and other places of worship which are now in possession of Government or of local bodies?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I am afraid, Sir, that, as I have already stated, it is not possible for Government to take action in regard to all mosques. If there is any particular mosque which is being misused, perhaps the Honourable Member will bring the matter to the notice of the authority concerned.

NUMBER OF MUSLIMS ARRESTED AND IMPRISONED UNDER THE ORDINANCES.

968. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Will Government kindly lay on the table separately the number of Muslims arrested and imprisoned under the different Ordinances up-to-date in various provinces?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: The information is not available and I do not feel justified in putting Local Governments to the labour of collecting it.

AHRAR PRISONERS CONVICTED IN CONNECTION WITH KASHMIR MOVEMENT.

969. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** (a) How many Ahrars who were convicted in connection with the Kashmir movement are still in jail?

(b) Will the cost of these prisoners be paid by the Government of India or the Provincial Government?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) 56.

(b) The matter is under consideration.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is it not a fact that the reasons for which they were put in jail no longer exist and is it not, therefore, desirable to release them now and give them amnesty?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: I understand that a great majority of the prisoners who were imprisoned in connection with the movement have already been released.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I understood the Honourable Member to say that there were still 56 prisoners. Can it not be applied to them?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: One cannot accept the principle that a person imprisoned in connection with a certain movement must always be released the moment that movement comes to an end.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is it not a fact that that movement has come to an end and, therefore, they may be released now?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: I understand that it has come to an end.

PARCEL CLERKS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

970. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** (a) Is it a fact that there are four classes of parcel clerks on the North-Western Railway?

(b) Is it a fact that there are three superior posts for parcel clerks, i.e., two at Delhi and one at Lahore?

(c) Will Government please state the number of different communities in the superior posts of parcel clerks?

(d) What is the pay of the present parcel clerks in superior posts?

Mr. P. B. Rau: With your permission, Sir, I shall reply to this and the next question together.

I am obtaining certain information from the Agent, North-Western Railway, and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

PROMOTION OF MUSLIMS TO CLASS "D" OF PARCEL CLERKS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

†971. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** (a) What are the scales of pay for the different classes of the parcel clerks in the North-Western Railway?

(b) Is it a fact that there is not a single Muslim in class D of the parcel clerks in all the seven divisions of the North-Western Railway?

(c) Is it a fact that promotion from class C to D is not based on any competitive examination, rather it depends on the officer's choice?

(d) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of issuing instructions to the effect that Muslims may be promoted to class D and to superior posts of parcel clerks?

RESIGNATION OF MEMBERS AND OFFICE-BEARERS OF THE WORKS COMMITTEE, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

972. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Has the attention of Government been drawn to a statement published in the *Alaman* of Delhi, dated the 5th August, 1932, regarding the resignation of the members and office-bearers of the Works Committee of the Government of India Press, New Delhi, on account of certain grievances and injustice done to them? If so, what action has been taken to remove those grievances?

Mr. T. Ryan: Yes. An enquiry has been made and Government have been informed by the Controller of Printing and Stationery that there is no basis for the suggestion made in the newspaper report that the cause of the resignation of the members of the Works Committee was unjust treatment by the executive officers of the Press. The resignations have since been withdrawn.

APPOINTMENT OF MUSLIM PEONS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

973. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** What is the permanent strength of peons in the Government of India Press, New Delhi, and how many of them are Muslims? If none, what steps do Government propose to take to make up the deficiency?

Mr. T. Ryan: The strength is nine; none of the permanent peons is a Muslim. No appointments are contemplated at present as there are no vacancies.

APPOINTMENT OF MUSLIM CLERKS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

974. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Will Government please state whether there has been any increase in the percentage of the permanent Muslim clerks of the Government of India Press, New Delhi, since 1929, and during this period how many vacancies fell vacant and how many were filled by Muslims? What action do Government propose to take in order to increase the percentage of Muslims in the permanent cadre of the Press?

Mr. T. Ryan: There has been no increase in the percentage of the permanent Muslim clerks in the Government of India Press, New Delhi.

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 970.

since 1929. There have been three vacancies since 1929, all of which were given to non-Muslims. I may explain that no direct recruitment is made to the permanent clerical establishment of this Press. There are a number of men in the temporary and fluctuating clerical establishment of the Press and vacancies in the permanent establishment have hitherto been given to the most deserving men in the temporary and fluctuating establishment, irrespective of the communities to which they belong. The question of applying the orders regarding minority representation to transfers from the temporary to the permanent establishment is being examined.

COMMUNAL COMPOSITION OF THE CLERICAL ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

975. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the number of permanent incumbents of each community holding different grades in the clerical establishment of the Government of India Press, New Delhi?

Mr. T. Ryan: A statement furnishing the required information is laid on the table.

Statement showing the number of permanent incumbents of each community holding different grades in the Clerical Establishment of the Government of India Press, New Delhi.

Appointment or grade.	Hindus.	Muslims.	Sikhs.	Christians.	Total.
Head Assistant	1		1
Accountant and Cashier	1				1
General Store Keeper	1				1
Head Computer	1		..		1
Assistants	3				3
Upper scale Clerks and Computers	10	2			12
Lower scale Clerks and Computers	11	5	1	1	18
Caretaker and Transit Clerk	1	1

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF MINORITY COMMUNITIES IN THE CLERICAL ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

976. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Is it a fact that all higher posts in the clerical establishment of the Government of India Press, New Delhi, are held by non-Muslims? If so, do Government propose to give effect to their declared policy of avoiding the preponderance of any one community or class in the services?

Mr. T. Ryan: There are no Muslims in any clerical post in the Press higher than that of upper scale clerks and computers. These higher clerical posts are usually filled by promotion, and promotions from one grade to another are not made with reference to communal considerations.

MEDICAL LEAVE GRANTED TO THE EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

977. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** Will Government be pleased to furnish a statement regarding the period of medical leave granted to Muslim and non-Muslim employees of the Government of India Press, New Delhi, for the last two years? How many Muslims and non-Muslims were sent to the Chief Medical Officer, Delhi, for the countersignature of their medical certificates?

Mr. T. Ryan: The Controller of Printing and Stationery is responsible to Government generally for the efficient administration of the Government of India Presses and Government do not propose to call for information on minor matters relating to such administration, particularly where, as in this case, the compilation of the information desired would entail an amount of time and trouble entirely disproportionate to the value of the result.

REPLACEMENT OF MUSLIM CLERKS BY LADY CLERKS IN THE QUARTER-MASTER-GENERAL'S BRANCH.

978. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** (a) Will Government kindly state the proportion which the number of permanent Muslim Superintendents, Assistants and clerks in the Quarter-Master General's Branch bears to the total cadre of the above ministerial establishment in that branch?

(b) Is it a fact that last year about ten Muslim clerks working in that office were given notices of discharge from service? If so, what was the reason for giving the notices in question?

(c) Is it also a fact that these notices were withdrawn a few days later and the persons concerned were allowed to re-join their previous posts? If the reply to this be in the affirmative, what were the reasons for withdrawing the notices?

(d) Is it also a fact that a number of these clerks were again discharged from the service a few months later and were replaced by lady clerks?

(e) Will Government state the reasons for this action, and what was the advantage that accrued to the State by this action?

(f) What are the educational and other qualifications of these lady clerks.

(g) Are the lady clerks in question Europeans, Anglo-Indians or Indian Christians?

(h) Why were the Muslim clerks discharged to make room for these lady clerks?

Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham: (a) 20 per cent.

(b) and (c). Notices were served on six unqualified temporary clerks, of whom two were Hindus and four Muslims, because it was desired to replace them by qualified candidates. The notices served on the Muslim clerks were subsequently withdrawn, because no qualified Muslim candidates were available to replace them.

(d) and (e). Three of these Muslims were eventually discharged, because the permanent appointments in which they were temporarily employed

were reduced as an economy measure. The fourth was discharged on the return to the Branch of a permanent clerk in whose place he had been employed. They were not replaced by lady clerks.

(f), (g) and (h). Do not arise.

PAUCITY OF MUSLIMS IN CERTAIN POSTS IN DAIRY FARMS.

979. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** (a) Will Government kindly state the number of (i) managers, (ii) supervisors, (iii) assistant supervisors, (iv) apprentices employed in dairy farms, and (v) clerks employed in dairy farms?

(b) How many of them are Muslims in each category?

(c) Will Government kindly state the reasons for the paucity of Muslims in these posts, and what steps have been taken to increase their number to the proper proportion?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the table.

(c) As the Honourable Member is no doubt aware, the orders of Government regarding the redress of communal inequalities refer only to fresh recruitment and have not been in force for a great many years. I can assure the Honourable Member that these orders are strictly observed and since 1930, 11 out of 49 vacancies in the Military Dairy Farms Department have been given to Muslims.

Statement.

	Military Dairy Farms Department.			Civil Dairy Farms attached to the Imperial Institute of Agricultural Research, Pusa.	
	Total No.	No. of Muslims.		Total No.	No. of Muslims.
Managers . . .	27	..	Superintendents . . .	2	..
Supervisors . . .	29	4	Assistant Superintendent	1	..
Assistant Supervisors	32	3	Supervisors	7	1
Apprentices . . .	74	9	Clerks	8	..
Clerks	93	10			

†1930*—1931.*

IMPORT DUTIES COLLECTED ON MOTORS, TYRES, ETC.

982. ***Sir Leslie Hudson:** Will Government be pleased to state the amount collected in import duties on (a) motor lorries and buses, (b) motor cars, and (c) tyres, for the six months January to June, 1930, 1931 and 1932?

† These questions have already been answered; see pages 1613-14 of L. A. Debates dated 30th September, 1932.

The Honourable Sir Alan Parsons: I lay on the table such information as is contained in the records that are available.

Estimated amount of duty collected on (1) motor buses and lorries, (2) motor cars, motor cycles, motor scooters and their accessories, and (3) rubber tyres and tubes, during the months January to June 1930, 1931 and 1932.

Articles.	Duty collected during the months January to June.		
	1930.	1931.	1932.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
(1) Motor omnibuses, motor vans and motor lorries	14,85,264	10,72,106	6,68,256
(2) Motor cars, motor cycles, motor scooters and accessories and parts thereof	42,31,502	37,66,325	24,22,559
(3) Pneumatic rubber tyres and tubes for motor cars, motor lorries, motor cycles and motor scooters	16,04,264	16,57,931	16,76,166

UTILISATION OF THE PETROL TAX ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF ROADS.

983. ***Sir Leslie Hudson:** (a) Are Government aware that for the period since the two-anna petrol tax was introduced up to the 30th September, 1931, Rs. 233½ lakhs have been collected, of which Rs. 170 lakhs have been distributed with respect to Revenue up to the 30th September, 1930, but only Rs. 42½ lakhs were reported to have actually been spent up to the 30th September, 1931?

(b) If so, what action, if any, have Government taken to press Provincial Governments to expedite the expenditure of these funds on those schemes for which the Central Standing Committee for Roads have authorised the grants?

(c) If not, have Government considered the question of taking action and also of recommending that the Standing Committee for Roads refuse further grants to those Provinces who are dilatory in pushing forward road development schemes and the question of distributing such amounts amongst those provinces which show an active interest in road development?

(d) If legislation is required to make this possible, are Government prepared to take the necessary action?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) Yes, except that the expenditure reported up to the 30th September, 1931, is Rs. 48.42 lakhs and not Rs. 42½ lakhs, as assumed by the Honourable Member.

(b) Government have not taken any action to press Provincial Governments to expedite expenditure.

(c) and (d). No. Such action would not be in accordance with the Resolution on the subject adopted by this House and by the Council of State. In this connection I may explain that the road development

account was intended to supplement previous road building activities and to enable new works beyond the scope of the then existing schemes and programmes of development to be financed. The financial depression and the consequent inevitable curtailment of existing provincial programmes have caused a certain amount of dislocation and re-arrangement to which the slowness of expenditure in certain cases can be attributed. There has, however, been marked progress in expenditure in the Provinces since September, 1931, and I may mention that excluding Rs. 28.70 lakhs sanctioned as loans from the fund the Provinces had spent, by the end of June, 1932, a total sum of Rs. 82.24 lakhs from sums allotted to them from the Road Development Account.

Sir Leslie Hudson: The tax was previously eight annas of which two annas went to the Road Fund. Twelve months ago, a surcharge of 25 per cent. on this eight annas was imposed. May I know if the proportion of the surcharge relating to two annas is being credited to the Road Fund now?

The Honourable Sir Alan Parsons: I shall have to verify the point before I can give a reply to the Honourable Member. I will lay a statement containing the information on the table in due course.

TERMS OF CONTRACT WITH THE BENGAL AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

984. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** Will Government lay on the table the final contract with the Bengal and North Western Railway? Did the contract include any provision for maintaining the equipment and administration in an efficient manner?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The final contract is still, I believe, under preparation.

TERMS OF CONTRACT WITH THE SHAHDARA-SAHARANPUR LIGHT RAILWAY.

985. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** What are the terms of the contract between Government and the Shahdara-Saharanpur Light Railway running between Shahdara and Saharanpur? When will the contract expire? Did Government renew the contract recently?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I would refer the Honourable Member to page 229 of the History of Indian Railways, a copy of which is in the Library. The contract can be terminated on the 18th April, 1934.

The United Provinces Government did not exercise their option of terminating the contract seven years earlier.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is it necessary in this case to give one year's notice?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I believe so.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: What is the last date for giving notice?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I believe somewhere in April, 1933.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Are Government contemplating to give notice?

Mr. P. B. Rau: It is the United Provinces Government that can give notice,

**ABSENCE OF WATER CLOSETS, ETC., IN THE THIRD CLASS CARRIAGES
OF THE SHAHDARA-SAHARANPUR LIGHT RAILWAY.**

986. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** (a) Are Government aware that water closets are not provided in third class carriages in Shahdara-Saharanpur Light Railway? Are not passengers harassed and charged if they use inter class water closets?

(b) Are Government aware that passengers are kept waiting for an unreasonable time at level crossings? Has any one given notice to recover damages from the Secretary of State for such wrongful detention?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to Lala Hari Raj Swarup's question No. 698 on the 23rd September, 1932. Government have no information as regards the latter part of this question.

(b) Government have no information, but I am bringing the Honourable Member's question to the notice of the Managing Agents of the Railway for such action as they consider necessary.

RATE-WAR AGAINST THE BENGAL BURMAH STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY.

987. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** (a) Are Government aware that the British India Steam Navigation Company sent the Bengal Steam Navigation Company to liquidation in 1910 by waging a rate-war and that they are waging a similar rate-war against the Bengal Burmah Steam Navigation Company?

(b) Are Government prepared to use their influence and stop rate-war? Is it not a fact that the British India Steam Navigation Company increased their fares between Chittagong and Rangoon from Rs. 12 to Rs. 14 and reduced it to Rs. 8 as soon as the Bengal Burmah Steam Navigation Company was formed?

(c) Are Government prepared to hand over the mail contract to the Bengal Burmah Steam Navigation Company, which is an Indian Company?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore: (a) The Government of India have received a representation from the Bengal Burmah Steam Navigation Company alleging that the British India Steam Navigation Company have been waging a rate-war against them in the passenger carrying trade between Chittagong and Rangoon.

(b) The matter is at present receiving the attention of the Government of India. The Government of India understand that before the Bengal Burmah Steam Navigation Company began to operate, the British India Steam Navigation Company had already reduced the fare for deck passengers between Chittagong and Rangoon, and that thereafter the fare was further reduced to Rs. 6.

(c) It is not understood to which mail contract the Honourable Member is referring. It may, however, be stated that the present contract for the conveyance of mails by the British India Steam Navigation Company over various routes continues until 31st January, 1934, and that the next

contract will be entered into on the result of open competitive tenders. It is, therefore, not possible now to make any definite statement on the subject.

Mr. K. Ahmed: What do Government propose and when will they give effect to the Resolution which was passed at the Simla Session in the absence of the Honourable Member? Is the Honourable Member aware that this House unanimously passed the Resolution?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am aware of that fact.

Mr. K. Ahmed: What do they propose to do with regard to that Resolution?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I think the Honourable Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar made it clear that Government could not give effect to that Resolution.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Are Government aware that the same principle should apply as it was fixed at the intervention of Lord Irwin with regard to the Scindia Steam Navigation Company and the British India Steam Navigation Company, Limited, that from Calcutta to Rangoon they will fix the same fare in respect of freight for cargo carried from Calcutta to Rangoon and *vice versa*?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am not aware to what my Honourable friend is referring.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Will Government consider whether the contract should be renewed in the case of the British India Steam Navigation Company if the company did not agree to the advice given by the Government about the settlement of differences between the two companies?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: The matter of deciding on mail contracts does not fall within my Department, but I shall bring it to the notice of my Honourable colleague who is unfortunately not able to be in his place here today on account of illness.

Mr. S. G. Jog: May I know the probable time by which these tenders will be asked for before the extension of the new contracts?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am afraid I cannot give my Honourable friend any information on this point, because it does not relate to a matter with which my Department is concerned but I will try to obtain the information for him.

PRICE OF PETROL IN INDIA, RANGOON AND LONDON.

988. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** (a) Are Government aware that all petrol, though bought from various sources, is sold at the same price in each district of India?

(b) Are Government aware that all the companies have combined together against the consumers?

(c) What is the price of petrol in Rangoon and in London?

(d) What is the cost of production of petrol per gallon? Is it not in the neighbourhood of one anna per gallon?

(e) At what price do Government purchase the petrol?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: (a) The information in the possession of the Government of India is that petrol from all sources is sold in India at a uniform price in a particular locality. This price, however, varies from place to place.

(b) The Government of India have no information, but, as promised by Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar in reply to a supplementary question during the last Simla Session, the matter is being investigated.

(c) The price of petrol in Rangoon at the end of August 1932 was Rs. 1-2-6 per gallon in bulk or pump and Rs. 1-3-6 per gallon in sealed cans. The price in London for the month ending on the 25th August 1932 was 1s. 1½d. to 1s. 3¼d. per gallon. It is believed that the price has recently been raised by 4d. a gallon.

(d) The Government of India have no information.

(e) The prices at which the Government of India purchase petrol vary with the localities in which supplies are required and the method of packing. The following are the prices at which the Indian Stores Department purchased at present.

- (i) F. O. R. at suppliers' installation in, and delivered free, at Rangoon, one rupee and one anna per Imperial gallon in returnable 2 gallon cans.
- (ii) F. O. R. at suppliers' installations at Calcutta, Bombay and Madras or delivered free at these places, one rupee five annas and six pies per Imperial gallon in returnable 2 gallon cans.
- (iii) F. O. R. at suppliers' installations at Calcutta, Bombay and Madras or delivered free at these places in returnable 40/45 gallon steel casks, one rupee and four annas per Imperial gallon.
- (iv) F. O. R. at suppliers' installations at Calcutta and Madras in buyer's containers or in bulk one rupee three annas and six pies per Imperial gallon.
- (v) For supplies made in bulk in Bombay City, annas five and pies six per Imperial gallon is charged less than the price mentioned in (iv) above.

This rate took effect from the 4th October, 1932. Previous to that date it was the same as in (iv) above.

- (vi) For deliveries made at Karachi, six pies per Imperial gallon is charged over and above the prices mentioned in (ii), (iii) and (iv) above.

Mr. K. Ahmed: In view of the fact that petrol coming from Russia lately is sold at Re. 1 per gallon at Bombay and in view of the fact that memorials were sent again and again, not by people who use motor cars alone, but also the suppliers of motor cars, copies of which must have reached my Honourable friend's Department, do Government propose, for the benefit of the people, to take steps to bring about a reduction in the price, considering the fact that the cost of production is not more than 10 annas and six pies?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: My Honourable friend is proceeding on an assumption which, I think, is not correct.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Will the Honourable Member kindly point out which part of my question is correct and which part of it is incorrect?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: According to my information, all his assumptions are more or less incorrect.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Did he or did he not receive a memorial that a gallon of petrol costs one rupee now-a-days in Bombay and the other cities are expecting the same?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am not aware of it, but I shall make inquiries.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Does it not appear from the report of the Burma Oil Company that the cost of production is only 10 annas and six pies and that they are charging such a huge amount, Government allowing this undesirable bargain?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I have already replied that Government have no information in regard to the cost of production.

Mr. B. V. Jadhav: May I know if Government have made any inquiries as to why they are getting petrol cheaper by five annas six pies since October 5?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I have no doubt that is due to competition.

Mr. B. V. Jadhav: Does it not show that the Company was making excessive profits before this competition came in?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: Not necessarily; it might be.

Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal: Do the Government realise that two Companies situated in this country, the Attock Oil Company and the Burma Oil Company, can sell petrol cheaper in London and dearer in this country? If so, does that not call for some inquiry by Government?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I think it is a fact that petrol is sold cheaper in London; but I am not aware of the reasons for that; it may be due to competition.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Do you propose to inquire about the reasons?

Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal: May it not be due to profiteering?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: It may be due to a variety of reasons. I do not think it is a matter in which Government can act, certainly not on the information which they have at present. If it is a fact that competition is succeeding in reducing rates, I think that the public will no doubt benefit very considerably.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is it not a fact that all the Companies have combined against consumers and now the Bolsheviks of Russia have come in to break this combine, when American Standard Company failed?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: It may possibly be so.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: In regard to the answer to part (b) of the question, may I know if it is very difficult for the Government to find out whether there is a combination and, if there is one, to provide against it?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I think I have already informed my Honourable friend that the matter is being investigated.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Exactly: what I mean is, is it such a difficult question that it should take so much time, and that we should be suffering in the meantime?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: My Honourable friend must realise that these inquiries cannot be made in the course of a few days or even a few weeks.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Would it require years to find out whether there is a combination or not? I would like to have an answer as to how much more time it will take.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I cannot possibly tell my Honourable friend.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I take it that Government will take an indefinite time over this inquiry?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: There will be an inquiry carried out and the results will, if necessary, be communicated to any Member of this House who puts a question on that point.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know why it should take such a long time?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am not prepared to give any more information on that point.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Then I take it that there is no desire on the part of Government to give a direct reply?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: My Honourable friend's assumption is entirely incorrect.

RETRENCHMENT IN THE RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

989. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** (a) What are the principles on which retrenchment is being carried on in the Railway Department?

(b) Are Government prepared to issue orders to Agents and Divisional Superintendents that persons who have retired from Company and State Railways and who are now serving in State Railways, should be compelled to retire?

(c) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of forcing persons, who have completed 25 years' service, to retire?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to paragraph 17 of the Government of India's Communiqué, dated the 6th June, 1932, a copy of which is in the Library.

(b) State-managed Railway Administrations have been advised that no extension of service after the age of 55 should ordinarily be granted to railway employees in units in which there is a surplus or where there is a waiting list.

(c) No. I would remind the Honourable Member that the Court of Enquiry definitely advised against following this course as a general rule.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Has the time come when retrenchment should now be stopped?

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

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Will the retrenchment continue?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I have not said that. I cannot give an undertaking on the part of the Railway Department that retrenchments will cease at the present moment. I explained in reply to a question yesterday what the position was with regard to the retrenchments in railways in general. So far as the information, available at present, goes I said that the total number of staff to be retrenched in the immediate future was not likely to exceed 8,000.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: My question was, is this whole question not a question of the past and now the question would not arise in future?

(No answer was given.)

PROMOTION OF PERMANENT WAY INSPECTORS TO THE RANK OF ASSISTANT ENGINEERS.

990. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** (a) Is it a fact that Permanent Way Inspectors are promoted to the rank of Assistant Engineers, even if they are not qualified?

(b) Do they have any knowledge, theoretical or practical, in construction work?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) and (b) Permanent Way Inspectors are promoted to the rank of Assistant Engineers only when they have the knowledge, theoretical and practical, considered requisite for the satisfactory execution of the duties they are called upon to perform.

MODERATION OF MR. HASSAN'S REPORT.

991. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** (a) Is it not a fact that Mr. Hassan's original report was moderated by Mr. Chandwani at the suggestion of Mr. Hayman?

(b) Will Government be pleased to lay the original report in the Library?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) No.

(b) The report, as laid in the Library, is the original report submitted by Mr. Hassan to the Railway Board.

RAILWAY BOARD'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON MR. HASSAN'S REPORT.

992. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad**: Is it not a fact that the recommendations for the Railway Board on Mr. Hassan's report were also prepared by Mr. Chandwani?

Mr. P. B. Rau: No.

MOSQUES UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE GOVERNMENT.

998. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (on behalf of Shaikh Sadiq Hasan): Will Government be pleased to enumerate (a) the mosques which are in their possession, or (b) over which Government claim to exercise control?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) 150.

(b) 95.

JAMA MASJID, DELHI.

994. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (on behalf of Shaikh Sadiq Hasan): (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the Jama Masjid, Delhi, was built by the Emperor Shah Jehan?

(b) Have Government got any claims over it? If so, under what agreement and with whom?

(c) Will Government be pleased to lay a copy of the agreement on the table?

(d) Do Government know that any interference with the full user of Jama Masjid, Delhi, by Muslims according to *Shariat* will cause great resentment throughout the country?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). A copy of the agreement was laid on the table on the 30th September, 1932.

(d) I would invite attention to the Press Communiqué issued by the Chief Commissioner, Delhi, on the subject on the 31st August, 1932.

CLASSIFICATION IN JAIL OF MAULANA ATAULLAH SHAH BOKHARI OF AMRITSAR.

995. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (on behalf of Shaikh Sadiq Hasan): (a) Are Government aware that Maulana Ataullah Shah Bokhari of Amritsar is held in great respect by Muslims?

(b) Was he convicted by a Magistrate at Delhi for making two speeches and placed as a prisoner in B class?

(c) Are Government aware that such treatment of giving him B class has caused discontent?

(d) Are Government prepared to change his class from B to A?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) The Government understand that he is an influential speaker.

(b) Yes.

(c) No.

(d) The Local Government see no reason to make such a change. The classification was made after due consideration.

RELEASE OF AHRAR PRISONERS CONVICTED IN CONNECTION WITH THE KASHMIR AGITATION.

996. *Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad (on behalf of Shaikh Sadiq Hasan): (a) Will Government be pleased to state how many Ahrar prisoners there are in jails in India in connection with the Kashmir agitation?

(b) Are Government aware that at present there is neither the disobedience movement nor the agitation against the Kashmir Durbar in British India?

(c) Do Government propose to release the Ahrar prisoners who were sent to jail in connection with the Kashmir agitation? If not, why not?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) 56.

(b) So far as I am aware, the Honourable Member's view is correct.

(c) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given by me to part (b) of question No. 707 on the same subject.

IMPRISONMENT OF MR. AZIZ HINDI OF AMRITSAR.

997. *Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad (on behalf of Shaikh Sadiq Hasan): (a) Will Government be pleased to state on what grounds they have imprisoned Mr. Aziz Hindi of Amritsar without a trial?

(b) How long do Government intend to deprive him of his freedom?

(c) Will Government ever put him in trial before a Court of law?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given by my predecessor in this House on the 27th January, 1931, to Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh's question No. 43.

(b) As long as this is necessary in the public interest.

(c) There is no such intention.

ABSENCE OF LATRINES IN THIRD CLASS CARRIAGES ON THE SHAHDARA-SAHARANPUR LIGHT RAILWAY.

998. *Kunwar Haji Ismail Ali Khan (on behalf of Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin): Is it a fact that the Shahdara-Saharanpur Light Railway does not provide latrines for the third class passengers? If so, why? Are Government prepared to invite the attention of the Shahdara-Saharanpur Light Railway Company to this want?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to Lala Hari Raj Swarup's question No. 698 on the 28th September, 1932. I am bringing the Honourable Member's question to the notice of the Managing Agents of the Railway.

ABSENCE OF LATRINES IN THIRD CLASS CARRIAGES ON THE SHAHDARA-SAHARANPUR LIGHT RAILWAY.

999. *Kunwar Haji Ismail Ali Khan (on behalf of Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin): What should the passengers of the third class travelling on the Shahdara-Saharanpur Light Railway do when they feel call of nature? Is it a fact that one such passenger who used the intermediate class latrine was charged excess-fare from Baraut to Baghat Road railway station on the 8th September, 1932?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I am afraid, Government cannot undertake to offer advice on the matter raised in the first part of this question. As regards the second part, I have no information, but, ordinarily, passengers, found in a higher class of carriage than that for which they hold tickets, are liable to pay excess fares.

EXPIRY OF THE CONTRACT OF THE SHAHDARA-SAHARANPUR LIGHT RAILWAY.

1000. ***Kunwar Haji Ismail Ali Khan** (on behalf of Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin): (a) Is it a fact that the term of the original contract between the Shahdara-Saharanpur Light Railway Company and Government came to an end, and an extension has been given to the Company?

(b) When, why, and for how much time was it given?

(c) Do Government propose to take over the management of the Railway after the extended term comes to an end?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) The last occasion for termination was in 1927. The United Provinces Government did not then exercise their option.

(b) Under the terms of the contract, the next occasion on which the option can be exercised is on 18th April, 1934.

(c) The question is one for decision by the Government of the United Provinces.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: In view of the fact that this Company takes very little care about the comforts of passengers, will not the Government convey to the Government of the United Provinces the wishes of the public that this contract should cease to exist?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I should say that the natural course would be to ask questions in the United Provinces Legislative Council.

INCONVENIENCE CAUSED TO PASSENGERS AT GARHMUKTESAR ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1001. ***Kunwar Haji Ismail Ali Khan** (on behalf of Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin): (a) Is it a fact that on some minor stations of the East Indian Railway, e.g., Garhmuktesar, only one man is kept on duty after sunset?

(b) Are Government aware that considerable inconvenience is thereby caused to the passengers alighting from the trains, as the gates are closed and they are not allowed to go out till the train has left and the member of the staff concerned is relieved of the incidental engagements?

(c) Is it the duty of the Railway administration to allow the passengers alighting from the trains egress from the Railway station as soon as they desire to go out?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) Government have no details of the staff actually employed at each station.

(b) The scheduled stoppage of trains at minor stations does not normally exceed two or three minutes. I am, however, bringing the Honourable Member's question to the notice of the Agent, East Indian Railway, for such action as he may consider necessary.

(c) Yes.

DETENTION OF PASSENGERS AT GARHMUKTESAR, EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1002. ***Kunwar Haji Ismail Ali Khan** (on behalf of Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin): (a) Is it a fact that on the 20th August, 1932, passengers arriving at Garhmuktesar Railway Station by the 4-M. D. train, Moradabad-Delhi Branch, were detained for about 20 minutes and were not allowed to go out till about a quarter of an hour after the departure of the train?

(b) Was Maulvi Muhammad Zharul Hasan, B.A., LL.B., Pleader, Ghaziabad, one of them?

(c) Has he served the Secretary of State for India in Council and the Agent, East Indian Railway, with notices claiming damages?

(d) What do Government propose to do in the matter?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a), (b) and (c). Government have no information.

(d) Government have called for a report from the East Indian Railway as to the facts and, when it is received, will consider whether any action on their part is called for.

DECLARATION OF A GRAVE AT GHAZIABAD AS A PROTECTED MONUMENT.

1003. ***Kunwar Haji Ismail Ali Khan** (on behalf of Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin): (a) Is it a fact that there is an ancient grave lying near the Dak Bungalow at Ghaziabad which is believed to be that of the mother of Nawab Ghaziuddin Hyder, the founder of Ghaziabad?

(b) Are Government prepared to declare it protected under the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act, and effect necessary repairs thereto?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) and (b). Government have no information, but propose to have the grave inspected by officers of the Archaeological Department.

Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan: Will Government kindly make inquiries?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I have already stated that we shall ask officers of the Archaeological Department to inspect this grave.

GRANT OF DISABILITY PENSION TO JAMADAR AHMAD BAKHSH.

1004. ***Kunwar Haji Ismail Ali Khan** (on behalf of Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin): With reference to my starred question put in the Legislative Assembly on the 5th March, 1931, and the answer given by the Army Secretary in his D. O. No. 42-G., dated the 11th April, 1931, that Jamadar Ahmad Bakhsh did not show any sign of ill-health while at Manzai, will Government be pleased to state how that reply can be reconciled with the following documents:

- (i) Manzai Hospital No. 7/1548/3/5, dated 25th April, 1926, and No. 7/2589/11, dated 30th May, 1926 (Brief Clinical Notes) showing that Jamadar Ahmad Bakhsh was sick at Manzai; and

- (ii) the certificate of the Medical Board held on this officer in March 1927, to the effect that the disability was contracted on field service during the Great War and was permanent?

Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham: Inquiries have been made from the military authorities concerned, and a reply will be laid on the table in due course.

REMOVAL OF MR. JUGAL KISHORE KHANNA AND LALA DESH BANDHU GUPTA FROM THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE DELHI MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE.

1005. ***Mr. B. Das:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if Mr. Jugal Kishore Khanna and Lala Desh Bandhu Gupta, members of the Delhi Municipality, have been removed by order of the Local Government under section 16 (1) (a) of the Punjab Municipal Act from the Committee on the ground of their having committed a breach of the oath of allegiance?

(b) Is it a fact that the said members in their reply to the charge of having committed a breach of the Municipal oath of allegiance refuted the charge?

(c) If so, will Government state if a breach of the oath of allegiance was proved in any competent Court?

(d) If the reply to part (c) be in the negative, will Government please state the grounds on which the charge was held by the Local Government to be justified?

Mr. G. S. Bajpal: (a) They were removed on account of having been convicted of an offence which implied, in the opinion of the Chief Commissioner, Delhi, a defect of character which unfitted them to be members of the Municipal Committee.

(b) The explanations submitted by them were considered unsatisfactory by the Chief Commissioner.

(c) This was not necessary.

(d) The Honourable Member's attention is drawn to the reply given to part (a) of this question.

Mr. B. Das: Is the Honourable Member aware that there are certain Members present on the floor of this House who have been similarly convicted by the Government, as for instance, my friend, Mr. S. C. Mitra ?

Mr. S. C. Mitra: I was never convicted of any offence, though detained in jail for several years.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: May I know for what offence this gentleman was convicted?

Mr. G. S. Bajpal: This gentleman was convicted for forming part of an unlawful association.

Mr. B. Das: Under the Ordinance?

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: What was the unlawful association? The Indian National Congress?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: No, not the Indian National Congress. The Honourable Member knows very well that the Indian National Congress as such has not been declared an unlawful association.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Then may I know what the Association was of which this gentleman formed a member?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: If the Honourable Member would like detailed information, I shall be very glad to call for it and furnish it to him.

ABSENTEE MUNICIPAL COMMISSIONERS OF THE DELHI MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE.

1006. ***Mr. B. Das:** (a) Will Government please furnish the names of those Municipal Commissioners of the Delhi Municipal Committee who, during the last six years, have absented themselves from the Municipal Committee for more than three months?

(b) Was any action taken against them for such absence?

(c) If the reply to part (b) be in the negative, will Government state why no action was taken against them?

(d) Why has it been thought necessary to take action under section 16 (1) (a) of the Punjab Municipal Act against Messrs. Khanna and Gupta?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a), (b) and (c). Government regret that they are unable to supply the information asked for by the Honourable Member as its collection would involve an expenditure of time and labour wholly incommensurate with the results.

(d) The reasons for the removal of Messrs. Khanna and Gupta have been given in the reply to part (a) of question No. 1005.

Mr. B. Das: Is the Honourable Member aware that this House happens to be the Local Council for the Delhi Province, and the Members of this House are entitled to have information about affairs in this province, though they may not be entitled to ask for information about other provinces?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I am sure, Sir, the House will appreciate the fact that I have never refused to furnish Honourable Members any information which it is in the power of the Government to supply.

Mr. B. Das: Did not the Honourable gentleman just now plead that on the ground of expenditure the information could not be collected?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Well, Sir, I have already said that Government will furnish information which it is possible for them to furnish consistently not only with the desire of the House to have certain information, but also consistently with their responsibility to the tax-payer.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: So far as part (b) is concerned, I think Government can easily find out the names of those gentlemen who, during the last six years, have absented themselves from the Municipal Committee for more than three months and, if any one of them was debarred from being a member of the Municipal Committee? It is a question of principle to see if this rule has been applied to anybody else in the past.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: My point is, that in order to get that information, the Local Administration will have to go through their records which are in the municipal offices, and it does not seem necessary to collect the information.

Mr. B. Das: May I ask the Honourable Member whether, if the Local Administration had a Local Council, they would not have had to supply this information?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: That, Sir, is a hypothetical question; if there is a Local Administration and a Local Council, they can settle the matter between themselves.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Is the Honourable Member a better representative of the tax-payers of this country than the elected Members of this House?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Far be it for me to contend that the Honourable Members opposite are less representative as regards their responsibility to the tax-payer.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: Is not the Honourable Member assuming too much when he says that to supply the information asked for would involve an expenditure of time and labour incommensurate with the results? We want to know why any member who has been absent for more than three months should be debarred from functioning again as a member of the Municipal Committee? That is a question of principle which should not be applicable to absentee politicians alone.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I have given the information which has been supplied to me by the Local Administration and I presume the Local Administration are in a position to judge what amount of work would be required for collecting certain information.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Is it because it will not redound to the credit of the Chief Commissioner that the Government refuse to supply the information?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: No, not a bit of it, Sir; because, as a matter of fact, the Honourable the Chief Commissioner has informed us, and I have also informed the House of that fact, that these two persons were removed from the membership of the Municipal Committee not because of prolonged absence from the Municipality, but under section 16 (1) of the Punjab Municipal Act.

**REMOVAL OF OFFICIAL PRESIDENT OF THE DELHI MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE
MOVED BY TWO MEMBERS OF THE NATIONALIST MUNICIPAL PARTY.**

1007. ***Mr. B. Das:** Is it a fact that Lala Jugal Kishore Khanna and Lala Desh Bandhu Gupta, Municipal Commissioners of Delhi, were members of the Nationalist Municipal Party who moved for the removal of the official President when the present Chief Commissioner was the Deputy Commissioner?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Government have no information.

Mr. B. Das: Will the Honourable Member collect information on the matter?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: If the Honourable Member wishes this point pursued, I am quite prepared to ask the Chief Commissioner to carry on inquiries.

Mr. B. Das: Was it not a part of the duty of the Chief Commissioner to supply the information, because he happens to be the President of the Municipality?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The Chief Commissioner, if I may submit it for the consideration of the House, is certainly expected to collect information with regard to official functions of individuals, but as regards the private associations of individuals, such as membership of a particular party, I am not sure whether it is part of his functions.

Mr. B. Das: Is the Honourable Member aware that similar questions are being asked in Provincial Councils, and whether under the Local Self-Government Act similar questions can be asked?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I am quite prepared to accept that from my Honourable friend. I have not personally made researches into the proceedings of Local Councils.

Mr. B. Das: Why does not the Honourable Member give information to this House which happens to be the Local Council for Delhi Province?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I confess that my Honourable friend seems to be unnecessarily irritated. He has asked for information whether certain members were members of a particular party. I have said I have no information on the point. I have volunteered to ascertain from the Local Administration the information. I cannot do anything more than that.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Why is the Honourable Member unnecessarily reticent about a matter which it is in the competence of the Honourable Members to ask on the floor of this House?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I can assure my Honourable friend that there is no reason to be reticent about the membership of a member or gentleman or of a particular party.

ALLEGED WRONGFUL DETENTION AND MALTREATMENT BY POLICE OF CERTAIN CONGRESS VOLUNTEERS IN DELHI.

1008. ***Mr. B. Das:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to a statement published in the daily *Arjun* and other papers of Delhi in their issues of the 29th August, 1932, in which one Sher Singh complained that on the 28th August, 1932, he and eight others, suspected of being Congress volunteers, were kept in the Delhi City Kotwali from morning till late in the evening without food, mercilessly beaten and then released?

(b) Are Government aware that persons suspected of being Congress workers and volunteers are being invariably remanded to police custody and kept in *thanas* where they are beaten and tortured?

(c) Are Government aware that a special police station has been opened in the Delhi Fort (Lal Qila) for this purpose?

(d) If the answers to parts (a), (b) and (c) be in the affirmative, will Government please state the law under which suspected persons are thus kept without food, tortured and beaten?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) Yes. The allegations made therein are baseless.

The facts are briefly that six boy Congress volunteers who started a "Flag Salutation" Ceremony, in furtherance of the civil disobedience movement, were told to disperse, but refused to do so. On refusal, they were taken into custody and could have been prosecuted, but were let off on account of their youth. The boys were not beaten by the Police, and were released in plenty of time to take their evening meal.

(b) No. On the contrary, the Chief Commissioner, Delhi, reports that such persons are almost always sent to the judicial lock-up. In a few instances only, where such men have been suspected of complicity in revolutionary crime, they have been detained in police custody for purposes of identification, etc.

(c) No. But some dangerous revolutionaries, whose cases are under investigation, have been detained in the Delhi Fort for greater safety.

(d) Does not arise.

Mr. B. Das: May I inquire whether humanitarian considerations do not permit Government officials to supply mid-day food to these boys for whom the Honourable Member expressed such kind feelings?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: How many times does the Honourable Member expect these boys to be fed?

Mr. B. Das: Were these boys supplied with mid-day food? They were released in the evening, and they had no food at mid-day?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: I understand that they were released in plenty of time to take their evening meal.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: When were they released? Were they released in the evening?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: I cannot give details, but I have given the information in my possession.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Then what authority has the Honourable gentleman got to say that they were released in plenty of time to take their evening meal, when he does not know exactly when they were released?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: I give the information on the authority of the Chief Commissioner of Delhi.

Mr. B. Das: Does the Honourable Member agree that these people were kept in the Delhi City Kotwali from morning till late in the evening without food, and if they were released in time for their evening meal, what about their mid-day meal? Little boys want more food than probably the Honourable Member or I want!

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: They may possibly have missed one of their meals, but I do not consider that a great hardship.

Sardar Sant Singh: May I know how the Government reconcile the answer to part (b) of this question by saying that these persons, when they are suspected of terrorist crime, are kept in *havalat* and not in judicial lock-up, and are kept there for the purpose of identification, etc.? What is the identification in such cases and what are the other implications, etc., for which they are kept there?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: I find it rather difficult to follow the Honourable Member's question. Does he want to know why the revolutionaries are sometimes kept in police custody for the purpose of identification. . . .

Sardar Sant Singh: May I explain my question once more? The answer given to part (b) of the question, as I understand it, is that boys suspected of revolutionary crimes are kept in *havalat* and not sent to the judicial lock-up for the purpose of identification, etc. What I want to know is this. The question of identification only arises when the boys' parentage or their addresses are not known. Now this was known to the police when they were arrested, and what other purposes are implied under the term "etc." for which they were detained in the *havalat*?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: The Honourable Member has, I think, misunderstood what I intended by identification. I did not mean for the purpose of discovering who they were, but, in the course of the police investigation, it is sometimes necessary to see whether certain people recognise these prisoners as having taken part in certain activities.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Or to extort confession from them!

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Next question, please.

ALLEGATIONS OF MALTREATMENT BY DHARAMPAL, A REVOLUTIONARY SUSPECT, WHILE IN POLICE CUSTODY IN DELHI.

1009. ***Mr. B. Das:** Is it a fact that very serious allegations were made (as per copy given below) by one Dharam Pal, a revolutionary suspect, accused, under the Indian Arms Act, in the Court of Mr. S. M. Rashid, Magistrate, I Class at Delhi, on the 5th of September, 1932, against the conduct of the police and the treatment meted out to him during the time he was kept in police custody in the Delhi City Kotwali and Delhi Fort Police Station?

"IN THE COURT OF S. M. RASHID, Esq., B.A., MAGISTRATE, I CLASS DELHI.

CROWN versus DHARAM PAL.

Srs.

The accused petitioner respectfully begs to state as under :

- (1) That the accused was arrested on 22nd July, 1932, and was remanded to police custody for 14 days.
- (2) That on 26th July, 1932, accused petitioner was confined in the Delhi Fort Police station where he was kept for about a week.
- (3) That for the first 5 days, i.e., on the 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th and 30th July, 1932, accused petitioner was made to stand hands up and given shoe-beating on hips under orders of Sardarji, the Sikh Sub-Inspector in-Charge of Police Station, Delhi Fort.
- (4) That the said Sub-Inspector and six constables—Sri Ram, Ghumani, Sarfaraz, Mulla and Mirza Manzur Ali by names—beat the petitioner by turn and made the petitioner sit with his legs asunder.

(5) That the petitioner was extremely tortured and made to wake up for two consecutive nights.

(6) That the accused petitioner, when produced last time in Court, orally complained about this to Ch. Baldeo Singh, Magistrate, who asked the petitioner to make a complaint in writing to the trying Court.

Petitioner therefore respectfully prays that an investigation into the conduct of the police be ordered and the officials concerned be dealt with according to law.

(Sd.) DHARAM PAL,

5th September, 1932.

Petitioner."

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: Such allegations were made by the accused in question, but careful departmental enquiries have disclosed no reason to give them credence. The complaint, however, will be inquired into by the Magistrate before whom it was filed and who is trying the Arms Act Case against the accused.

Sardar Sant Singh: May I know if the person who made these allegations, Mr. Dharampal in this particular case, was present at the time the investigation was going on, or whether his statement was recorded by the department?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: I imagine that his statement was very fully considered in the departmental enquiry and it will be considered in still more detail and in his presence by the Magistrate.

TOTAL EMOLUMENTS AND THE NUMBER, ETC., OF SUPERIOR GRADE PUBLIC SERVANTS IN CERTAIN DEPARTMENTS IN DELHI.

1010. ***Mr. B. Das:** Will Government please furnish:

(a) the figures of the total expenditure in emoluments of public servants located at Delhi, in 1910; and

(b) the number and designation of superior grade public servants in the Executive, Judicial and Public Departments—employed for the administration of the Delhi District in the said year?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) The information is not available and could not be procured without an amount of research that I should not feel justified in undertaking.

(b) A statement giving the information is laid on the table. It is assumed that in speaking of the Public Department the Honourable Member is referring to the Public Works Department.

List showing the number and designation of superior grade public servants of Executive, Judicial and Public Works Departments in the Delhi District in 1910.

Number.				Designation.
1	Deputy Commissioner.
1	District Judge.
3	Assistant Commissioners.
5	Extra Assistant Commissioners.
1	Judge, Small Causes Court.
1	Settlement Officer.
1	Extra Assistant Settlement Officer.
2	Executive Engineers.

AREA AND POPULATION OF THE PRESENT PROVINCE OF DELHI.

1011. *Mr. B. Das: (a) Is it a fact that the total area and population of the present Province of Delhi are considerably less than those of the Delhi District in 1910?

(b) Will Government state the number and designation of the superior grade public servants employed for the administration of the Executive, Police and Judicial Departments of the Delhi Province at present?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) No, Sir. The area of the Delhi Province is no doubt less than that of the old Delhi district, but the population is very nearly the same.

(b) A statement giving the information is laid on the table.

List showing the number and designation of superior grade public servants of the Executive, Police and Judicial Departments in the Delhi Province in 1932.

No.					Designation.
1	Chief Commissioner.
1	Deputy Commissioner.
1	Land and Development Officer.
1	Additional District Magistrate.
1	Resident Magistrate, New Delhi.
4	Extra Assistant Commissioners.
1	District and Sessions Judge.
6	Subordinate Judges.
3	One President and two members of the Tribunal.
1	Judge, Court of Small Causes.
1	Registrar, Court of Small Causes.
2	Superintendent and Additional Superintendent of Police.
1	Assistant Superintendent of Police.
1	Special Officer (Police.)
2	Deputy Superintendents of Police.
1	Deputy Superintendent of Police (Temporary for six months.)
1	Temporary Officer for Criminal Investigation Department.

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE OF THE DELHI PROVINCE.

1012. *Mr. B. Das: (a) Is it a fact that the revenues of the Delhi Province usually fall short of the expenses of the administration?

(b) If so, how much have Government contributed to the expenditure on the administration of the Delhi Province since 1912?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) Yes.

(b) The Honourable Member will find the necessary information since 1913-14 in the *pro forma* account for Delhi appended to the Explanatory Memorandum by the Financial Secretary on the Budgets beginning from the year 1915-16. The Explanatory Memorandum referred to is included in the annual Financial Statement, Volume I, up to the year 1920-21, and, after that, in the annual Budget Volume. Both these documents are in the Library of this House. No figures for 1912-13 are available.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Do these figures include the expenditure on New Delhi also?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: I am afraid I must ask for notice of that question.

ABOLITION OF THE POST OF CHIEF COMMISSIONER, DELHI PROVINCE.

1013. *Mr. B. Das: Will Government please give reasons for not accepting the General Purposes Committee's recommendation that the post of the Chief Commissioner of the Delhi Province should be abolished, and that the administration placed under the direct supervision of the Home Department of the Government of India?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: The reasons are fully stated at page 85 of the Summary of the Results of Retrenchment Operations in Civil Expenditure and in Military Estimates, copies of which were circulated to Members of the Legislative Assembly in March, 1932.

Mr. B. Das: Does not national economy demand that Government should adopt some cheaper system of administration for a small area like Delhi than the present one?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: It is difficult, in view of the present constitutional arrangements, to simplify the administration of the Delhi Province.

Mr. B. Das: Is not the whole of the Delhi Province smaller than a district in the United Provinces from which my Honourable friend comes?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: That is perfectly true, but it is not only the headquarters of the Government of India, but the place in which Honourable Members of this House assemble for a large portion of the cold weather. (Laughter.)

†1014. *

†This question has already been answered; see p. 1485 of L. A. Debates, dated 28th September, 1932.

NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING THE PURCHASE OF THE BENGAL AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

1015. ***Pandit Ram Krishna Jha:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the negotiation that was carried on between the Government of India and the Bengal and North Western Railway authorities, regarding the purchase of the Bengal and North Western Railway, including Tirhut Railways, has come to an end?

(b) If so, what is the result of the negotiations?

(c) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table the entire correspondence that passed between the Government of India and the Railway authorities on the subject?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state what steps they have finally decided to take in the matter of the purchase of the said Railways?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) Yes.

(b) and (d). I would refer the Honourable Member to the Railway Department Notification No. 6870-F., dated 16th May, 1932, published at pages 645 to 651 of Part I of the Gazette of India, dated the 21st May, 1932.

(c) There has been no correspondence on the subject between the Government of India and the Railway authorities. The Gazette Notification, to which I have referred the Honourable Member, reproduces the correspondence that has passed between the Secretary of State and the Railway Companies.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Will the Honourable Member kindly give the main features of the new contract, which is under preparation, with the Bengal and North Western Railway?

Mr. P. B. Rau: They are contained in this correspondence to which I have just attracted the attention of the Honourable Member.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Are the conditions substantially the same as in the previous contract?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I am afraid I do not carry all those conditions in my head.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I thought the Honourable Member should know whether there have been changes.

Mr. P. B. Rau: There have been certain changes following the recommendations of the Committee which was appointed by this House.

WANT OF PROPER ACCOMMODATION FOR GAZETTED OFFICERS IN SIMLA AND DELHI.

1016. ***Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Is it not a fact that many officers of gazetted rank and in higher service find it difficult to get Government quarters both at Simla as well as at Delhi?

(b) Will Government state how many officers are without Government quarters and how many of them are living in hotels as they could not secure quarters?

(c) Are Government aware that these higher officials are put to great inconvenience on account of this want of proper accommodation?

(d) If so, what steps do Government propose to take in the matter with a view to removing the inconvenience and discomfort to these officers?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) At both Simla and Delhi a number of officers are unable to obtain Government quarters.

(b) Information on this point is not available.

(c) Government are aware that officers who desire to live in Government quarters but are unable to obtain them are put to inconvenience.

(d) In existing financial conditions, Government are not in a position to add substantially to the number of Government quarters available for officers at Simla and Delhi.

†1017.*

JURISDICTION OVER CART ROAD NEAR THE QUARTERS FOR ASSEMBLY MEMBERS IN SIMLA.

1018. ***Mr. S. G. Jog:** Will Government please state in whose jurisdiction is the portion of the Cart Road between the second mile and the orthodox quarters for the Assembly Members?

Mr. T. Ryan: The portion of the Cart Road in question is under the jurisdiction of the Government of the Punjab.

Mr. S. G. Jog: Will the Honourable Member bring to the notice of the Punjab Government the inconvenience caused?

Mr. T. Ryan: What inconvenience? That it was under their jurisdiction?

CONTEMPLATED APPOINTMENT OF AN OFFICER OF A COMPANY-MANAGED RAILWAY AS A DIRECTOR OF RAILWAY BOARD.

1019. ***Mr. Badri Lal Rastogi:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that an officer of a Company-managed Railway in South India is being seriously considered for appointment as a Director of the Railway Board?

(b) If so, will Government be pleased to state if no suitable officer is obtainable from any of the State Railways?

(c) Is it also a fact that the said Company-officer was superseded on his own railway?

(d) Is it also a fact that his age is over 55?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Yes.

(b) Appointments in the Railway Board's office are open to all officers of Railways, both State and Company-managed.

(c) No.

(d) No.

† This question was withdrawn by the questioner.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Will Government be pleased to state to which community this officer in question belongs?

Mr. P. R. Rau: If my presumption about the officer in question is correct, he is a European.

Mr. B. Das: May I enquire what is the exact age of this officer? It is stated to be 55.

Mr. P. R. Rau: It is under 55.

Mr. B. Das: Is it very close to 55?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I do not think so.

Mr. B. Das: Is not the age 55 only meant for Governors of Provinces and not applied to public servants under the retrenchment schemes? All officers above 55 should be retrenched—is not that the recommendation?

Mr. P. R. Rau: There is a general rule in railway service that an officer superannuates at the age of 55.

RESOLUTION *RE* TRADE AGREEMENT SIGNED AT OTTAWA.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Further consideration of the Ottawa Agreement and the Resolution and amendments thereon.

Mr. Arthur Moore (Bengal: European): Mr. President, I imagine there
 12 Noon. must be in this House some older Members who are feeling, as I do myself, that never before has so great a responsibility for our vote been placed upon us. There have been in the past some very important issues left to the decision of this House, important tariff issues; but, on other occasions, as for instance, in the very critical divisions on the Emergency Finance Bill, a year ago, it was possible to feel that after all the ultimate responsibility did not rest with us, and I think there have been occasions in the past when Members opposite have felt that, owing to the existence of the possibility of certification, they were allowed a certain liberty and it was sometimes possible for them to do what political parties in all countries do, if they are annoyed with the Government on one question they decide to show their annoyance by hitting the Government a blow on some other question. It has been possible to make a gesture and to give a vote even against one's conscience, with the feeling that after all the business before the House would in the end be put through by the system of certification. Well, that is not possible today. We are made in this matter to feel ourselves a responsible House. We are told, as I understand it, that the decision rests absolutely with us. When the division bell rings tomorrow evening or the evening after or whenever it does ring, it will then be finally decided whether the Agreement made at Ottawa is to go through, or whether a great scheme which has been prepared with a view to the whole of the British Commonwealth of Nations sharing in it is to be, shall we say, crippled in the very important section of it that relates to India.

[Mr. Arthur Moore.]

Furthermore, we must remember that at Ottawa both by the British Delegation and by the Dominions Delegations it was clearly set forth that this was an attempt at a scheme of world recovery. It was not aimed at the nations, outside the Empire. It was hoped, on the contrary, that it would lead to further understandings and to the possibility of a greater volume of trade, and freer trade, throughout the whole world in order to enable it to recover from its present depression. That seems to me the issue that we have got to consider and I do not think it is a very simple one. Personally, when questions of tariffs are brought under my notice, any question of a tariff deal, whether it is a round deal table or a square deal table, I am inclined to look under the table as well as over it. I am inclined to look round the corner as well as straight in front of my nose. Tariffs are tricky things; and I would like to say that, in supporting the principle of the Agreement, we here would wish it to be understood that we entirely reserve our right of criticism in regard to the resulting tariff Bill. There are two ways of carrying out the undertaking to give a margin of preference. You can give your margin of preference by increasing your existing tariffs on other countries up to the required margin or you can give your tariffs by decreasing your existing tariff in relation to the countries with which you come to agreement. That is a question which, in each particular instance, will necessarily have to be examined on its merits.

But I would like to ask the House to follow with me some of the processes of thought which lead me to feel that this Resolution ought to be supported. First of all, right in the centre of the landscape is the colossal fact that Great Britain and, with her, the whole of what is called the Colonial Empire, that is to say the Empire apart from the Dominions and India, all that portion of the Empire which has not enjoyed fiscal autonomy, that that tremendous market is ceasing to be a free trade market, and that Great Britain has abandoned her traditional policy of free imports. Now, that is a definite and decisive fact. I have heard it said yesterday and I have seen it stated in public comments in this country on the Ottawa Agreement that a pistol has been pointed at us or that there is some threat. That is a profound misunderstanding. Great Britain has changed her policy for the best of all reasons. One might say that she had changed her policy, because she has been converted by the example of her own Dominions and of India who, enjoying fiscal autonomy, have refused to follow in Great Britain's footsteps and to adopt a policy of free trade. But I do not think that would be a correct assumption, and, to me, it seems perfectly clear that Great Britain has done what she has done for the simple reason that she has had to do so. The debt situation created after the war and the refusal of two great creditor countries, France and America, to accept, in the case of France, reparations from Germany, and, in the case of America, her war debt from Europe in the form of goods and services, and their insistence on having it in metal, has created chaos; and unless a way out is found, the world must inevitably crash. It has created a situation in which all countries are compelled, against their will, to follow the example of America, and, in order to keep solvent, they have to diminish the margin of imports over exports, and

that at a time when in every country the total volume of trade—imports and exports together—is shrinking! Countries are forced by that debt position even with the shrinking volume of trade to try and curtail imports, in order to secure a surplus balance of trade. More than that, the social services at home in education and in other directions are such that, at the present moment, without a general tariff for revenue, it is absolutely impossible to carry on; and we have the decisive facts that when the Labour Government was in power, the Economic Council which they appointed reported in favour of a tariff and that the very members of the Labour Government who refused to remain with Mr. Macdonald and are now in opposition, those same members in a memorandum, written when they were in the Cabinet, said that a tariff was necessary as the only means of balancing the budget. Therefore, I am absolutely convinced that even if we could conceive of such a thing as the return of what may be called the orthodox remnant of the Liberal Party, and if Sir Herbert Samuel himself were to become Prime Minister, faced with the situation that exists, he also would be compelled to accept a tariff. Therefore, the Import Duties Act, which comes into force this day week, has to be taken as a settled fact. I have in front of me a pamphlet by Mr. Gadgil of the Gokhale Institute which is written largely in condemnation of the Ottawa Agreement, but it is also largely a condemnation of tariffs. But he finally says (*A Voice*: "Page?") on page 56:

"It is hard to believe that the British Delegation would not have agreed to the grant of the *status quo* for a further period of six months for making such an inquiry, or that the British Cabinet will refuse such a request even now if put forward by the Assembly",

and I saw a similar idea expressed in a Resolution which appeared on the Order Paper. Well, that seems to me a pathetic misunderstanding of the position. The Import Duties Act was absolutely inevitable, and all countries were faced with a most serious situation. Furthermore, in so far as the Import Duties Act can be considered as a measure of retaliation and as something for which the high tariff party in Great Britain have been asking in order to protect their home industries, it is clear that it is in no sense a pistol pointed at any member of the British Empire,—at any Dominion or at the Indian Empire. In so far as it is a retaliatory measure, it is clear that it is chiefly aimed at the foreign manufacturer who is competing strongly in Great Britain's home market. I notice also that Mr. Gadgil suggests that there is a danger, if this Agreement is passed, that it will provoke retaliation against India on the part of other countries. That is an argument which I find it difficult to follow, because other countries have their tariffs against India and India has her tariffs against them. In so far as there is retaliation, it is already in full swing. What has happened, on the contrary, is that the prolonged refusal of the rest of the world to follow Great Britain's example of having an open door has in the end forced her to adopt a different policy. So we have got this fact, that this day week the greatest free market that the world has ever seen will be closed, turnstiles will be set up, and no one will pass through unless either he produces an Ottawa pass or unless he pays his way. Other countries have turned an entirely deaf ear to the appeal that they should follow the example of Great Britain. They said, "here is a great market. We shall keep our own tariffs, capture as much of that for ourselves as possible". Every country has followed this plan.

[Mr. Arthur Moore.]

and none of them for a moment thought of allowing their own home markets to remain unprotected. In the Dominions, there arose, then, this criticism. They said, "here is this tremendous market in Great Britain, and we are the members of the empire. Why should we not have a special position in this market?" And so the policy of tariffs with preferences was evolved. Whereas foreign countries hoped that England would remain a free trade country, the Dominions urged that England should adopt tariffs against foreigners in order to provide economic links which would draw the British Commonwealth together. And what do we find? We find that in all the Dominions this policy, which was realised at Ottawa, is regarded as a fine policy. There is a great deal of argument about detail, but from no part of the Empire and from no self-governing country has yet come a refusal, or the suggestion that it was not highly profitable and desirable to enter into this new system. The case of Ireland is the most striking of all Mr. De Valera.... (Mr. B. Das: "Hear, hear.") (Laughter.) Well, Sir, I may say that I have recently had the same privilege as Mr. Jimmy Thomas, the privilege of hearing from Mr. De Valera's own lips his views; and in any case there is no secret in the matter. Mr. De Valera is criticised in many quarters. But as regards Ottawa at least it cannot be said that he is that kind of a fool. He is quite clear in his mind that however much he wants an Irish Republic, he does want Ireland to be in the Ottawa system of preferences. And it is a very remarkable thing that not only did it never occur to him not to send his delegates to Ottawa, but in those taxes that he has imposed since the quarrel with England over the land annuities developed in order to attempt to save the financial situation, he has been very careful to give Great Britain and all the Members of the British Commonwealth a preference. There is only one opinion in the Free State amongst all parties that somehow or other, whatever may be the quarrel about the land annuities, they must come into the Ottawa scheme of preferences for the Empire.

Now, Sir, what would be our alternative? There is an alternative, and it might at first sight seem a reasonable one. We might say that it is extremely difficult to estimate gains and losses under this Agreement. Why should we not wait and see? If we wait and see, let us clearly understand it is not a case of postponing the operation of the Import Duties Act. Nothing can postpone the operation of the Import Duties Act, but it would be possible to wait and see and to carry on for a year or more. Let the duties be put in force against us and then we shall see at the end of that period what we are losing. The losses are not denied. I have read a good many criticisms

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Order, order. The Honourable Member has already had 25 minutes. The Chair wishes him to conclude his remarks within five minutes.

Mr. Arthur Moore: Very well, Sir. I shall conclude immediately. The losses are not denied in any of these criticisms of the Agreement. There are suggestions that markets could be found elsewhere, but it is admitted that we should lose the benefits on 25 crores of tea and on eight or nine crores of tanning industry and on others. Well, I suggest that we are not in a position to do that. And the other argument that somehow

England is in difficulties and that England's difficulty is India's opportunity seems to me fundamentally incorrect. This is an attempt, first, at reconstruction in the countries of the British Commonwealth, where we are all suffering. Can anyone doubt the tremendous depression in India? Can anyone doubt that we are in a bad way? Beyond that, it is an attempt to relieve the whole world situation. We are all suffering together, and if we take the narrow view, if we suppose that somehow we have been "done", that our representatives whom we know and who are Members of this House, have somehow been fooled

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member is not addressing his Group; he is addressing the House.

Mr. Arthur Moore: I am addressing the Chair, Sir. If we take the narrow view, then I fear the inevitable result will be that in the coming times of difficulty we must be prepared to see our trade and commerce flowing through narrow and sandy channels, and not as a great river, full at all seasons and winding safely to the sea.

Mr. B. N. Misra (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, yesterday you allowed us to discuss this issue on political, economic and other grounds. Sir, politics is a very vast subject and what appears to be very important in your opinion may not be so in the opinion of others and what may appear to be very important to a constituency or to a Member may not be so from the view point of another. In the present issue before us about the Ottawa Agreement, I have been always thinking the viewpoint of the Government. Sir, whenever India is concerned, *e.g.*, for the Geneva Conference, for the League of Nations, she has been pointed out as one of the most prominent Members of the League and Indian delegates go there to sign as if they are really the representatives of India. What we find in practice, however, is that they are only the nominees of Government or favourites of Government and are not the favourites of the people or the representatives of the people of India. As was observed yesterday, probably the British Government dictates and the Indian Government dittoes it. That is how the representatives go forward from India to sign these agreements which are thrust on us. There are also other matters which have been discussed for the last so many years, such as the question of central responsibility. This question has not yet been settled and it has not been taken serious notice of. Other things, such as the formation of the new Orissa Province for which we, in Orissa, have been agitating for over 30 or 40 years, have not been taken notice of and settled promptly. When such important questions remain to be settled, this Ottawa Agreement has been thrust on the Assembly for consideration. No time is allowed for us to consider the full implications of this Ottawa Agreement. We do not know whether it is beneficial to India or whether it is beneficial to Great Britain. As is well known, India is purely an agricultural country and we have enormous quantities of raw materials, such as linseed, groundnut, cotton, jute, castor seed and so many other things which are exported from India to other countries. We not only export to England, but also to other countries. The quantity

[Mr. B. N. Misra.]

that is exported to Great Britain is much less than what we export to other countries like Japan, America and Germany. I find from a report that we export linseed to the value of 451 lakhs to all other countries, whereas we export to Great Britain linseed valued at 110 lakhs. The export of groundnut to all other countries is worth 1,713 lakhs, whereas to England only 103 lakhs. Mark the proportion, Sir. If we give Imperial Preference only to England, what will be the fate of all our exports to other countries? (Hear, hear.) This aspect of the question has not at all been considered in the Ottawa Agreement. The same is the case with castor seeds. To all other countries, the export is worth 289 lakhs whereas to the United Kingdom, it is worth only 59 lakhs.

You will see from the items that I have just quoted that we are trading not only with Great Britain, but with other countries as well. Great Britain wants now preference. Of course if there is anything advantageous to her, she always grasps at it and wants preference. If there is anything advantageous to India, we are not allowed to enjoy that advantage. After she gets the raw produce from India, Great Britain makes them into finished articles, and exports them to India. India gets no advantage in the bargain; probably India has to pay 10 or 15 times more for the manufactured goods from Great Britain. This aspect of the matter has not been considered at all in the Ottawa Agreement. India being mostly an agricultural country, we have now to consider seriously whether we should not manufacture finished products out of the raw produce that we have got so much in abundance. Why should we at all export these raw products to England and get them manufactured into finished products there? Why should we not finish these in our own country? Then it will be beneficial to us. In considering the Ottawa Agreement, that should be our main consideration, namely, whether India could not get more benefit by retaining all the raw produce here and manufacturing them into finished articles here. We have all along been fighting for the right to manage our own affairs in the way most advantageous to India. For over 100 years and more, England has been taking all the best of our country and we were getting the worst. We are probably paying in some case 30 or 40 times out of the same raw materials that are being sent by us. We are just now lifting our head and we are just now trying to become a manufacturing country. We have established a few mills in India, and, with the advent of the new constitution, if we are given power to manage our own affairs in the way most advantageous to us, then we can become a great manufacturing country. They are now sitting at the Third Round Table Conference hammering out a constitution for India. We must know what kind of constitution we are going to get. We must know what powers we are going to get under the new constitution, whether we will be given a chance to manage our own affairs.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore should, in fairness, give us more time to study this Ottawa Agreement. He has been in the Government of India studying this problem for the past so many years, and we as laymen ought to be given more time to consult experts. This Ottawa Agreement has been placed in our hands only for the past fortnight and, in fairness, we ought to be given more time to consult business men and experts and see how this Agreement is going to affect India. It is not

right that the Government should, on the very day of the commencement of the Session, ask the House to pass a Resolution ratifying the Agreement without seriously considering its implications on the future well being of India. The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré has very thoroughly considered this problem with the help of so many experts in the Government of India and I wish that, in fairness, he should allow us more time to consider this question. Of course with the vast power vested in Government, they can easily hoodwink any Member and win over any Member to the side of the Government and they will run to the Government lobby and will cast their vote for Government. But what will be the fate of the dumb voiceless millions, 30 crores of them. What will be their fate if this Ottawa Agreement is ratified by this Assembly? We must have enough time to consider whether the Agreement will be beneficial to the masses of India. As far as I have studied this problem, I have come to the conclusion that the ratification of this Ottawa Agreement will not be beneficial at all to India, but it will be beneficial to England. If the Honourable the Commerce Member, who is an Indian, is true to the salt that he eats at the expense of the poor Indian taxpayer, he will do only that which is beneficial to India and he will not think of the British Government or the Britisher. He is paid by the Indian taxpayer and I hope he will not think of injuring the source from which he is paid, and where he gets his bread from." I mean no personal reflection against my Honourable friend. It is very unfair on his part to have asked the House on the very commencement of the Session to ratify an Agreement which bristles with so many complicated matters. I will only say in conclusion that the concluding of such an Agreement and enacting legislation thereon at a critical period at this juncture when the horizon is cast with political turmoil and when the question of transferring of powers to Indians is looming large would not be proper and desirable. I would urge Government to postpone the consideration of this question till the new revised constitution comes into force and India obtains a chance of expressing its clear opinion under the National Government. I trust that Government will postpone the ratification of the Agreement in this Session of the Assembly with the support of the official and nominated block and prevent the strong suspicion that has already been created in the public mind in respect of the economic motives of the United Kingdom in dealing with India in a one-sided manner. The following analysis of the Indian Agreement recently disclosed by the President of the Board of Trade, in the House of Commons, evidently shows how Great Britain will benefit at the cost of Indian industries and trade:

"The value of the Indian Agreement would mean an enormous increase in the activities of our houses exporting to India with a corresponding effect on the manufacturing centres in the United Kingdom."

From the Indian point of view the gain of the United Kingdom will doubtless be the loss to the Indian industries and a further reduction of the purchasing power of the Indian masses. Sir, in this view of the case I shall appeal to all Honourable Members to remember that while proceeding to one or other of the lobbies, the entire blame will lie upon them if they hastily come to a decision without considering this matter thoroughly and clearly. I personally support the amendment of Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad that it must be referred to a Committee.

Mr. A. Das (Benares and Gorakhpur Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, there is no doubt that this question is of very great importance, and you, Sir, at the very beginning recognised that fact by allowing a certain latitude to the Members in the matter of the time limit. So far as this question is concerned, a decision on it will not be effective only for a particular period, but it will also bind the future constitution that will come to India, and it is from that point of view that I submit that it is of the utmost importance that this matter should be thought over in a cool and deliberate spirit and as far as possible mostly on economic grounds not tinged with political considerations. And after a decision has been arrived at, then only should votes be given. Any hasty step one way or the other would be likely to jeopardise the interests of India in the future. Now, Sir, there are certain preliminaries that have to be looked into in considering this question. We have to see that the relations of the United Kingdom with the Colonies are on a different footing from what they are with India. There is the United Kingdom and there are the Colonies, mostly self-governing Colonies, and they act and react on each other with equal rights of partners in the Empire. Unfortunately that is not the case with India. We are a dependent nation and we have to go according to the wishes of the British Government and, therefore, our difficulty is all the greater, because we have to examine this question from an independent point of view whether it will benefit this particular dependency or not. The Honourable the Commerce Member, in his opening speech, rightly divided his subject into three heads; firstly, why we entered into this Agreement; secondly, whether it will benefit India at all or not, and, thirdly, what is India going to lose. So far as the first point is concerned, there may be those reasons which the Commerce Member gave for entering into this Agreement, but, apart from that, the non-official Members on this side of the House cannot be blind to the fact that the members who attended the Conference at Ottawa were not representative members of this House. They were nominated by the British Government. They were elected Members of this House, but they were not sent by this House as their representatives to Ottawa. I do not cast any slur upon their merits or upon what they have done. My point is that they did not have sufficient opportunity to study both sides of the question. They were sent there on one month's notice. All the facts and figures placed before them, before entering into the Agreement, were supplied by the British Government or the India Office and they had not the time to consult the people interested in the trade and commerce of this country as to whether this Agreement would or would not be to their interest. And, in the absence of an impartial inquiry made by certain experts, in the absence of facilities to consult the various trading bodies in India in order to form an opinion, I submit, it is a point for consideration whether they may not have fallen into the error of being coerced to enter into this Agreement on behalf of the British Government. I, therefore, submit that so far as the two so-called representatives of this House are concerned, the value of their signatures is not much having regard to the fact that they did not have the time to study the question from all points of view.

Sir, I do not desire to tire the House by going into facts and figures for which I am not prepared and I have not got the ability either for it. The facts and figures which Sir Joseph Bhore gave may be correct or they

may not be correct. But what I submit for the consideration of this House is this, that the real test by which this Agreement should be looked into, apart from every other consideration, is whether it is beneficial to India or not. If the unanimous voice of this country is that this Agreement for the present and for the future will be for the benefit of India, certainly we will go ahead and accept it. If, on the other hand, there is no unanimity on that point, there will be some doubt as to whether it will benefit us or not. Where there is some doubt as to whether the gain or loss would be greater, I submit a point is made out for the consideration of this question by an expert Committee which will go into it minutely and give its decisive answer; and it will then be for this House to consider whether it should or should not ratify that Agreement.

Mr. S. O. Mitra (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, may I ask you whether it is fair to the House that the whole of the Treasury Benches should not, at the moment, be represented by a single Honourable Member of the Executive Council?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Chair regrets it, but the Honourable the Commerce Member who is in charge has left for a few minutes with its permission.

Mr. A. Das: May I continue, Sir?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Please go on.

Mr. A. Das: It is a pity that the Commerce Member has left, but I do not claim any special merit for what I am going to say and one of the reasons for the emptiness of the Treasury Benches may be that they do not attach any importance to what we on this side of the House have to say on this Agreement. Be that as it may, we will have done our duty if we bring all the facts that we can for consideration of the Members of this House. I was submitting that the real test about this Agreement is whether it will or will not benefit India; and in order to give an answer to that test, one way or the other, we have got a set of opinions on one side and a set of opinions on the other, to which I will presently invite the attention of this House. My submission is that the set of opinions, as far as the benefit to India is concerned, is very very doubtful.

Now, as far as the benefit to England is concerned and to the other Colonies, there is no doubt: we are all agreed that this Agreement will at once benefit England also the Colonies. The question is whether it is beneficial to India or not. The first thing to take up in historical order is the opinion of Lord Curzon. Preference was rejected in 1904. Then there is the opinion of the Fiscal Commission on which you, Sir, sat. They also came to this conclusion in 1923, that it will not benefit India. Apart from these opinions, as far as Indian opinion is concerned, it consists of those who are in a position to speak. I will point out the opinion of Mr. Birla who said in September quite clearly that this would benefit England more and India less. After that we have received the opinions of the three Chambers of Commerce which cannot be set aside by a mere twist of the head. First of all, I would refer to the Bengal National Chamber of Commerce presided over by Mr. Nalini Ranjan Sarkar. He

[Mr. A. Das.]

has given certain points which are printed at pages 46 and 47 of the Report. If you will permit me, Sir, I will give them below :

- (1) The Agreement is restrictive in principle and practice.
- (2) India stands to gain little and to sacrifice much more.
- (3) The benefits to India are inconsiderable and problematic.
- (4) The benefit to Great Britain is much more definite and considerable.
- (5) It will affect adversely India's trade with other foreign countries, which form its largest group of customers.
- (6) It is likely to provoke retaliation by countries which are hit by preference to Great Britain or the other Empire countries.
- (7) For these reasons, it will only cause a redistribution of Indian trade and not increase the total volume of trade; in fact India's exports are likely to be reduced.
- (8) It will either reduce the margin of protection required for Indian industries, retarding the industrial development of the country, or else
- (9) It will impose an additional burden on Indian consumers by raising the prices of important articles for the benefit of British industries.
- (10) It will render our fiscal system inflexible, virtually destroying our fiscal freedom.
- (11) It will render it difficult, if not impossible, for India to negotiate mutually advantageous trade agreements or preferences with other countries.
- (12) It will make the Central Budget more difficult to adjust and result in more taxation.
- (13) It will isolate India economically, which is economically and culturally unsound. This is detrimental to our economic development and fraught with danger to our future economic stability.
- (14) It will greatly increase India's economic dependence upon Great Britain and confirm her political subjection to that country.
- (15) It is likely to be used as a sop or threat in political concessions. It should be noted that in neither case is there any great economic loss involved. Our exports to the United Kingdom are not likely to be restricted as she cannot well do without most of them—moreover 'being instrumental in sending large quantities of imports to us she would be compelled to take adequate quantities of our exports.'

This is what Mr. Nalini Ranjan Sarkar has said on the Ottawa Agreement and each one of those points should be looked into and replied.

I shall now take up the opinion of Mr. C. N. Vakil and Mr. M. C. Munshi who are Professors of Economics in Bombay and this is their conclusion arrived at not before the receipt of the Agreement, but after its receipt and consideration. They say :

"The conclusion is obvious that the report of the Indian Delegation and the Agreement go far beyond the scope of Trade Agreements, that they introduce novel features into the Fiscal Policy of this country, which were never contemplated, that they commit India to the principle of protection with discrimination in favour of British goods, that thereby they accept the position of a stunted industrial growth in India as illustrated by the Supplementary Steel Agreement based on the theory of Industrial co-operation. These are far-reaching consequences which cannot be lightly accepted even though they are coupled with the clause, that it is possible to terminate the Agreement by a six months' notice, because the power to denounce the Agreement at six months' notice cannot appeal to those who believe that it is economically unsound."

On that point Mr. Raju yesterday made it quite clear that this six months' notice is of no use; because we have to remove it by a Bill and we all know how difficult it is to get an Act passed to amend another Act. So, this is Bengal and Bombay opinion. If we read through the

conclusions arrived at by the Indian Merchants Chamber and Bureau of Bombay, we find that they have also said:

"In conclusion, my Committee would like to emphasise that the Agreement should be judged as a whole in its manifold consequences on the economic life and financial system of the country, because these are interconnected. The emphasis of the Delegation on only one single aspect, viz., the threatened loss of India's trade in the British market, gives an entirely wrong and warped perspective to the Agreement, and this must be deprecated as but a piece of propaganda in favour of British industry under the guise of the so-called protection of the interests of the Indian farmer. For, the Agreement does not at all protect his interests; it is calculated only to divert the trade of India from other countries to the United Kingdom. In fact, the probable loss to him in the reduced demand for Indian raw materials from other countries will be greater than the threatened loss to him in the British market in case of non-acceptance of the Agreement. Judging the Agreement as a whole, my Committee have no hesitation in pronouncing their conviction that it is not in the interest of the Indian farmer, not in the interest of the Indian businessman, not in the interest of the Indian manufacturer, nor in the interest of the general taxpayer. It is only in the interest of the British manufacturer, the British exporter and the British shipper. Truly, has the President of the Board of Trade in His Majesty's Government declared in the House of Commons that it will mean 'an enormous increase in the activities of our houses exporting to India with a corresponding effect on manufacturing centres in the United Kingdom'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member will please conclude in five minutes.

Mr. A. Das: I will, Sir. Lastly there is the conclusion in the report of Mr. Gadgil of the Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics. He says:

"We conclude, therefore, by emphatically stating that our bargaining position has not been properly used at Ottawa; that we have been committed to a general preferential policy which is entirely against the interests of India and that the whole agreement has been conceived and brought forth in a hurry for which there is not the least justification."

My point is, that in the face of all these opinions on the one side, what is the balance of evidence or opinion on the other? There is the assurance of the Honourable the Commerce Member and there is the assurance of the two members who went there, Mr. Chetty and Mr. Haroon, who had not all the materials before them. I submit that the balance of evidence is clearly on the Indian side; and, therefore, if any impartial person were to judge of this evidence together with that evidence, he will rightly come to this conclusion that the point has been made that this should be inquired into further; and, as my friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, has suggested, a Committee of experts and non-official Members should go into the question and decide within a month as to whether this Agreement should or should not be entered into. Lastly we cannot altogether ignore the political aspect of the question and I would conclude by quoting what you, Sir, have said in your minute of dissent in the Fiscal Commission. I feel no hesitation in saying that the considerations that applied then apply equally well at the present moment. This is what you said:

"To the Indian people their self-respect is of far more importance than any economic advantage which any Dominion may choose to confer by means of preferential treatment. We may confidently state that the people of India would much prefer the withdrawal of such preference as they will not care to be economically indebted to any Dominion, which will not treat them as equal members of the British Empire having equal rights of citizenship."

Mr. S. C. Sen (Bengal National Chamber of Commerce: Indian Commerce): Sir, I do not propose to enter into the controversial points as to whether the Ottawa Agreement will be beneficial to India or not. My objection is mainly to the great hurry,

[Mr. S. O. Sen.]

the inordinate hurry, which the Honourable the Commerce Member is showing to pass this Resolution and to proceed with the consequential Bill which he has threatened to introduce and of which notice has been given here. What is the hurry about this matter? He himself, I understand, admitted yesterday that there is no need for hurry, as the Import Duties Act in England, although it may come into operation on the 15th of this month, will not be operative against India by virtue of this Agreement. If that be so, why should not there be an examination, a critical examination, of the principles involved in this Bill, or in the Bill to be introduced, or in the Resolution, or in the Agreement itself? It is the usual practice, Sir, in this country, for tariff reforms to be examined by the Tariff Board, and, then, after considering all their recommendations, to pass those reforms into law. That is the universal practice, and that has also been stated by Sir Atul Chatterjee at the opening speech which he made at Ottawa. I may be permitted, Sir, to read a portion of his speech which appears at page 56 of the Report of the Imperial Economic Conference at Ottawa, which was submitted to the Members here. I read from paragraph 5:

"The policy adopted by India aims at securing an ordered and balanced development and the avoidance of some of the dangers and difficulties to which protection sometimes leads. The industries selected for protection are only those which are considered to possess natural advantages that would enable them in the long run to dispense with State assistance. In every case the protective duty is only fixed after a careful examination by the Tariff Board at a level which will be adequate for its purpose without imposing an unnecessary burden on the consumer."

This is the principle upon which we have been acting all these years. Why should there be a departure in this instance, and why should you rush through a Resolution and then proceed with a Bill embodying the merits of the Resolution and the Agreement which has been signed by these representatives at Ottawa? Our fiscal system is different to that of the other parts of the world. We want to encourage our home industries, and, for that purpose, we want to have tariffs which will enable those industries to survive the foreign competition and nothing more. But why should we now be called upon to put a tariff on things about which there is no fear of any competition, except the imaginary fear that something else would be done against us. Take the case of jute and lac. In these two articles India has got a monopoly. The Government think that if we do not enter into this Agreement, they will use other classes of materials which may compete with jute. Sir, I have been hearing this threat for the last fifty years. We heard, when jute was being sold at a very high price, when gunnies were being sold at a high price, that the United States of America, which were one of the largest buyers of Hessians, were thinking of introducing other classes of materials to replace jute. That was 50 years ago, but all these years they have been purchasing very largely jute and gunnies and Hessians from India. The same is the case with regard to lac. We have also been hearing that there are other cheaper materials which might be used, but up till now we have not seen any substitutes. Therefore, what is the danger that we need fear about, and why should we rush through this measure? I for one cannot understand. If we are to enter into this Agreement for the benefit of India, whether for her gain or to minimise the losses, I do not see why there should be such a great rush in the matter. Why should not the matter be examined? I understand that the Dominions and other Governments who were invited to Ottawa

had this question examined by experts long before the day of the meeting. Was that done in the case of India? Were the Indian Delegates given any opportunity to calmly consider the position, to think of what they were doing? They were rushed there. The sword of Damocles was hanging over their heads. The provisions of the Import Duties Act were flourished before them and they were told that unless they entered into this Agreement at once, the Act would come into force from the 15th of November. That was the fear which succeeded in getting our Delegation there to submit to the wishes of the British Delegation.

Now, although the Honourable the Commerce Member says that there is no chance of the Import Duties Act coming into operation on the 15th of November, my friend, Mr. Arthur Moore, whom I am very glad to see back here again, has also explained to us as to what would happen to India this day. Probably India will go down the bottom of the ocean if we do not accept this Resolution—I do not know. But, Sir, we have survived all these alarmist fears, all these alarming threats, and I think we will survive them in spite of all alarming threats. Under these circumstances, as the question has not been examined by an expert Committee, I do not see why the matter should not be referred to our expert Board, I mean the Tariff Board, who were always consulted before any tariff reform was effected, and why should not there be some delay in dealing with the threatened legislation?

Mr. G. Morgan (Bengal: European): Sir, in rising to support the Government Resolution, I would like to point out that even although there has not been very much time to study, what is called by other speakers, the details of this Agreement, I personally have found ample time to study them sufficiently to give my support for ratification. My friend, Mr. Arthur Moore, has said that the real test of what our views are on the details, will be known when the Tariff Bill is placed before the House. If it is referred to a Select Committee, so much the better, but, in any case, whatever happens, there is not one item in that Bill, when it comes before us, which will not be scrutinised and cut to pieces if we consider it necessary

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar (South Arcot *cum* Chingleput: Non-Muhammadan Rural): May I ask the Honourable Member one question before he proceeds further? Can we judge on the merits of this question without those tariff proposals? Can we really come to a right conclusion on this question without knowing what the tariff proposals are going to be? Suppose we reject the tariff proposals later on?

Mr. G. Morgan: I would say in reply, I do not consider that that affects the actual question of the ratification of the preference proposals. How that preference will be effected is what we have to decide when the amendment to the Tariff Act is brought before us. Whether we agree with that method or not is another question. I consider that, in the question of this preference, we are looking, not for an increase in the duties on non-British goods, but are looking for a reduction of duties on British goods. This is the only way which will bear out the arguments advanced at Ottawa that the inter-Empire consultation would be the beginning of arguments in favour of a reduction of tariffs generally, which, it is hoped, the World Economic Conference will ultimately decide upon.

[Mr. G. Morgan.]

And, as far as I understand, the British statesmen, the members of the Delegation from Britain, put that more or less in the front rank. We cannot tell what will be the position of each individual item until we see the actual duty which the Government of India propose; when that is before us we will decide as to whether that particular item should be on Schedules or not. As far as I can gather, the reason for the so-called "hurry" is that we will have duties of ten per cent. against us on the 15th November unless we ratify this Agreement. I do not take that as coercion; I do not take that as a bamboo at all. The United Kingdom has definitely changed its fiscal policy and we cannot get away from that position. If we are to gain any benefit from the position which has been created, there is no question to my mind but that we ought to ratify this Agreement.

I should now like to make a few remarks about the Delegation. Some Members have stated that the Delegation did not represent this House. But let that pass. From information, which I have, the Indian Delegation stood out amongst all the Delegations at Ottawa, and I have been informed by people who know, that the efficiency displayed and the information supplied, by our Delegation was ahead of any other Delegation at Ottawa. (Cheers.) That does away with any idea that the representatives were rushed to Ottawa, hit over the head with a bamboo and compelled to sign the Agreement. That, I do not think, was the case. Another point. I think you will all agree that India's Tariff Board is, and has been a great success in the working out of our protective duty policy, etc. That Board, I may tell you, has been looked upon as a great success and is being recommended by Great Britain and will be adopted by other Members of the Commonwealth. I think, that is a great feather in the cap of India. Anyhow we have advanced more than other Members.

In all these many pamphlets, that we have received, very interesting, but not conclusive,—in all those pamphlets and all those conclusions which have been come to by others, it seems to me that they have gone on the basis that the ten per cent. preference means a rise of ten per cent. in duties all round. I do not take it as that, and, if the Tariff Bill is made out on that basis, we shall have something to say. But I would like to go back to what I have said before, and that is that it is a world recovery that we want. It has been definitely stated that this Ottawa Conference is the thin end of the wedge, and that we will be able to go before the World Economic Conference with a nucleus of countries who are determined to break down tariffs as far as is possible. Other countries in Europe have already suggested that they might come into this Empire Agreement. We hope that the World Conference will be successful. The statements made by Sir George Schuster and Sir Henry Strakostch at Ottawa bear out what I have just stated regarding the Ottawa Agreements and the World Conference. Everyone is looking for the World Conference in its attempt to solve the present position. In connection with the Agreement, there is a supplementary agreement regarding iron and steel, and that I whole-heartedly support. I will not go into figures at this stage, but I have no doubt in my mind that that arrangement will be a great benefit to India. It will be a great benefit to the unfortunate position of pig iron, it will be a great benefit to the unfortunate position of coal, and it will be a great benefit to the more unfortunate position of our railways, and, I am sure, the Member in charge of the Railway Department will be only too glad to see some more

money coming in. But the main point is, as pointed out by my Honourable friend, Mr. Arthur Moore, that the United Kingdom's fiscal policy is entirely changed. It is no good harping back to 1904, or 1921, or any of those other dates. The fact is, the position is entirely changed now. Since 1929, we are faced with a different world and we have got to change our opinions. In connection with the Fiscal Commission Report, we had many discussions in Simla, and a great part—I do not say all, but a great part,—of the report of that Commission is now a back number.

I would urge Honourable Members of this House, apart altogether from all these pamphlets and conclusions that have been put forward—I would urge them for their own sakes to ratify this Agreement, and to **hold back detailed criticism** until we see what the Government of India propose to put before us in the shape of an Indian Tariff Amendment Bill.

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir, Ibrahim Rahimtoola) in the Chair.

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I have listened very attentively to the speeches of my Honourable friends opposing the motion who have preceded me and I am constrained to say, especially as regards those gentlemen who have moved amendments, that they are talking of things which they have not at all understood. In the very first place, every speaker, who has opposed this motion, has been talking as if this Agreement was a part of a policy of *Imperial Preference*. Nothing can possibly be farther from the truth. The Agreement is part of a policy of *reciprocal preference* which has come into vogue now after England decided to leave off free trade. This misunderstanding of the whole position is responsible for many erroneous statements made on the other side of the House and, I believe, it has been induced by a reading of a certain propagandist pamphlet the arguments of which my Honourable friends on the other side seem to have adopted as their own. (Mr. B. Das: "You give us a little credit.") Even if this Agreement were regarded as part of a policy of *Imperial Preference*, the remarks addressed against it by the other side are not justified by the authorities which they say support them. My Honourable friend, Mr. Das, purported to base himself on the authority of the Fiscal Commission. I hope to show to the House that my Honourable friend has been misreading the Fiscal Commission's report and the minute of dissent which he cited as his authority. As I said, this Agreement is part of a policy of *reciprocal preference*. Our Delegates at the Ottawa Conference have not committed us to a policy of giving England or any other Member of the British Commonwealth anything which is not in return for something given by either England or the Member of the Commonwealth concerned. It is a policy of *quid pro quo*. It is not a policy of receiving on one side and giving on the other side and that will be abundantly clear from the report of our Delegates at the Ottawa Conference.

[Mr. N. N. Anklesaria.]

I would say a few words about the amendment moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Das. He bases his arguments against the report not on any grounds which are relevant to the present discussion, but which are wholly irrelevant, as regards the question which we are discussing today. Mr. Das stated that till India gets an equality of status, India should not enter into any such Agreement as the present one, should not, as he said, accede to the principle of Imperial Preference and he cited, as his authority, the minute of dissent to which you, Sir, were the most prominent signatory. The minute of dissent, contained in paragraph 44 on page 166 of the Fiscal Commission's report, says:

"We will now summarise our conclusions in regard to the Imperial Preference. We are in favour of the principle of Imperial Preference on the distinct condition that India should in *this matter* be put on the same footing of freedom as is enjoyed by the Self-Governing Dominions."

If my Honourable friend had emphasised the words 'in this matter' I think the House would have understood his meaning, but, by failing to emphasize those words, he possibly created a misunderstanding in the House that it was a status of political equality that was meant by the dissenters in the Fiscal Commission's report as a condition precedent to India entering into Agreements. As I have read the words, it is abundantly clear that nothing of the sort was intended either by the dissenting minute or by the report of the Fiscal Commission itself. Then, Sir, I will also cite the Fiscal Commission as my authority in support of this Agreement. The Fiscal Commission, on page 119, paragraph 262, lays down three Conditions by which the desirability of a particular Agreement for Imperial Preference should be judged and they are, in the first place, that no preference should be granted to any article without the approval of the Indian Legislature. It is for the fulfilment of this condition, that the present Resolution is brought before the House. The Agreement is put before the House for its approval and thereby the first condition laid down by the Fiscal Commission is satisfied. Secondly, no preference given should in any way diminish the protection required by the Indian industries. Now, Sir, if my Honourable friends had read the report, they would have found that our Delegates have seen to it that no Agreement, they could have possibly entered into, would in any way infringe the condition laid down by the Fiscal Commission in this respect. None of the industries which we have protected in India in any way suffer any loss as regards the protection accorded to them. Thirdly, the condition is that the preference should not involve any appreciable economic loss to India after taking into account the economic gain which India derives from the preference granted to her by the United Kingdom. Now, as regards the fulfilment of this condition, opinions may differ, and it is most natural, because this Agreement is not given time for operation. Before the Agreement is accepted and acted upon, nobody is in a position to say what India would actually lose or what India would actually gain, and it would be for the Honourable Members who oppose the motion to show conclusively to the House, if they possibly can, how and to what extent India is going to lose under this Agreement. I say, it is impossible.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrat (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): You are wrongly changing the burden of proof.

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria: You are a lawyer and you ought to know it.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: It is therefore that I tell you.

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria: Now, of my Honourable friends, one gentleman is a Professor of Mathematics, another knows nothing about trade and commerce and is not a Professor of Economics or Mathematics.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): What about yourself?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Order, order.

An Honourable Member: He is an expert.

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria: And the third gentleman is a Civil Engineer. (Laughter.) They have pitted themselves against the considered opinion of men like Sir P. Ginwala, Sir George Rainy, Mr. Shanmukham Chetty and Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon (*An Honourable Member*: "Hear, hear." "Three cheers!"), most of whom have made the subject their life-long study. (Ironical Cheers.) I challenge the other side to name one gentleman of the repute of Sir P. Ginwala as an expert on tariff questions outside

Sir Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Outside what?

Mr. B. Das: We accept the challenge.

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria: I think my Honourable friends who require an expert Committee to give us their opinion on this Agreement could not possibly have found a better expert Committee than our Delegation to the Ottawa Conference. (Hear, hear.) If they can, I challenge them to name some of the members of the proposed expert Committee. Names have indeed been proposed by the Mover of one of the amendments, and it is for the House to judge whether the names proposed in any way affect what I have already said on the present question. Now it has been said that our Delegation to the Ottawa Conference was not a representative Delegation, that it did not represent the people of India.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Nobody said that they did not represent the people of India. It was said that they did not represent the Assembly.

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria: In the first place, it is not the Delegation on which we have to give our verdict: we have to give our verdict on the work of that Delegation (Hear, hear), whether that Delegation was composed of X, Y and Z or P, Q and R is absolutely no matter for the House to consider: and judging the Agreement on that basis, it is up to the other side to point out in what manner and to what extent that Agreement is injurious to the interests of India. I would ask the House not to regard it as an Agreement between England and India, an Agreement in which it is said one side occupies a preponderatingly influential

[Mr. N. N. Anklesaria.]

position. I would ask the House to regard the Agreement as an Agreement between India and any other foreign country in the world, and judge that Agreement by the ordinary test by which Agreements are judged, namely, the advantages which accrue to one side or the other on the basis of that Agreement. Now I am not going to pursue this topic in detail, because, as I said, nobody is in a position to dogmatize on the effect of the Agreement as regards gain or loss to one side or the other in the absence of reliable statistics collected after the Agreement has come into operation. An example of the fallacy into which one falls by relying on statistics is furnished by the very pamphlet on which my Honourable friends rely. I refer to the pamphlet by Mr. C. N. Vakil and Mr. M. C. Munshi. That pamphlet and the arguments contained in it purport to be based on the statistical tables given at the end of the pamphlet. Now it has been pointed out that these statistical tables are erroneous and highly misleading and the authors of the pamphlet themselves have admitted that their table I, and their table V, which are some of the most important tables, are erroneous and they propose to make alterations and amendments in a supplementary pamphlet.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member will have to conclude in five minutes more.

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria: Very well, Sir. Then the pamphlet contains table IV, and it is headed, "Articles of import into India under the Ottawa Agreement". Now, anybody who peruses that Agreement and the report of our Delegation will find that cotton and cotton goods are specially excluded. But what do we find in this pamphlet? The very first and the second items are "cotton piecegoods" and "cotton yarn" which amounts to £35 million of the imports, that is, nearly 50 per cent. of the whole of the imports from India into the United Kingdom. I say a pamphlet based on such fallacious statistical tables cannot possibly be cited as an authority in support of the disadvantages which, my Honourable friends say, would accrue to India if the Agreement is ratified.

Mr. Lalchand Navrai: Will the Honourable Member be pleased to let me know on what page they have admitted that these tables are wrong?

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria: You will find in the *Times of India*, dated the 29th October, at page 5, that Professor Vakil himself has admitted that. Sir, it is said, what is the hurry about ratifying this Agreement? The Honourable the Commerce Member has admitted that there is no crucial date now concerned. He said that 15th of November was no longer a crucial date. I admit, Sir, that the 15th November is no longer a crucial date, but the crucial date will be the date on which the division will take place in this House on the present motion. That would be the crucial date, because England will then know whether India is going to stand by the Agreement or not: and if England is convinced that India is not going to stand by the Agreement, then it would be stupid for India to expect that England would continue the preferences which India has been granted under the Import Duties Act. The result would be that the place which we at present occupy will be taken up by our actual or

potential competitors and that place, once occupied by our potential and actual competitors, will not be easily vacated by them and, as Sir P. P. Ginwala has pointed out, the effects to at least one of our key industries—I mean the pig-iron industry and to our agricultural industry—will be disastrous. I would just give you three instances. There is the case of linseed. It is a very important item of trade with England and if we refuse to ratify the Agreement, England will have to accede to the offers and proposals about the linseed trade made to her by Argentine. Secondly, Sir, as I said, there was the pig-iron industry. Then we have the industry of agriculture. As Sir P. P. Ginwala has said, the effect on our agriculturists and on our key industries will be disastrous and if my Honourable friends on the other side are prepared to contemplate such a prospect with equanimity, I say that equanimity will be the result not of reason and enlightenment but of prejudice and ignorance.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, the Honourable gentleman who preceded me referred to the iron and steel industry and spoke of pig-iron as an industry. The iron and steel industry, which is represented by the Tata Iron and Steel Company in this country, came to this House for a good deal of protection which we very gladly granted, for we wanted to protect and increase the iron and steel industry, so that we may attain the same stage of perfection in regard to iron and steel industry as other industrial countries in the world have attained. But what has happened under the Ottawa Agreement? What has happened under the general Ottawa policy? A policy has been introduced much against our wish which is a policy of crippling the development of the iron and steel industry. Sir, as an old industrialist and as one who has contributed a good deal to the industrial regeneration of this country both practically and in the beautiful and immortal words which you have used as a member of the Industrial Commission, Sir, you have pointed out how Indian industries must be protected and how Indian industries should be developed—a contribution which will not be forgotten by this country and a contribution which will be remembered by future generations who, I am certain, will live up to the expectations that you have raised in your life-work as well as writings. And what is that expectation? It is that India must stand upon her own legs, industrially speaking. When the Tata Iron and Steel Company was given protection by us, we did not say and we did not want that it should be said: "Thus far shalt thou progress and no further". But, under the Ottawa Agreement, an arrangement is reached that thus far shall the Tata Iron and Steel Company progress and thus far shall our steel and industrial progress be reached, and no further. Time was, as every student of industrial life and history of this country is aware, when we were importers into England and other countries purely of raw material and when the industrial policy adopted in this country, as recorded by the historian, Hayman Wilson, was regulated for the advantage of England and not for the development of a manufacturing people in this country. I do not want to go into that troublous and sad history and how our industries went out of existence for the very simple reason that we had not the right of controlling the industrial policy. We were responsible, under the Constitution, to a Government which had the interests of their own people at heart. Authorities for this need not be quoted at present for the simple reason that they are familiar to almost every Member in this House. Today England, progressing with the times, is quite willing

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

to adjust and alter her ancient policy. An age of industrialism is on us and in this industrialised and industrial era in this country a new policy and a new principle is enunciated under the Ottawa Agreement. You will find that policy in paragraphs 113 and 144 of the report that has been presented to us and that policy is embodied in these two cryptic words—"Industrial Co-operation".

Under the pretext of industrial co-operation we are told that the Tata Iron and Steel Company should export to England sheet bar and not produce galvanised sheet, so that a limitation is put upon our industrial ambition. Sir, their exact words are these: "While industrialisation must increase and expand in the less industrialised countries,"—a pious wish and a wish that is presently defeated,—"the more highly industrialised countries must adapt themselves to ever-changing conditions by means of increasing specialisation".

Why, I ask, should not the Tatas devote themselves as well to industrial specialisation? Why should not the Tatas produce galvanised sheet (*A Voice*: "More and more") *more and more* as the Honourable friend to my left Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar correctly adds. We must produce galvanised sheets in this country, but we are told we need not produce them. We will be supplied with galvanised sheets, just as we were told in another era that we could send raw materials and receive finished products. Now, in this industrial era, when we have not yet reached the highest perfection, they say, "You need not reach the *ne plus ultra* of industrial progress. We shall give India finished products, give us your semi-finished products". Sir, every industrial patriot in this country will say "We want to be industrially self-dependent. Economically speaking, we want to stand on our own legs". Under the Ottawa Agreement, we are denied that opportunity. Economically speaking, we want to stand on our own legs, because India is in the peculiar position of a country which resembles no other country within the British Empire. It resembles a country outside the British Empire, in the multitude of her thrifty people, in the vastness of her industrial wealth and economic resources and that country is the United States of America. We would rather follow a self-dependent economic policy, but our friend, Mr. Arthur Moore, comes forward and tells us that the industrial policy of England has altered. I agree that the industrial policy of England has altered and Mr. Morgan, who followed Mr. Arthur Moore, told us that the United Kingdom had definitely changed her fiscal policy. I agree that the United Kingdom has definitely *for the present* changed her fiscal policy, definitely so far as the present Government continues to be in power, but I refuse to be tied down to the chariot wheel of the Tory policy of "industrial co-operation" (Hear, hear) as they call it. Why, I ask, should we be victimised to a fiscal policy to which Great Britain is committed? This fiscal policy is certain to change later on, for even my Honourable friend, Mr. Arthur Moore, with his great knowledge of English political life, will not prophesy that this fiscal policy has come to stay and that the Tories will be permanently in power. In that case, England will be drifting into a kind of Tory Fascism and all talk of democracy and Mother of Parliaments will become something of a dream. That that Tory Fascism is not going to materialise is indicated by the fact that men like Lord Snowden, who made the present Government

what it is and who contributed to putting the present Government in power, men like Sir Herbert Samuel have resigned from the Cabinet on this Ottawa question.

When great Englishmen, who made the nationalist policy in England possible, resigned on the ground that the Ottawa policy was wrong, that the very foundation of that policy was false, surely it does not lie in the mouth of English friends in this country to come and tell us "Follow that industrial policy denounced by the best of our own countrymen" and I dare say it will be denounced in the fulness of time by all the English people themselves.

Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European): May I put one question to my Honourable friend? Is he aware of the fact that Sir Herbert Samuel, in addressing the House of Commons on the Ottawa Agreement, pointed out that if all the provisions of the Ottawa Agreement had been on the same basis as the terms relating to the Indian Agreement, most of his objections to the Agreement would have been removed.

Mr. O. S. Ranga Iyer: I would ask my Honourable friend another question, though this is hardly question time. (Laughter.) Sir Herbert Samuel wrote a letter of resignation which he communicated to his chief, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald. Has my Honourable friend read that letter of resignation? My Honourable friend nods his head indicating he has read that letter of resignation. In that letter, Sir Herbert Samuel very clearly states why he resigned. I shall read out for the information of the House the reason why some Cabinet Ministers resigned over the Ottawa issue: "The British Delegation went to Ottawa with the declared intention of increasing inter-imperial trade and securing a general lowering of world tariffs. We had their assurance that nothing would be agreed to which hampered our freedom to negotiate with foreign countries for the lowering of tariffs. They have come back after weeks of acrimonious disputes and sordid struggles with vested interests with Agreements wrenched from them to avert a collapse of the conference and exposure to the world of the hollowness of the talk of imperial sentiments in economic matters". (Hear, hear.) This is the view of Sir Herbert Samuel as expressed by Lord Snowden for all those who resigned from the Cabinet. Sir Herbert Samuel himself, in his letter of resignation, made it perfectly clear that he was not and will not be a party to the Ottawa policy. The Ottawa policy was directed against the present troubles coming out of world depression. In his speeches delivered outside Parliament Sir Herbert Samuel said that the Empire was an important part of the world and if the Empire countries came to an agreement and excluded the world from that agreement, it might be from the Tory point of view possible to increase the Empire prosperity up to a point, but to the same extent it would be affecting the rest of the world-customers with the Empire itself. You cannot cause a wave in the ocean without causing a hollow somewhere else, and every student of economics will be able to tell you. Sir, that if the rest of the world is excluded from an economic agreement, the capacity of that world for purchase is lowered, and the depression in that world is made deeper, and being a part and an important part of the world, nearly half the world, the economic depression in the world reacts upon the Empire itself and consequently the Empire will suffer. (Hear, hear.) But, Sir, in answering these interruptions, I am naturally taken away from my own argument which I would have liked to develop in the limited time

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

before me. I am very willing, even at this stage, to attack them on their own grounds. The Honourable the Commerce Member also reminded us of Parliamentary statements, though he conveniently forgot to tell us what Lord Snowden wrote to the Prime Minister and why he and his colleagues including Sir Herbert Samuel resigned.

As for a particularly unfortunate statement of Sir Herbert Samuel, it is all well and good for him to refer to a particular aspect which is excluded from the Ottawa Agreement, because it is not so good for England and not so bad for India. To that extent I am willing to admit that the Ottawa Delegation had not played false to India for the simple reason that even my Honourable friend, Mr. Chetty, could not have gone against the interest which is dear to his heart, namely, the cotton interest. Sir Herbert Samuel had the interest of Lancashire at heart. It is too late in the day to think of suppressing our own industries. But, Sir, my quarrel with the Ottawa Delegation is about the choice of goods for preference. My quarrel with them is that they have bungled in their choice. For instance, on what matters have we been given preference? We have been given preference in regard to articles in which we needed no preference whatever. What is the object of preference? What is the object that the Tories have at heart? The object is to push on British trade. But, in matters like tea, in articles like jute where we need no pushing forward, we have pushed ourselves forward into the British market without any preference. In such matters, where we hold the field, we are told that we have been given so much preference. I can understand the talented Leader of the House—I mean the Commerce Member who will be the Leader soon—telling us with all humility of a self-effacing “novice”,—novice he is certainly not,—with all the humility of a layman which, again, he is certainly not, but I can explain why he tells us with all his warmth and with all the heat, “Do you dare to call it a bluff”: he is importing heat, because light is lacking. There was almost lightning when he told us, “Dare you call it a bluff”. I can well understand him waxing eloquent on that particular matter, because that is the weakest link in the preference chain. To give preference to tea and not exclusive preference either because we have a co-sharer in that preference and that co-sharer is our neighbour, Ceylon, to give such a half-hearted preference is no preference at all. And, then, he said, look at how Java is threatening to compete. Sir, the limitations of Java competition must be more fully explored by the Honourable the Commerce Member. I do not believe that Java is yet in a position to push herself into the British market and replace our tea even though the pistol of preference may be set against us. Then, I may also say one other thing, that the present Tory Government would not have dared to impose a preference against us in regard to tea, because they are not like my Honourable friend opposite “non-responsible” in the Parliamentary sense. They have got a constituency, they have got several constituencies. They have to go to their people and in every English home tea is consumed and an increased tea-tax there will be as odious as the salt-tax in India (Hear, hear); and if these Tories ventured to go to their constituencies with this additional tea-tax, they would be swept out into the lap of Mr. Snowden, Sir Herbert Samuel and the Labour Opposition. That being the case, I can understand my Honourable friend saying, have they not taxed or at any rate threatened to tax the Dominions, have they not said that they would do likewise with the Dominions? Why should they hesitate to do so even though their Imperial cousins in

India are tea planters? That is not my line of argument at all. They would not have taxed, I say, because they could not have gone out of office so soon, at any rate they would not have liked to go out of office so soon.

Sir, my friend, Mr. Moore, enlightened us about what he heard from the lips of Mr. De Valera himself. I should have been surprised, had Mr. Moore not taken the opportunity, as a great journalist that he is, to come into contact with the leader of the Irish Free State, and not only as a great journalist in this country, but also as an Irishman deeply devoted to both sides of Ireland because he lives on the border land. (Laughter.) Sir, I find my Honourable friend nodding in agreement because he is neither too much Ulster nor too much Free State. He is betwixt and between, an Irish border-man and naturally he is pleased with the idea that the south of Ireland is not, according to Mr. De Valera, to be deprived of the benefits which the north of Ireland is going to reap, namely, the benefit of the Ottawa policy. But Mr. Moore forgets that Mr. De Valera's Ireland is a free country; and we in the same position,—as you, Sir, pointed out in the memorable note you wrote on the Fiscal Commission report,—we in the same position would not have taken the intransigent attitude of Mr. De Valera on political grounds. Whatever objection we might have urged or whatever agreement we might have reached would be entirely on economic grounds, and even though not in the same position, I have been urging today no political arguments at all. I am quite willing, as I say, if you can convince me that your Agreement is going to do us good, to consider the matter and improve the trade. But no case has been made so far either by Mr. Moore or by the late Leader of the European Party, very much alive in this House (Laughter), Mr. Morgan.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member will please conclude in five minutes.

Mr. G. S. Ranga Iyer: Thank you very much, Sir, for your telling me that I have five minutes more and I will conclude within these five minutes.

Mr. Morgan referred to world recovery. He said, we want world recovery; and that is exactly what Mr. Snowden said. He objected to the Ottawa policy, because it was directed against world recovery. What we want is Indian recovery (Hear, hear), because India has 1/5th of the world's population. And how can you have Indian recovery if you do not look at the Indian question through the same spectacles through which the late Lord Curzon looked at the Indian question when he was entrusted with the responsibility for India? What Lord Curzon said in 1903 about the danger of "reprisals" from non-Imperial and non-English nations holds good today. For, before the war, England had a large percentage, 70 per cent. or more, of the Indian imports. Today the English imports into this country have shrunk to nearly 37 per cent. or so of the total imports. That being the case, may I ask in all humility, the same humility with which the Honourable the Commerce Member spoke,—blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the votes (Laughter)—may I ask, with the same humility, why we should not take a purely straight view of things and not visualise, the Commerce Member conveniently refused to visualise, what effect this will have on the foreign

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

nations, our most important customers? Giving preference for goods like jute in which we have a monopoly, giving preference for tea which has captured the British market, we are asked to give preference to British goods to push out other goods, forgetting that this policy might act like a boomerang. Sir, I object to the Ottawa policy, because of the boomerang consequences that policy involves. (Applause.)

Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal (Jullundur Division: Non-Muhammadian):

Sir, the Commerce Member took us into a few secrets of this Agreement, but I am afraid he did not let us into all the secrets of this pact. He went into some of the details of this Agreement and assured us that some part of the population of this country would be a gainer if this Agreement is accepted. He told us particularly about tea, about linseed and some other things in which India is likely to benefit by the English market being thrown open to India on preferential terms. I will presently examine the extent of this claim and the justification for it. But one part of it was safely omitted, and, I submit, with all respect, that that part was the real crucial determining factor in the light of which we must accept this Agreement or hold up our hands. I particularly invite the attention of the House to this aspect of the proposition which has been put before the House by these Benches. We are not asking the House at this stage to reject the Agreement. We are only asking the House to consider it and obtain the opinion of experts and to see whether this Agreement will in the end be good for India or not. After all, as the Honourable Member opposite was pleased to tell us, he approached this question as a layman. We are most of us laymen and, in a matter of this kind, in which such huge issues are involved, would it not be well to take the opinion of experts, so that the claim, which has been put forward from these Benches for a cool and dispassionate examination of this Agreement, may be tested and examined? The point to which I was coming was, if India is going to get a certain favour in the British market, we must give something for it. What is it that we are giving? We are giving to England the right to send her goods into this country with a preferential tariff. That is a question which requires a little examination. We all know, perhaps we know it too well, that the budgetary position of this country has been balanced or sought to be balanced with the help of a tariff—manipulation of the tariff. We are raising about 50 crores of rupees by taxation in that quarter. If that is so, how are we going to let English things in without altering our Tariff Act and upsetting our budget? Either we must raise taxation on goods from other countries or we must lower the taxes on English manufactured goods. Now both these processes are likely to mean money, to mean cost to the Indian consumer. If that is so, we might well have been told how India which aims at industrial independence, India which aims to be an industrial country, which aims to have her raw produce converted into finished articles in this country, how India is going to gain in this process. To be told that our tea will go into the British market and be welcomed there, is poor consolation for being told at the same time that for all generations to come, you will be only exporting raw produce and will be only sending your raw skins and hides and linseed and other things to England and other European countries and never be an industrial country. Up till this time the industrial development of this country has been postponed—has

been talked about, but never seriously taken in hand. Now, we are told that for all time to come we had better be content with the position we now occupy, that industrial development shall be under the conditions which England is going to introduce, that the most powerful industrial country will have a certain preference and we should live or die as best as we can under that tariff wall. I submit with all respect that that aspect of the case has not been at all adverted to.

I submit also that another part of the subject has not been looked into. We were told that we will have a favourable market in the United Kingdom. Grant, for the time being, that our hides and skins and linseed and other things will go into the British market, as they are free from tax there. We are not being appealed to on sentimental grounds. I do not think sentiment plays any part in the settlement of such matters. It is, after all, a business deal. Suppose your hides and skins are diverted from Antwerp and Hamburg and go into England. The Ottawa spirit is satisfied. You may say so much goods have gone into the British market more than they used to go there before. But what is the gain to us? The real point to consider there is whether it will develop our trade in a particular commodity or whether it only means that goods which we are sending to Antwerp and Hamburg will go to some other place. That would not amount to an improvement in our trade. Has anybody gone into the question at all? As has been pointed out by previous speakers, there are a good many commodities with regard to which we have a kind of monopoly or practically the supply of which is such that other countries cannot successfully compete with us. Take the case of tea itself. Java production of tea is not such a serious factor that it will put our tea out of the market. We may have more competition from Ceylon than we may have from Java; and, for the matter of that, in hides and skins even if the supply from certain quarters is taken in, we may be still remaining in the market. I claim that so far as these intricate questions are concerned, no attention has been given to that part of the subject, and I submit that it would have been just as well if the spirit underlying the amendments brought forward had been accepted by the other side. If I may say so, the real reason for the hurry, with which his Agreement is sought to be rushed through, is that the 15th November was a crucial date and that the advantage that we were enjoying under the Import Duties Act would be likely to be lost if we did not pass this Bill. Now, with regard to this, it has been pointed out that the 15th November has ceased to be a crucial date. But I go further. As has been pointed out in the report of this Delegation, they somehow or other consider the whole case from the point of view of what India was going to lose if she did not adopt the Agreement, rather than from the point of view of what she would gain if she accepted it. My learned friend, Mr. Anklesaria, from that quarter, in a kind of legal argument, put it: "Have you shown what India is going to lose if this thing is passed?". There was an interjection from this quarter: "The onus is wrongly placed". But onus in the legal sense need not trouble us. My friend here was right when he said that the onus is wrongly placed; but let us look the thing in the face. You are asking us to upset the present arrangements; it is for you to make out a case that the new arrangements would be so very beneficial. Whoever heard of a person, who wants to upset the balance of things and upset the *status quo*, to require the other side to prove that it would not be harmful to you? That is what Mr. Anklesaria asks us to do. You prove that it will be beneficial

[Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal.]

to us; it is not up to us to prove that it will not be harmful. If you want me to do a thing, you have to prove that it will be beneficial to me. So that, the thing has been put the wrong way about and that is what I felt yesterday trying to approach the question with an absolutely open mind, that the real thing was "Hurry on; time is passing and we have considered that India is not going to lose by it". This is, in fact, what one of the paragraphs in the Report has said. If my Honourable and learned friend, Mr. Chetty, and his colleagues had a very accurate pair of balances, they would have been able to tell us what is on one side of that scale: nobody has taken the trouble to tell us what is there on the other. Therefore the real point that was in issue has not been looked at; and this modest attempt on the part of my friends to have the examination either by an expert Committee or by the Tariff Board reinforced with some experts has been unnecessarily opposed. Support was vouchsafed for this Resolution from another quarter—the Leader of the European Group. He passed in survey some of the conditions which led to the present change of policy on the part of England. My friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, has in very happy terms examined some of the propositions put forward by Mr. Arthur Moore; but I try to look at it from a different point of view. One of the propositions which my learned friend put forward was that this is a momentous occasion in which our vote will count—not in the sense that the tellers count—but in the sense that our vote will be decisive. I am reminded in this connection of something which happened some years back; but I have no desire to go into the merits of it; but may I remind my learned friend opposite, what is the implication of this suggestion that our vote on this occasion will be more decisive than it is on other occasions—I think he was referring to the convention that when the Government of this country are in agreement with the Legislature, then any tariff or any fiscal measure will pass through and the Secretary of State will stay his hand. That, I think, is the idea underlying it. Does my friend forget that the very condition underlying the vote of the Assembly in a matter of this kind does not exist? The underlying idea was that the conditions which exist in Self-Governing Colonies or Dominions should be deemed to apply to India; and if that were so, my friend should be the first to have asked that the vote of Nominated Officials should not count in this division. (*Nationalist Cries of "Hear, hear"*.) That is the first thing if my friend wanted a sense of responsibility—responsibility to be taken by the elected elements of this House or the non-official element if I may say so—that it is by their vote that this Agreement is to be decided: then the Government of this country which comes to the House for a vote on this question should stay its hand and should not interfere with the vote.

Mr. Arthur Moore: On a point of explanation, may I say that I was not actually referring to the convention? I was merely referring to the undertaking given, as I understand it, that this question would be left to the House and that there was no question of certification.

Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal: I do not know whether that carries the case any further. In fact I was putting a much better interpretation upon what my friend said: I was going to give him credit for what he does not like to take. Anyway, I put it forward as a proposition which my friend might

well consider. If the Government came to this House for a vote as a responsible Government whom we could displace by an adverse vote, the position would be otherwise; but, as things stand, they should stay away and, in wishing to obtain the verdict of the House, they should not meddle with the voting. That is the least that we can ask them and if that is the kind of vote that they want to have, then they should produce the conditions for the recording of that vote.

Then we were told, that this is a part of the scheme of world rehabilitation which has been necessitated by post-war problems and by the peculiar situation of the United Kingdom. Now, Sir, let us examine this a little bit. We are told that the post-war problems, reparations and the need of balancing the budgets of several countries have led to an accumulation of gold in two particular countries, France and the United States, and the other countries who have got to make payments in gold cannot balance their budgets and have to restrict their imports, and various devices are adopted for that purpose. That is so, and that is one reason why in most countries various expedients are resorted to for stimulating trade. The other argument that was brought out by my learned friend was, that in the United Kingdom, it has been felt that we are losing ground in trade and it is difficult to balance the Budget and, therefore, England has gone back on her traditional policy of free trade. We are told that even the Ministers who resigned from the National Government and the Labour Government which appointed a Commission said that unless they imposed a tariff, there was no possibility of balancing the Budget. All these considerations do lead to the conclusion that an inquiry, an elaborate inquiry, is the least that can be demanded in the interests of India. Before this problem was presented to the Conference at Ottawa, the United Kingdom had been considering this question for several years; the need had been felt for imposing protective duties on more than one occasion, and the United Kingdom had been driven almost to the position that a tariff arrangement was necessary. The Colonies had been progressing towards that ideal for a long time. Can anybody say that we had a clear cut and well defined policy like the one which the Colonies and the United Kingdom had been adopting in this matter, and if we ask for a definite pronouncement from an expert Board after examination of the various data, after examination of the various interests, shall we be asking too much? May I point out, Sir, that the policy which is sought to be laid down here will bind future generations?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member will please conclude in five minutes.

Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal: I will try to do so, Sir. We were told: "Oh, this thing can be denounced by giving six months' notice on either side". That, Sir, is a very specious proposition, if I may say so. Once you get into this Agreement or pact, I can tell the House that it will be very difficult for us to get out, for the very simple reason that various interests would have grown up, your trade would have been diverted into a particular channel, and if you have lost custom somewhere, it would not be very easy to get it back by the simple expedient of denouncing your trade arrangement and by trying to bring about trade conditions which

[Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal.]

have ceased to exist. If that is so, this device of a six months' notice on either side, I submit, should not have any effect on the verdict of this House, because, if you are going to walk into this thing in a hurry, you will have to repent at leisure. Therefore, will it not be much wiser, much better, that before we enter into this Agreement or pact, we should have a clear enunciation of the policy of Government by an expert body. It is fortunate, Sir, that in the matter of protection which we have so far been able to lay down, we have an expert body, I mean the Tariff Board, and our scheme of discriminatory protection received a good deal of praise at Ottawa. India has already got a body of experts ready to advise Government whenever they are in difficulties,—and they are always in difficulties,—and, therefore, when we have this expert body, why is it that we are giving them a wide berth on this occasion in a very important matter like this? My learned friend opposite, Mr. Anklesaria, was telling in one of his arguments that we should look at this question quite independently of personalities. I am very happy that he adopted that frame of mind. After having told us that, he was out to lavish great praise on my friend, the Deputy President, then he was out to bestow praise on Mr. Ginwala, and again he was out to lavish praise on my friend, Seth Abdoola Haroon, and then he told us: "Do not care a fig as to who the Members of the Delegation were"; but these honest gentlemen, these great industrialists would not have given away your case. If that is the argument, then it shows that you preach one thing and do another. Anyway, all that I say is, that as suggested by the Movers of the various amendments, there must be an impartial and thorough inquiry before we are asked to accept this Agreement.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, my only claim for intervening in this debate is the fact that I am interested in an industry which I consider will greatly benefit if this Ottawa Agreement is ratified. I venture to preface my remarks with the observation that we should divest our minds of all political bias and of all economic prejudices before we come to consider the implications of this Agreement. There are reasons, Sir, why political and economic bias exists against this Agreement. It is useless to disguise the fact, that in previous years the history of the British Government towards the trade and industries of this country has been one of complete subordination of Indian interests to British interests. That, Sir, is the manner in which I read history. If you read, for instance, the manner in which taxes and tariffs have been imposed, excise duties levied in previous years, the conclusion is irresistible, that the object of these duties and taxes, and the object of the whole tariff policy of the Government for many years past was the subordination of Indian interests to British interests.

Mr. B. V. Jadhav (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Has that policy changed?

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: I will come to that presently. That, Sir, is the real reason of the political bias with which many thinkers and many writers in the press

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: Is it political sense or political bias?

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: I say political bias, and I will tell you why. This kind of political bias is not unusual if you read history aright. We remember that in the 18th century, the greatest commercial rivals of England were the Dutch. The Dutch merchant was a very cunning individual, and in their dealings with English merchants generally, the Dutch had generally the best of it. This fact was so familiar and so much resented in England at the time that a well-known poet of the day crystallised the sentiments of the time in the following couplet :

"In matters commercial the fault of the Dutch
Is giving too little and asking for too much."

That, Sir, is the manner in which the Englishmen of the day regarded the Dutch merchant, who was his rival. So much so that in common parlance a Dutchman was almost synonymous with the word 'liar'. Things have changed very much since then. The Dutchmen and Englishmen have become the greatest friends, and you find that the greatest boast of the Dutchman today is that of all Continental nations, he resembles Englishmen the most. That is the position in regard to the changes that occur in political and commercial relations as circumstances change and the position readjusts itself, and so I must ask this House respectfully to divest their minds of any political or economic bias that Honourable Members may have against this Agreement and to approach the consideration of this question solely and exclusively from one point of view, and that is, is it or is it not for the benefit of India? Is there a *quid pro quo* for the benefit that India is going to confer by giving preference to English goods? Or is it entirely a *pro* without any *quid* in return?

I said that my only qualification for taking part in this debate is that I am interested in an industry which, I consider, will greatly benefit by the ratification of this Agreement. I refer to the planting industry, and more especially, the coffee planting industry. The figures for 1929 show that the United Kingdom imported in all about 8½ millions worth of coffee, or Rs. 5 crores worth, of which India supplied only £168,000 worth, or Rs. 20 lakhs worth, and India's average for the five years previous was £375,000, worth or Rs. 50 lakhs worth. On the average, then, from the figures it appears that England takes 8½ per cent. of her requirements from India, 36½ per cent. from the Colonies of British East Africa and the Dominions which, in 1930, supplied £1,800,000 worth of coffee, and the rest 55 per cent. comes from foreign countries. Roughly speaking, with regard to 55 per cent. of coffee which comes to England from foreign countries, namely, nearly four crores worth of coffee—that market is open to be captured and I venture to submit with all confidence that it is very likely to be captured by India if this Ottawa Agreement is ratified with regard to the preference given to coffee. And why do I say so? There is no doubt that in this country, especially in the provinces of Mysore, Coorg and Madras, there is a steadily increasing area which comes under coffee cultivation, but unfortunately, owing to the depression in trade and fall in prices, that cultivation is not as lucrative as it might have been. Now, coffee is a product which requires intensive cultivation more than any other planting crop that I am aware of. If there is any diminution in the intensity of cultivation, the amount of fertilisers used or any other cultivating operations that are devoted to coffee, then there is an immediate, direct and necessary fall in the output. What have been

[Dr. F. X. DeSouza.]

the results of the depression of the last few years? A large number of planters have been obliged to reduce the quantity of manures and the several processes that are devoted to cultivation of coffee, with the result that the output has been considerably reduced. On the contrary, those with some staying power have tried the recent developments in cultivating operations and, by the application of special fertilisers and spraying and other methods, they have found that an expense of Rs. 10 extra per acre gives a profit of Rs. 50 per acre. If that is so, seeing that there is need for an outlet for coffee in outside countries, seeing that the area under cultivation is capable of indefinite extension, seeing that the outturn also is capable of further improvement by more intensive cultivation, am I not justified in the inference that in more prosperous times and, with preference given to Indian coffee in the English market, there is a great probability of greater sales and of greater profit to coffee planters in this country? Another reason for hoping that Indian coffee will realise higher profits and develop a better market in England is this. Hitherto we have been enjoying a preference of one farthing per pound against our rivals, Brazil and other countries. The Ottawa Agreement proposes to give us a preference of a penny a pound. There is no doubt that the demand in England is for a kind of coffee which is of a mild type, and the Indian coffee appeals to the English palate far more than the Brazilian coffee. Therefore, if that preference is given to the Indian coffee in the English market, the prices are likely to be such that the average consumer in England would prefer to buy Indian coffee as against Brazilian coffee. The total percentage of the Indian crop that the United Kingdom takes is 28 per cent, France 27 per cent, Germany takes 10 per cent, and the rest of the world takes the remainder.

It is said that if we give a preference to English manufactures in this country, the necessary consequence would be that foreign countries will retaliate against our own exports including, among others, coffee. But, Sir, there is a limit to retaliation. It is not as if coffee entered free in all the great countries of Europe. I find that in Jugo-Slovakia the duty is 80 shillings a cwt., in France it is 25 shillings a cwt. How far can this retaliation go? Retaliation so as to exclude Indian coffee would be very much like cutting one's nose to spite one's face.

Again, it was said that, after all, the planting industry of coffee and tea is in the hands of British planters here and that, whatever may happen, it is not likely that the British Government would penalise the produce of their own countrymen in this country. Sir, I deny the premise. It is not true that the bulk of the coffee planters,—whatever may be the case with regard to tea—in southern India are purely European. My Honourable friend, Mr. James, tells me that 69 per cent. of the planters are Indians in southern India, and that percentage, I can assure this House from my own knowledge, is steadily increasing.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member must conclude within five minutes.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: The Indian planters have benefited by the example which has been set by the English planters who were the pioneers originally and to whom both Mysore and Assam owe a great deal for their enterprise in developing vast jungles and forests and making them yield

rich and profitable produce like tea and coffee. It is not true then to say that it is only the English planters that would benefit by the preference. Indian planters would lose a great deal if they lose the trade in coffee and tea.

One word more and I shall conclude. If we ratify this Agreement now, we are not precluded from repudiating it if, by experience, we find it works against our interests. We must remember, in approaching this question, that we are on the eve of obtaining Swaraj. (*Mr. B. Das*: "That is our point too.") Fiscal autonomy is one of the concomitants of Swaraj and, if a Swaraj Government, after considering the pros and cons, find it necessary by experience to repudiate this Agreement, I think that, in spite of what my Honourable friend, Mr. Sitaramaraju, said about the necessity of obtaining the sanction of the Council of State and guarding against the veto of His Excellency the Governor General, the Swaraj Government will certainly repudiate it. With these words, I support the Resolution moved by the Commerce Member.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Sir, I must make it very clear to the House that this question is not an easy question that can be decided on the mere assurances that have been given to us. This is a question which requires great consideration. This is a question on which we should not be guided away by those that have considered this question at the Ottawa Conference. Nor can we be swayed away by any opinions which are being given in the British Islands. The only issue is this. We are not concerned whether this preference is beneficial to the British Islands or other places in the Empire, but we are concerned only with the point whether it is beneficial to the interests of India. Bearing that point in mind, I would request you to consider this question with facts and figures and not to be carried away by the arguments that are being put forward by the Treasury Benches. On this question there ought to be some way of finding a solution. The decision on this question must depend upon showing to the House that this preference is beneficial to India. The burden of proof is upon those who have brought forward this Resolution to ratify the Agreement and the House should not be led away by the misleading remarks made by Mr. Anklesaria who tried to misplace the burden of proof. Three issues were put before the House by the Commerce Member. The first issue was, why the Delegation went to Ottawa. We know that it went in the interests of the British Government. The British Government complicated the situation by introducing the Trade Import Bill in their own interest and it was, therefore, because the British Government wanted to get out of that complication, that they wanted the Indian Government also to join hands and to send some people to the Conference. The first question is, whether we should follow the lead given by those Indians who went to Ottawa. I say, that will be a false position. I know the Deputy President is an able man, he has got a mastery over economics. I know also, Haji Abdoola Haroon is a merchant who deals in sugar and other things, but those are not the qualifications that should go to satisfy us that what they have done is in the best interests of India. No one of us sent them. The Indian people never wanted that any Delegation should go. It is the British Government that wanted them to go and they went at the mandate of the British Government. Though they are Members of this Assembly, they were given no representative character by Indian people for the Ottawa Conference. I would not say anything about these gentlemen

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

myself, but I would put it in the words of the opinion given in the House of Parliament by a prominent Member of that House with regard to the representative character of these Delegates, etc. I will read to you this. This is a contribution I find in the *Tribune* :

"The Ottawa debate in the House of Commons on Tuesday was so unreal, the ratification of the Agreement being a foregone conclusion, that it was not necessary to take any serious notice of it. Its only importance from India's point of view lay in the fact that it afforded that indefatigable friend of India, Mr. Lansbury, an opportunity of proclaiming to the world that the Delegates who had been sent to Ottawa from India had no representative character and that the Indian mercantile community which really matters in a transaction like this, like the one gone through at Ottawa, had been ignored in spite of its vigorous protests. Those who went to Ottawa were nominees of the irresponsible Government of India and not representatives of the people of India. India has always been opposed to the vicious principle of Imperial Preference, no matter by what name it may be called."

Therefore the Delegates were not sent by the Indian people and they did not ever consult the Indian people before going. Did they take any brief from them? As lawyers, we know how to make up our minds and to form our opinions. We get instructions from our clients with all the facts and then we are in a position to know what opinion to give to them. If the Delegates had been sent by the people of India, we would certainly have respected their views.

Then, for the second issue, we are asked to depend upon the assurances that we get from the Treasury Benches. That again is a fallacy. The Government of India are subordinate to the British Government and to the British Parliament. Now, how is it expected that we must

4 P.M. have faith in whatever this Government tell us, and that we should repose all confidence in whatever assurance they give us? Therefore, that is not the real test. But here I note that the Honourable the Commerce Member himself was very frank enough to tell us that he could give us no positive and absolute assurance that this would be to the benefit of India. Therefore, Sir, this issue is not proved. It is only hoped by him that it will likely be to the interest of India. Now, is that an assurance? Then, again, it is said that if it does not prove to be in the interest of India, then we can throw it out after six months. Sir, we all have a most unhappy experience of things which are done by the British Government here; we all know what hope there can be of such things being rescinded without much difficulty. This point has already been made clear to the House that it is very difficult, when a proposition like this is accepted, to get it revoked.

Then, the third consideration which ought to appeal to us is that it is the Indian people who should decide; and as the Government at present are not Indian and, as a new constitution is going to come in,—it may be that we may get a better prospect of a suitable constitution,—it will be then only that the Indian people can sit together and decide whether preference should be given or not. Sir, it is not only a question of give and take—which was the second issue laid down by the Honourable the Commerce Member. The real issue is, whether in giving and taking we are benefited.

Sir, the position of India is a peculiar one. We have got no industries in the first place. Our industries have been more or less annihilated by the process of British exploitation. We know how India was self-contained

and self-sufficient in these industries, and how, as history tells us, these industries came to be destroyed. Now, if there is any desire in the Indian Government to support the infant industries we have at present, there should be protection for India and no preference for others. I should say that if there are to be any preferences, they should be between countries that can compete with one another properly. But if it is going to be a case where preference is given to the competitors of our infant industries, then, I must say, we will be no where. Then the fourth course open to us is only one, and it is this, that we should be guided by Indian public opinion. Sir, we here may not be merchants, but we know it that after this Agreement was arrived at, Indian traders and Indian merchants and the Chambers of Commerce have given us their definite opinions and these definite opinions are not as vacillating or as vague as the opinion which has been given to us by the Treasury Benches here. They have gone into the pros and cons of the question and into all the points of preference with regard to particular articles and they have come to the conclusion that the Agreement will not be beneficial to India. Now, on that point, I would only submit that the Federation of Indian merchants have given their opinion, and issued a pamphlet. Then there is the Indian Merchants' Chamber, Bombay, and I shall only read for two minutes from their proceedings. Sir, at page 2 of their pamphlet which has also been sent to the Government of India, their Secretary says:

"My Committee have examined the Report, and can only reiterate their condemnation of the Agreement entered into. Indeed, from an examination of the arguments and the statistics contained in the Report, they feel more convinced than ever that the Agreement is not only *not* to the benefit of India, but is positively prejudicial to her economic interests."

Then I shall read one or two paragraphs from page 4 which will satisfy the House that their observations are not vague and unsupported by any detail. They say:

"The most amazing part of the Report is that in which an attempt is made to show that by keeping certain articles on the free list, the United Kingdom is conferring a boon on India, and that the Delegation have achieved some unforeseen gain for India by persuading the British Delegation to do so. The Delegation admit that in the case of those articles in which India possesses what amounts to a practical monopoly in the British market, a preference is 'nugatory'. They enumerate articles, like Raw Jute, Lac, Myrabolams, Broken Rice, Mica and certain varieties of Hemp, in which India enjoys such a monopoly. In spite of this, they make a laboured apologia to lead the public to believe that India has been favoured by the United Kingdom by keeping on the free list these raw materials of British industry.

Then, again, the consideration of the Delegation has been most superficial and one-sided, on the effects of India's non-participation in the scheme on her export trade to the United Kingdom. The largest items in this trade are, Tea, Jute, Hides and Skins, Raw Cotton and Oil-seeds. My Committee consider that the risk, which weighed in the minds of the Delegation, in the case of Tea, was most exaggerated. After all, India is the largest supplier of tea to the United Kingdom, and the ability of Ceylon to supplant India in the United Kingdom market is limited. An import duty on such a necessary of life inevitably falls on the consumer. So much has been said of the instance of tea that it calls for a little fuller examination. India exports to the United Kingdom Rs. 22 crores of Tea. Ceylon, the next largest supplier, exports about 18 crores. Now, if Ceylon got preference, and we did not, it could under-sell us in the British markets provided, of course, it were capable of totally supplanting Indian exports. But it is obvious that Ceylon cannot more than double its output. . . . A duty of 10 per cent. against Indian tea, 18 crores of which is wanted by Britain, can only result in raising the price of *all* tea imported into Britain. In that case, Ceylon would no doubt have the benefit of that higher price. All the same, the person who would be hit most would be not the grower in India but the consumer in Britain."

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

Sir, I ask your permission to say one word more. The danger to our infant industries is very much. For instance, aluminium is imported from the United Kingdom and other outside places. There are British manufacturers in India and also Indians handling aluminium, but the aluminium is imported by the same British people who own factories here. Therefore the Indian manufacturers are principally at their mercy for the purchase of the aluminium and also the quantity they could get from them. Indians are thus not able to compete with them and the only course open to them now is to make purchases from other outside countries and if you grant a preference to British goods, you then put the Indian manufacturer into a more hazardous position, *viz.*, that he will be entirely deterred from purchasing aluminium from other outside countries and be not able to compete at all with the British manufacturer, but to leave the market wholly to him. I think, therefore, that if these opinions expressed by the Chambers of Commerce and the Indian merchants are given due weight, it will be realised that they have proved that it is not at all in the interests of India to accept this Agreement.

Mr. B. V. Jadhav: Sir, at the outset I would like to offer my compliments to the Honourable the Commerce Member for presenting his case so very beautifully. He has made much of the points of which he could show some advantages to India and he has conveniently passed over other points on which he could not say much and, in this way, I think, he has taken a leaf out of or taken some instructions from his colleague, the Leader of the House, a very able lawyer. Sir, this side of the House has not yet made up its mind as to accept or throw away the Ottawa Agreement, but what I would wish is that sufficient time be given to consider the various provisions stated therein and to have some expert advice on the various points, and I like the idea of referring this question to the Tariff Board for detailed examination. Now this giving preference to Empire goods must be looked upon as a fair bargain. If India is giving up more and receiving less, then it would not be a fair bargain. We have, therefore, to see what we are to get and what we are to lose. For that purpose a detailed examination is certainly necessary.

Now, as a matter of fact, the Honourable the Commerce Member has shown us in what respects India is going to get preference. He has cited the instances of lac, myrabolam, tea and vegetable oil, etc., and some of my friends on this side have dealt with this point at some length and, therefore, I do not propose to take the time of this House. Now, Sir, the fiscal policy of India has been based to a little extent on the policy of protection and, to a certain extent, our import duties have been levied for the purpose of raising revenue. There are a few industries started here in India and the Government of India have found that, in order to give proper encouragement to these industries, import duties are necessary and, therefore, those duties have been levied. Under the Ottawa Agreement, the necessary protection to indigenous industries will be preserved. But, I am not quite sure, what the intentions of Government are as regards those duties which are levied for revenue purposes. Do they intend that the ten per cent. preference, that is to be given to Empire goods, is to come out of the present rate of duty or is the present rate to be increased by an additional ten per cent? My Honourable friend, Mr. Morgan, has clearly stated to this House that he was opposed to any addition to the existing duties in order to enable Government to

give preference to Empire goods and I fully agree with him; because the present duties for revenue purposes have raised the retail prices in the market and to that extent the purchasing power of the ryot is crippled. If these duties are to be further increased by ten per cent., in order to provide preference to the Empire manufacturers, then the purchasing power of the ryot will be further crippled and we shall be laying heavy duties upon the poor people here in order to feed the rich manufacturers of England and other places. So, if any preference is to be given, it ought to come out of the present duties which are levied for revenue purposes. And, if that is so, it is evident that the Indian finances will suffer. It is very difficult, Sir, for the Finance Member to make both ends meet even under the present circumstances and the condition of the Finance Department will be very difficult if the ten per cent. is to come out of the present duties which are levied for revenue purposes. This is a thing to be seriously considered, for it will throw our finances into confusion.

I have, Sir, to raise my feeble voice of protest for Government's way of accomplishing things. Government have been trying for a very long time to impose this preferential policy upon India. The first attempt that was made was about 1903 and we know what reception it had at the hands of the Government of late Lord Curzon. Then, there were certain other attempts and one of these recorded is when the Fiscal Commission was appointed. The question there raised was about preference at that time. You know very well, Sir, what the report of the Fiscal Commission was and the opinion of the minority has been quoted here so very often that I need not repeat it. Since then, on two occasions, Government have forced this Assembly indirectly to accept the principle of preference. Once it was in the case when some protection was to be given to the Tata Works and therein surreptitiously Government introduced a preferential tariff for British steel and iron products. The Members of this Assembly were placed in a very difficult position. It was in the hands of Government to push on the measure or to withdraw it and the Assembly was faced with the difficulty that if they did not swallow the sugar-coated pill of the preference to English steel and iron goods, then the measure for giving protection to the steel industry would also be withdrawn and the steel industry would fare very badly and might ultimately collapse. So the Members of the Assembly were obliged to give their consent to the surreptitiously introduced preference principle. Then, again, when the question of giving preference to the cotton piecegoods came, Government made use of the same policy. Although they assured the House that the passing of the measure would not be taken as accepting the principle of preference, still they have made use of the very two instances in the report of this Ottawa scheme that the Assembly has on two occasions accepted the principle and given its support to that principle. In the same way, they have now come forward and announced to the House that the Agreement has already been signed and, therefore, the date, the 15th November, is not a very important date. The principle has been surreptitiously introduced here that the Government of England, with the connivance of the Government of India, may sign any agreement on behalf of India and come before this House and say: "Now it has already been signed and tell us whether you approve of it or not". The signing of the Agreement is not left to us. We are not here to say whether the Agreement should be signed or not, because the Agreement has already been signed. We have only to say whether

[Mr. B. V. Jadhav.]

we approve of it or not and, perhaps, if we do not approve of it, Government may say that they will give six months' notice.

Now, Sir, it has been told us that some of the major Dominions and even foreign countries are very eager to come to terms with the Government of England and that they are ready to enter into agreement with them. Of course the country, which is suffering loss, may agree to enter into an agreement to better its chances. If India finds that it would be to her advantage to enter into the Agreement, then, we, on this side, will not be sorry and will not be lagging behind in giving our consent. But there is a good deal of difference between other agricultural countries and India. No doubt India is pre-eminently an agricultural country, but, at the same time, a major portion of our agricultural produce is taken up for home consumption and, therefore, we do not depend upon the export of our agricultural produce to foreign countries to such an extent as other agricultural countries do. Formerly India was a self-sufficient country, all her needs were supplied by home manufactures and our ultimate goal is to attain that position. Therefore, we are very anxious to encourage home industries here and such industries as would, in the long run, be able to stand severe competition of foreign manufacturers. For that purpose this House has been willing to give its consent even to heavy import duties for the protection of nascent industries. But the preferences that are proposed in Schedule F are so very numerous and are of such far-reaching effect that I am afraid they may ultimately kill some of our infant industries.

Reference has been made here to the aluminium vessel industry by my Honourable friend from Sind. The condition here is that vessels made of aluminium have been in the market for a very long time and many of the Indian firms have been engaged in manufacturing them and they have been importing aluminium disks from Germany and from Canada and from other places. Now, the British and Canadian manufacturers of aluminium disks are not content with exporting their disks only, but they have come to India and started their own factories in order to kill the Indian factories that have been working here for a number of years. They now hold the monopoly as far as the Canadian aluminium is concerned, and their competition has been found to be very severe by our Indian manufacturers. Now, this preference of ten per cent. will, I am afraid, be utilised by these foreign manufacturers who have established their own factories here in killing the Indian manufacturers. They will be getting the ten per cent. preference while the Indian manufacturers will be obliged to purchase their aluminium disks from Germany and other countries who do not enjoy this preference. The consequence will be that the Indian manufacturers will have to pay nearly ten per cent. more for their raw materials than the Canadian or the British manufacturers in India who will have to pay ten per cent. less and, in that way, the Indian aluminium industry will be killed.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member will please conclude in five minutes.

Mr. B. V. Jadhav: There is another industry which I want to bring to your notice and that is the industry of making bedsteads and iron furniture. There are certain small men who have been carrying on this

manufacture for about half a dozen years and they now stand threatened with extinction, because the iron bedsteads that will be imported from England will get a preference of ten per cent. and that is clear gain to them. It is evident that the iron that will be imported in India will have to pay the same duty as before, while the iron bedsteads that come from England will get a preference of ten per cent., so that the Indian manufacturer, who produces iron bedsteads, will be at a great disadvantage and it is feared that he will be thrown out of the market. From the newspapers, I see that even the makers of machinery are trying to ask for preference and perhaps their voice might be found too strong for the Government of India to resist and if the English machinery is to get preference of ten per cent., then the Indian manufacturers will be greatly handicapped. I see the Honourable the Commerce Member shaking his head. I, therefore, hope and, I am sure, that India will be saved from that danger.

A reference was made to the speech of Sir Herbert Samuel in the House of Commons, and my Honourable friend, Mr. James, said that the real arguments of Sir Herbert Samuel were in favour of the Ottawa Agreement, if other Members of the British Empire would also accept it. I think that that is a perfect answer which we, on this side, also will give. If the other Members of the British Empire are not going to accept the Ottawa Agreement, because they do not find it beneficial, for the same reason it ought not to be beneficial to India also. But India is in a dependent position and, therefore, the Indian Delegates could not refuse to sign that Agreement, while the Members, comprising the Delegation from other Dominions, were more free and they have not signed on that account. Sir Herbert Samuel was perfectly right in saying that if the pact was signed by all, then there would be something which would show that there was justice on all sides, but the abstaining from signing by other Members of the British Empire shows that this Agreement is not a fair one and, therefore, the diffidence that is felt by this side of the House is justified.

Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi: (Madras ceded Districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Sitaramaraju, which is to the effect that this matter of Ottawa Agreement should be first referred to the Tariff Board for a thorough enquiry before any legislation is introduced and considered in this Assembly. I must, at the outset, state that though I support that amendment, I do not agree with all that has been said by the Mover in support of this Resolution. Most of his speech was devoted to the political aspect of the question. I should say at the outset that I would like to view it from an economic aspect and not mix it up with the political aspect, because India cannot wait for economic freedom until she gets political freedom and so, I would rather view the Ottawa Agreement from its thoroughly business point of view and, if at all we have to get any benefits from the pact, I would be the first to support it. So, I would like to tell the Treasury Benches that we are anxious to view it only from its economic effect on India. The Ottawa Agreement accepts wholesale the principle of Imperial Preference and, in support of that, my Honourable friend, Mr. Anklesaria, quoted from the report of the Fiscal Commission to show that this report also supports the view that India can accept the principle of Imperial Preference. But he has

[Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi.]

quoted only those passages wherein the Fiscal Commission lays down the principles to be observed with regard to the applicability of Imperial Preference. But if he had quoted other passages, he would have found that paragraphs 238 and 239 have laid down clearly that the principle of Imperial Preference will adversely affect the interest of India. Sir, I will make no apology for reading this short paragraph. It says:

"The above examination of the existing preference granted to Indian products in the United Kingdom bears out our general proposition that Indian exports on the whole are not of a nature capable of benefiting to any great extent by preferential rates, particularly as much as can be granted in the United Kingdom."

Then again, in paragraph 239 they say:

"On the other hand it would no doubt be possible for India to offer substantial advantages to British products by the grant of preference to her imports. The nature of the British imports, which are nearly all manufactures, makes this clear, but we do not think that India can grant anything of great value without imposing a serious burden on herself, and it would not be reasonable for India to incur such a burden."

Sir, these passages make it clear that at present India will stand to lose and not to gain by accepting the principle of Imperial Preference. The situation has not changed considerably since the time this report was published in 1921-22. And so, if at all, the Government have to prove that things have changed and it is to the interest of India that we should accept this Imperial Preference. It is for Government to prove that. Then, Sir, the Delegates that went to the Ottawa Conference have accepted this principle and have acted upon it. That is clear from the statement in the report wherein they say that "hereafter it is a question of what India stands to lose and not what India stands to gain". It is with that view that they have entered into the Tariff Agreements. What are the reasons? The reasons also they have given, and, in their report, they say that England has now changed her tariffs and it has become now a full-blown protectionist country and gone far away from its free trade position. Secondly, they state that the Import Duties Act, by which a ten per cent. duty will be levied on all goods which enter England after the 15th November, will come into operation and so we have to come to some conclusion and we have to accept this principle, so that we may escape these duties.

With regard to the first point, namely, that England went off free trade and accepted the policy of protection, it is a purely domestic matter with which we are not concerned. What we are concerned with is that it should be used as an argument for Indian Delegates accepting this principle of Imperial Preference. Sir, we are not to be tied to the chariot-wheels of the British Parliament and follow a policy which they find useful to them. Already Sir Herbert Samuel has voiced his feelings in the House of Commons and has clearly stated that if the Liberal Government come into power, they are going to revert to the free-trade principle; and so the principle of protection which they have adopted will not be a permanent one. And if we are to be tied to the chariot-wheels of British tariff policy, then India stands to lose. Then, Sir, with regard to the second reason which they have given, that is, the threat of the application of the Import Duties Act, the Honourable the Commerce Member said that it is a real threat and not a bluff as some people would put it because, as he said, it equally affects the Dominions and the people of the Dominions are their own kith and kin, and,

therefore, it is not a bluff, but they meant it in all seriousness. With regard to this, I have to say that the Dominions were very anxious to enter into such Imperial Preferences for nearly 50 years. They have all the time been urging the mother-country to accept these preferences and it is the United Kingdom that was opposed to it and so when the United Kingdom said that they would like to enter into these Imperial Preferences, they accepted it with great alacrity, because they have been urging it for a long time. So it is only a bluff intended for India. Then, Sir, with regard to the import duties themselves, India is exporting only raw materials and also food, drink and tobacco to a large extent to the United Kingdom; and if at all they would levy these duties, we also have got the power to retaliate. And, further, it is to the disadvantage of England to impose any duties at all on raw materials. On this ground also we cannot support this principle of Imperial Preference.

Sir, in judging this question of Ottawa Agreement, we have to have before us two fundamental factors. The one factor is that the United Kingdom is gradually losing her hold upon her Empire markets, and the foreign countries like the United States, Germany, France, Italy and Japan are making serious inroads into their close preserve and carrying away their trade to a considerable extent. That is one important feature and, in support of that, I will only quote the statistics. The percentage of imports of merchandise to India by the United Kingdom in 1913-14 was 64 per cent., while in 1930-31 it has dwindled to 37.2 per cent. On the other hand, whereas countries other than the United Kingdom had a share of 30 per cent. in 1913-14, it has risen to 53.9 per cent. in 1930-31. Thus you can see that other countries have made great inroads into the preserve. The second point which we have to bear in mind is that India has been exporting raw materials to a great extent and receiving manufactured goods; and we also find in this Fiscal Commission's Report that it is to the advantage of manufactured goods that these preferential duties will operate and raw products do not stand in any need of preference at all. A few statistics will make it clear to show that India is exporting large quantities of raw materials to the United Kingdom and also food, drink and tobacco. India is exporting to the extent of 30 per cent. of value of articles of food, drink and tobacco, and with regard to raw materials, produced and unmanufactured articles, 43 per cent. of value, and in all 73 per cent., whereas it is importing 65 per cent. of value of the manufactured goods from the United Kingdom. Thus it is for the benefit of the United Kingdom that we should enter into these preferential tariffs. I do not want at this stage to enter into a detailed discussion with regard to the effect of these preferences on each and every article, but I would divide these articles into certain groups and prove that articles under some of those groups which we are exporting to England do not stand in need of any preference

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member will please conclude in five minutes.

Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi: I will do so, Sir. Certain articles which do not at all benefit by this preferential treatment are articles which India produces in great abundance and in which the capacity of the United Kingdom to absorb is very limited. Under this head come groundnuts, rice and jute manufactures and such other articles. For instance, India produces groundnuts to the value of 14 crores odd; whereas the

[Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi.]

United Kingdom absorbs at present only about 2½ crores. So the preference given to our groundnut does not at all benefit us. Because there is very little market in the United Kingdom for our products: it absorbs only 2½ crores whereas we have been producing to the extent of 14 crores; and so we have necessarily to go to foreign markets for that produce. So also rice. We are producing nearly 30 crores worth of rice, whereas the total absorption of the United Kingdom is only about 2½ crores; so necessarily we have to go to foreign countries and any preference given to this commodity will not be of much benefit; so also with regard to other articles—jute manufactures and others. Then there are other articles which come under another group wherein England absorbs large quantities and India produces only a small quantity and the Colonies are supplying to the United Kingdom to a greater extent. Here also the preference will not be of much avail, because in this case we have to compete with the Colonies if at all we have to capture the market in the United Kingdom since they also get the same benefits. At present we are producing these in very small quantity and preference is, therefore, of absolutely no benefit to us. There are other articles which we produce in which preferential rates will benefit India. Take the case of imports from the United Kingdom. At present the United Kingdom is importing certain manufactured goods in very small quantities for whom preferences are given while there is a very big market in India and India is getting most of these manufactured goods from foreign countries. For these cases it will take a very long time for England to capture the Indian market with these preferences and the consumer here will have to bear the burden for a pretty long time until England completely captures this market. So it will not be to the benefit of India to give any preferences for such commodities to England. Further, by giving such preferences to so many manufactured goods, it will kill the nascent industries of India. Of course it is said, that by giving preferences to certain articles, ultimately it is proved detrimental to the interests of India, we can give six months notice and terminate the Agreement. But previous speakers have already stated what difficulties there are in getting any Act of Legislature passed in the present Legislature to terminate such agreements. So when once it is passed, it will become a permanent feature. Thus there are sufficient grounds for submitting the Ottawa Agreements to an inquiry by the Tariff Board for enquiry as to how far and on what articles we can, with advantage, give preference and also receive preference. All I have to say is this: that it is better that this Agreement should first be thrashed out by a special Committee like the Tariff Board and then come before the Assembly with a considered report. With these words I support the amendment moved by Mr. Raju.

Mr. A. Hoon (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I thank you for permitting me to speak at this late hour and I hope the House will also be indulgent towards me, because I am sure I will not inflict a long speech or waste much of their time. The issue is very clear now. On the one side we are asked to ratify the agreement straight off and on the other side, the House has put forward amendments just with a note of warning and caution. The Opposition has asked the Honourable Member who has moved this Resolution to give them time to have the advice of their experts, to have the advice of those in whom

they have implicit faith; and considering that the crucial date, that is the 15th November, is not likely to interfere in this arrangement, I have no doubt that the Honourable Member will not grudge this concession to the House. Anyhow, as the debate has been going on, we on this side of the House, have only to substantiate and prove the necessity of asking for time for further consideration of the details of this Resolution. When a gentleman of the ability of the Honourable Member who moved this Resolution with all the resources behind him and with all the experts at his side was modest enough and frank enough at the same time to tell us that he felt a bit nervous in treading upon the thorny ground full of figures as far as these matters are concerned, I think we, on this side of the House, who are mostly laymen, would not be wrong if we cry halt and just ask a little bit of time more to reconsider this matter before we are asked to sign this Agreement and to ratify it. The Honourable the Mover of the Resolution has told us that the introduction of the Bill raising duties on the imports in England is going to be put into effect and that we would lose a lot of money if we did not ratify this Agreement. It may or may not be so—I do not know what is going to be its full significance in the near future, but the first idea, that strikes a layman like me is that. I look upon this attempt as a little bit of a coercive act. We all know on this side of the House that there is a very large number of Honourable Members who are concerned in what is called the Swadeshi movement. We are all helping to spread and increase the Swadeshi movement in this country as much as we can, and, coming as it does at this moment—a threat from a country like England which has always taken pride in its history of free trade,—I think we are fully justified in thinking that there is something more behind it than what appears on the surface. I submit, the first impulse that comes in the mind of a layman like me is to hit back. I say "away with your pranks; if I can hit you back, I will certainly do so", and I do not think that we are not in a position as not to be able to hit back with effect. After all, England's biggest market, as far as Lancashire cloth and other goods are concerned, is India. We have been trying to check the import of British cloth as far as possible, and there is no reason why, at this moment, we should not be able to tell the British people that if they are going to inflict these things on us, we have also got some weapon in our hands by which we can hit them back. And hence they should not be in a hurry and levy import duties on the 15th of November. If they want to talk to us in a friendly way, let us have time; we shall think over the matter and see what is best in the interests of all concerned.

Then, Sir, one has got to remember the fact that no Member of the House who has so far spoken has gone into the figures relating to this Agreement, simply because in matters of this nature incalculable points creep in. We have, at the very outset, to be very careful in judging one particular fact. We are, Sir, on the threshold of a new era in our national history. We want to take our proper place with all the other nations of the world. There is no reason why, if we start with an arrangement of this kind by giving preference to one country, we should not be putting all the other countries in a bad humour, and I submit that it will be a tragedy if our national life begins with such handicaps. National prejudices, settling down old accounts, jealousies and all sorts of things work in these matters, and we have got to be extremely cautious. Therefore, what we want from the Honourable Member opposite is that,

[Mr. A. Hoon.]

taking into account all these facts, he should give us time. We do not want years to settle these matters. We only want a reasonable time to have this matter inquired into, and then if all goes well, if all the assurances that he has held out to us are really good assurances, he will find us very strong co-operators to see that the whole thing is brought to perfect success.

Then, Sir, as far as the speech of the Honourable Member in charge of the Department of Commerce goes, I could see that he was trying to make out a strong case with regard to the question of the export of tea. There is no doubt that the export of tea is a very valuable asset as far as our country is concerned; but, as a layman, I think that there is a good deal of the bogey about the position that has been created. I am inclined to think that, considering the fact that the tea planters are mostly men from Britain, that the capital in the tea companies is mostly British the English people would not be so foolish or unpatriotic or unfriendly towards their own kith and kin as to destroy the tea industry.

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: They want safeguards.

Mr. A. Hoon: I should think that if we leave the question of the tea industry alone and do not attach to it undue importance, the tea planter, who is a Britisher, will become our friend, and he will go to the big Corporations in London moving from restaurant to restaurant and tell those people to look upon the Indian tea as British tea, because it is produced by British capital and British management in India. As such, if the question of tea is left into the hands of the British planter rather than in the hands of Mr. Chetty or Seth Abdoola Haroon, the question will be solved in a much better way.

Again, Sir, there is one other aspect of this question which I commend to the House for very serious consideration, and it is this. Whether we agree with the general populace of this country at this moment or not we cannot get away from the fact that feelings at this time in the country are not towards buying anything British; much less are the feelings to enter into any trade or other agreements with Britain. We may agree with such a view or not, but we cannot forget this aspect of the question, because, after all, we are elected by our constituents, and we have got to answer them. We have got to do here what we are required to do by the wishes of the people, and not what we ourselves think proper. I again say that I may not be agreeing with the opinion of the public on that point, but I commend this point of view to the Members of the House who are elected.

Now, with regard to all these difficulties, there is suggested one solution. There is one point which was mentioned by the Honourable the Mover and which was very prominently brought out by all Members who asked us to support the ratification of this Agreement, and it is this, that if we are in any trouble, we can always cancel the Agreement by giving six months' notice. Sir, as a lawyer I may tell this House that I do not believe in any such nonsense. I know, and I think most of us know, what is the condition of a suit or a case between a poor man and a rich man. The case generally ends in success for the rich man, and the poor man may go on fighting and fighting and one does not know what may happen

eventually. My advice to the poor client always is to try and compromise any way he can, because fighting, even for the most righteous cause against a rich opponent is not a business proposition in the end. I am inclined to think that if we ever ask for the cancellation of this Agreement,—and a note of warning has been sounded,—we will not and we cannot succeed. Whatever constitution this country is going to get, there is going to be a House of Elders, and we know what they always do in matters of this kind. It will be practically impossible for us to cancel any such Agreement if we now enter into it. If we make great noise in the Lower House, probably the Government will set up another Round Table Conference, and we know who would be selected, and what would be the result.

With regard to the question of reciprocity, I would say that, as far as the Colonies are concerned, I would leave them out altogether. No temptation of any gain coming from that quarter would induce a man like me to enter into any negotiations with them. Why? Because my self-respect prompts me not to have any talk with them whatsoever. If those gentlemen from the Colonies want to talk to us, I only want them to give to the relations and friends of the Secretary for the Education Department the same treatment in that country which they have in this country as far as the civic rights are concerned. If they do that, then, of course, we shall talk to them and see what is best for us. With these few remarks, I commend the amendment of my friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, that the matter be referred to a Committee where experts may be asked to help us.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 9th November, 1932.