

2nd April 1937

**THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES**

(Official Report)

Volume III, 1937

(15th March to 3rd April, 1937)

FIFTH SESSION

OF THE

FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1937



PUBLISHED BY THE MANAGER OF PUBLICATIONS, DELHI.
PRINTED BY THE MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, SIMLA.

1937

Legislative Assembly.

President :

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

Deputy President :

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

Panel of Chairmen :

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

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

SIR LESLIE HUDSON, KT., M.L.A.

SIR COWASJI JEHANGIR, BART., K.C.I.E., O.B.E., M.L.A.

Secretary :

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR-AT-LAW.

Assistant of the Secretary :

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

Marshal :

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

Committee on Petitions :

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

SIR LESLIE HUDSON, KT., M.L.A.

SARDAR SANT SINGH, M.L.A.

MR. M. GHIASUDDIN, M.L.A.

MR. MATHURADAS VISSANJI, M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME III.—15th March to 3rd April, 1937.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
MONDAY, 15TH MARCH, 1937,—		WEDNESDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1937,—contd.	
Questions and Answers	1909—19	The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the con- sideration of clauses not concluded	2070— 2120
Short Notice Question and Answer	1919—20		
Motion for adjournment <i>re</i> Jute Mill Strike at Cal- cutta—disallowed by the Governor General	1921	THURSDAY, 18TH MARCH, 1937,—	
Election of Members to the Public Accounts Com- mittee	1921—26	The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the con- sideration of clauses not concluded	2121—78
Motion of the Standing Committee on Roads	1927	FRIDAY, 19TH MARCH, 1937,—	
Election of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways	1927	Member Sworn	2179
Election of the Central Ad- visory Council for Rail- ways	1927	Questions and Answers	2179—86
The Indian Oaths (Amend- ment) Bill—Introduced	1928	Unstarred Questions and Answers	2186—87
The Commercial Docu- ments Evidence Bill— Introduced	1928—29	The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the consi- deration of clauses con- cluded	2187— 2233
The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the motion to consider not conclud- ed	1929—82	Statement of Business	2233
TUESDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1937,—		SATURDAY, 20TH MARCH, 1937,—	
Questions and Answers	1983—90	Member Sworn	2235
The Indian Finance Bill— Motion to consider adopt- ed	1990— 2058	Questions and Answers	2235—41
WEDNESDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1937,—		Unstarred Questions and Answers	2241—47
Questions and Answers	2059—64	Statements laid on the table	2247—50
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2064—70	Election of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways and the Public Accounts Committee	2250—51
		The Indian Finance Bill— Recommended amend- ment negatived	2251—68

	PAGES.		PAGES.
SATURDAY 20TH MARCH, 1937,—contd.		TUESDAY, 30TH MARCH, 1937,—contd.	
Demands for Supplementary Grants	2268—89	The Indian Soft Coke Cess (Reconstitution of Committee) Bill—Circulated	2384—2403
The Arya Marriage Validation Bill—Passed as amended	2289—95	The Repealing and Amending Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded	2403—15
Statement of Business	2295—96	WEDNESDAY, 31ST MARCH, 1937,—	
Election to and Nominations for the Standing Committee for Roads	2296—97	Questions and Answers	2417—43
TUESDAY, 30TH MARCH, 1937,—		Unstarred Questions and Answers	2443—51
Members Sworn	2299	Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Racial Discrimination against Indian Members of the Military Medical Services in India—Adopted	2452, 2493—2510
Questions and Answers	2299—2349	Election of Members to the Central Advisory Council for Railways	2452
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2349—58	Election of Member to the Standing Committee for Roads	2452
Statements laid on the table	2358—65	Election of Members to the Standing Advisory Committee for Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department	2452—53
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Banning by the Police Commissioner, Calcutta, of Processions, Meetings and other Demonstrations—Ruled out of order	2365—69 and 2382—84	The Repealing and Amending Bill—Passed	2453—58
Declaration by H. E. the Governor General	2369	The Commercial Documents Evidence Bill—Circulated	2458—59
Election of the Standing Finance Committee	2369—70	Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Accounts of 1933-34	2459—93
The Payment of Wages (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	2370	THURSDAY, 1ST APRIL, 1937,—	
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	2370	Members Sworn	2511
The Indian Oaths (Amendment) Bill—Circulated	2370—91	Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Firing by Police at Panipat—Disallowed by the Governor General	2511—12
The Code of Civil Procedure (Third Amendment) Bill—Passed	2381—82 and 2384—85		
The Indian Red Cross Society (Amendment) Bill—Passed	2385—94		

PAGES.	PAGES.
THURSDAY, 1ST APRIL, 1937, — <i>contd.</i>	FRIDAY, 2ND APRIL, 1937, — <i>contd.</i>
The Indian Arms (Amendment) Bill—Motion to refer to Select Committee negatived	Message from the Council of State
2512—28	2573
The Moslem Personal Law (<i>Shariat</i>) Application Bill—Referred to Select Committee	Resolution re—
2528—44	Introduction of Homeopathic Treatment in Government Hospitals and Recognition of Homeopathic Colleges in India—Adopted
The Muslim Intestate Succession Bill—Circulated	2573—92
2544—46	India's withdrawal from the Membership of the League of Nations—Discussion not concluded
The Indian Subscriptions Bill—Discussion ruled out	2592—2605
2546—48	
The Control of Coastal Traffic Bill—Discussion on the motion to refer to Select Committee not concluded	SATURDAY, 3RD APRIL, 1937,—
2548—52	Questions and Answers
FRIDAY, 2ND APRIL, 1937,—	2629—33
Display of Flags or Emblems on the tables of Honourable Members within the Assembly Chamber	Motion for Adjournment
2553	2633
Member Sworn	The Insurance Bill—Appointment of Mr. J. A. Mackeown to the Select Committee in place of Mr. P. J. Griffiths
2553	2633
Questions and Answers	The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Passed
2553—58	2633—38
Short Notice Question and Answer	The Payment of Wages (Amendment) Bill—
2558—61	Passed as amended
Statements laid on the table	2638—62
2561—65	Resolution re—
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Arrest of Congress Leaders and Volunteers in Delhi—Adopted	Amendment of the Indian Legislative Rules—Postponed
2565—72	2662
and 2605—27	Payment of the Depreciation Reserve Fund from the Railway Revenues—Postponed
Election of Members to the Standing Advisory Committee for Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department	2663
2572—73	Report of the Public Accounts Committee
	2663—68

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 2nd April, 1937.

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

DISPLAY OF FLAGS OR EMBLEMS ON THE TABLES OF HONOURABLE MEMBERS WITHIN THE ASSEMBLY CHAMBER.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Leader of the House): Sir, I rise to a point of order. I see—as you will see, Sir,—certain emblems on the Benches opposite. I bring this matter to your notice with a view to your deciding whether they should be removed or not.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): With very great respect, Sir, I do not see any point of order. Any person is entitled here to come in any dress he likes and represent any emblem he likes; and if my Honourable friends on the other side are so highly offended, they will hear of it more at 4 o'clock.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): As regards dress, the Chair entirely agrees with the Leader of the Opposition and if Members stick anything on to their dress, the Chair would have no objection. But no flags should be placed on the table. (Members on the Congress Benches then put the flags on their persons). The Chair has nothing more to say.

MEMBER SWORN.

Mr. George Richard Frederick Tottenham, C.S.I., C.I.E., M.L.A. (Defence Secretary).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

RECRUITMENT OF DOMINION SUBJECTS FOR THE DEFENCE FORCES OF INDIA.

822. ***Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** (a) Will the Army Secretary state the exact nature of the information which recently appeared in the press regarding certain questions and answers in the Parliament relating to recruitment for the Defence Services in India?

(b) Are Government actually thinking of bringing Dominion troops, or Dominion subjects into the Defence Forces of India?

(c) If the reply to part (b) be in the negative, on what authority was it said in the British Parliament that Government were thinking of recruiting Dominion subjects for the Defence Forces of India?

(d) Are any Dominion subjects at present employed in the Defence Services of India? If so, how many, and in what capacity?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) I can add nothing to the press reports on the subject.

(b) No.

(c) It appears that a passing reference was made in a debate in the House of Commons to the purely hypothetical contingency that in certain circumstances it might be necessary for His Majesty's Government to form a Foreign Service Army, as distinct from a Home Service Army, a certain number of recruits for which might be obtained from the Dominions. There is no proposal to recruit Dominion subjects for the Defence Forces of India.

(d) A few Dominion subjects are probably serving as officers both in the Indian Army and in the British Army in India. I cannot give the exact numbers.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: May I know whether any Indian nationals are employed in any of the Dominions?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I would require notice of that.

ACCEPTANCE OF TENDERS FOR THE SUPPLY OF COAL TO STATE RAILWAYS.

823. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Do Government still adhere to the principle stated by the Honourable the Commerce Member in reply to starred question No. 1172 of Dr. P. N. Banerjea, on the 12th March, 1936, that in accepting the tenders for the supply of coal to State-managed Railways one of the considerations is "the distribution of the requirements over as many collieries as possible consistent with the quality of coal and economic prices in order to keep as many collieries working as possible during the current depressed state of trade?"

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state what are the present economic prices of different classes of Loco coal?

(c) Is it a fact that Government have this year allotted much less than the usual quantity to the collieries who quoted same rate? If so, why?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Yes.

(b) Economic price is dependent on quality and other factors and cannot be established for coal by classes.

(c) The answer to the first part is in the negative. The latter part does not arise.

GRADES OF COAL FIXED BY THE INDIAN COAL GRADING BOARD.

824. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state:

- (i) whether the Chief Mining Engineer, Railway Board, is the President of the Indian Coal Grading Board;
- (ii) whether the officials of the Chief Mining Engineer's Department take samples from different collieries for grading purposes; and
- (iii) whether the grades fixed by the Grading Board are accepted and adhered to by the Railway Board at the time of accepting the coal tenders; if not, why not?

(b) Will Government please state whether at the time of accepting the coal tenders the Railway Board make any distinction between graded and ungraded coals?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Information is being collected and will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

CHANGE IN GOVERNMENT'S POLICY REGARDING PURCHASE OF COAL.

825. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Do Government change their policy regarding their coal purchase from year to year? If so, is the same made known to the different coal trade organisations before the tenders are called for? If not, do Government propose to consider that the trade should know it beforehand?

(b) Is it the practice of the Railway Board to group together different collieries producing more or less same quality of coal for the purpose of determining the allotment?

(c) Is the grouping changed from year to year? Is it a fact that in such grouping, coals which were considered for years as inferior to some are apparently grouped with better quality of coal and allotted larger quantities?

(d) Are the Railway Board prepared in future to arrange to supply the different coal trade organisations, before the tender is called each year, the list of such grouping of collieries made by the Board at the time?

(e) Are Railway freight and tollage taken into consideration along with the rates tendered at the time of accepting coal tenders? If not, why not?

(f) Are the Railway Board prepared to issue instructions that simultaneously with the issue of letters of acceptances, a complete list of accepted tenders be furnished to the different trade organisations?

(g) Will Government state whether they consider Jote Dhemo and Jote Janaki class of coal as equal in quality in comparison with Jambad and Kajora quality coals?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Information is being collected and will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

COAL TO BE PURCHASED FOR THE EAST INDIAN AND EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAYS.

826. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what quantities of coal they propose to take from the Railway collieries for East Indian Railway and Eastern Bengal Railway, respectively, during the year 1937-38?

(b) What quantity did they allot for those Railways during 1936-37 from the Railway-owned collieries?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (b). The Eastern Bengal and East Indian Railways have been allotted 60,000 and 840,000 tons, respectively, of steam coal from railway collieries for 1936-37 and 1937-38.

EXPIRY OF LEASES OF *NAZUL* LANDS IN CERTAIN AREAS IN DELHI.

827. ***Seth Sheodass Daga:** (a) Are Government aware that the lease of certain *nazul* lands in Bhandani Mohalla, and other areas in Paharganj, Delhi, expired some years ago, i.e., in 1924—28?

(b) Are Government aware that since then the lessees have been requesting the authorities for the renewal of leases without avail?

(c) Will Government please state if any fresh allotment of land in that area to any individual or parties has been made since 1928?

(d) Will Government also please state if any leases for plots of land in the area were renewed at all during the period? If so, how?

(e) How many applications for renewal of leases from this area are still pending with the *Nazul* Office since 1930 and why?

(f) Besides other conditions attached to such lands, what rate of rents used to or is charged for these plots of lands before and after the renewals?

(g) Are Government aware that in the case of renewals, Government, like other landlords, have been slightly increasing the rate of rents to a maximum limit of cent. per cent.?

(h) What rate of increase in rents on renewals have Government been levying in the past?

(i) What rate of increase in rents they propose levying on the tenants whose applications are still pending and the leases have not yet been renewed?

(j) Are Government aware that it is proposed to increase the rent to the extent of four times the rent charged at present in the case of these old tenants also? If so, why and on what grounds is this going to be done?

(k) Will Government state how this increased rate of rent compares with those plots of land which are now being allotted by the *Nazul* Department, Delhi?

(l) What are the reasons for making distinction in the case of these old tenants only and charging them at such an abnormal rate?

(n) Do Government propose to see that all tenants are treated alike and charged only reasonable increase in the rents after renewals of their leases? If not, why not?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: Enquiries have been made and the result will be communicated to the House in due course.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THE CUSTOMS AUTHORITIES IN CUDDALORE.

828. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Are Government aware that during a religious festival on or about the 25th February, 1937, when several deities were taken to the sea and when thousands of persons were gathered there for worship and holy sea bath, in the seat at the Cuddalore New Town, the customs officials seized from the person of some of the people gathered there their wearing apparel, namely, *saries* and upper clothes, indiscriminately in spite of protest?

(b) Is it a fact that on or about the 10th March, 1937, the customs officials searched the Government Girls' Hindu Hostel, Government Girls' Christian Hostel and the residence of one Rukmani Ammal, music mistress in the Government Girls' School, Tirupappuliur?

(c) Is it a fact that the search in the Hostels took place between 8 P.M. and 8-30 P.M. and that an inventory was prepared of the articles seized at about 9 P.M.?

(d) Is it a fact that the matron and the girls residing in the hostels were practically kept imprisoned in the hostels with no one to assist them or tender advice to them? Will Government please lay on the table of the House a list of the articles thus seized?

(e) Is it a fact that the customs party left at 9 P.M. and again returned at about 10 P.M. and took statements from the girls residing in the hostel and this went on till late after midnight, that is, about 1-30 P.M.?

(f) Are Government aware that great inconvenience and mental worry and anxiety had been caused to the girls in the hostels by the action of the customs party?

(g) Under what provision of law did the customs authorities seize wearing apparel referred to in part (a) above?

(h) Is it a fact that the customs authorities in Cuddalore are seizing even vegetables and other perishable articles when they are brought into British territory from the French possessions?

(j) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of issuing instructions to the customs officials—

- (i) that persons carrying things for personal use and household consumption at a value not exceeding Rs. 15 should be allowed freely without being subject to customs duty; and
- (ii) that vegetables and other perishable articles should on no account be subject to any duty?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I am making enquiries into these matters.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know, Sir, whether we will be allowed to put supplementary questions later on?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): After the inquiries are made, if the Honourable Member wishes to find out anything more, he can.

REPRESENTATIONS TO THE UNION GOVERNMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA ABOUT THE ANTI-ASIATIC BILLS.

829. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the cable published in the *Hindu* from its Cape Town correspondent, dated the 16th March?

(b) Is it a fact that the Government of India did not make any representations to the Union Government about the Anti-Asiatic Bills pending before the South African Legislature?

(c) Did Government take any steps in the matter after the budget cut motion was passed on the 8th March, 1937, regarding Indians abroad? If not, why not?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). No. The Government of India informed the Union Government of their opinion and of the opinion of the people of this country towards the Bills, both before and after the debate on the 8th March, 1937.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know what the latest position is, with regard to these Bills which have been referred to a Select Committee by the South African Parliament?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: So far as we know, the Select Committee has not yet presented its report.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER.

PROTECTION OF THE LIVES AND PROPERTIES OF INDIANS IN ABYSSINIA.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: (a) Are Government aware that the business of British Indians in Abyssinia is ordered to be closed by the Italian Government, specially the firm of G. N. Muhammad Ali & Co., who have invested enormous sums in business and have stock in trade of a very large value in Abyssinia, is about to be confiscated by the Italian Government and also the lives of the proprietors of the firm are in great danger?

(b) What steps, if any, have Government taken to protect the lives and properties of the British Indians in Abyssinia?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: (a) The Government of India have received official information that the firm of Messrs. Muhammad Ali's at Addis Ababa and also their branches at Harrar, Dire Dawn and Jijiga received orders a short time ago from the Italian authorities that they must close their business immediately as the firm was being expelled from Ethiopia. Government have no information either as to the confiscation of the firm's property or as to the lives of the proprietors of the firm being in danger.

(b) His Majesty's Representative at Addis Ababa immediately reported the facts to His Majesty's Government and also asked the Italian authorities for more time to be given before these orders were carried out. His Majesty's Government at once instructed their Representative at Rome to enquire of the Italian Government the reason for this action. No further information has been received, but I am informing His Majesty's Government by telegram of the interest taken in the matter in India and am asking for further information.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: In case the Italian Government do not respond to the representation of the British Government, do Government propose to take retaliative measures against the Italian Government by stopping totally the import of Italian goods into this country and by expelling the Italians from this country and closing down all their firms and other business concerns in India?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: That, Sir, is a hypothetical question, which you have already disallowed.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Matra: May I know if the Italian Government has been given to understand that this order should be withdrawn?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: I have given all the information in my possession, and I am not in a position to add anything to it.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: I understood the Honourable Member to say that the Italian Government has been asked to give a little more time to give effect to this order. I wanted to know from the Honourable Member whether the fact that this order is illegal has been brought to the notice of the Italian Government and if they have been asked to rescind that order. Have the Government of India made any such request to the Italian Government?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: I have said that His Majesty's Government at once instructed their representative at Rome, that is, His Majesty's Ambassador at Rome, to inquire of the Italian Government the reason for this action. So far, we have not been informed of the result of that inquiry.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Sir, in view of the huge losses they have suffered, may I know whether they are making any attempts to get reparation for them from the Italian Government?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: I think that is a hypothetical question. In any case the Honourable Member does not explain whom he means by they as he has used that word two or three times.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: In view of the fact that this firm has suffered huge losses on account of its being expelled from Abyssinia, may I know whether any attempts are being made to get the firm reparations for the loss they have suffered?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: The stage has not yet been reached when we can ask for reparation. We do not know yet whether the order will be implemented or not.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Will the Honourable Member be pleased to send a copy of this short notice question together with the supplementaries and answers thereto to His Majesty's Government?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: I shall have no objection to doing that, but as I have said, I have already telegraphed yesterday to His Majesty's Government pointing out the great interest taken in this country and in this House in the question and asking for further information.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Is it a fact, Sir, that some members of this firm acted as British Consuls in such towns in which they were doing business?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: I understand that that is not a fact, although there was one room, I understand, in the firm's premises at one of their branches reserved for use as a court by the British Consul from Addis Ababa, but I understand that no member of the firm ever acted as British Consul.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: May I know, Sir, whether it is a fact or not that the Italian Government have ordered the closing down of the Indian firm?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: It is a fact, and I have already stated it.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: May I then ask whether the Government of India will take similar steps and order all the Italian firms in this country to close down?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: What exactly is the information which my friend desires? Is he asking for action?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Are the Government contemplating to take action only on that portion,—it is a fact and not a hypothetical question,—relating to retaliation and order that all Italian firms in India should be closed down?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: The Honourable Member is either asking for action, or he is asking me to disclose what the Government will do in certain circumstances.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Do the Government of India contemplate retaliative action and order all Italian firms in India to close down?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: They are certainly giving the matter further consideration. I cannot say more than that.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Will the Government of India pass a special Ordinance permitting us to retaliate ourselves?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: The Honourable Member is not asking for information. He is asking what the Government of India will do, and I am unable to answer that question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the reasons why the Government have not so far taken any action on the admitted fact of this firm having been closed, and what is the reason for the delay in taking some effective action in this country?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: Because they naturally wish to know what the effect of the diplomatic protest being made at Rome will be.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: How long do they propose to wait?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: Until they know the result of this protest.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Even if they take ten years?

Mr. Ramsay Scott: Will the Honourable Member let this House know the further information as soon as he receives it?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: Of course, I shall be very glad to do so. I have agreed to answer the short notice question merely in order that the House may be kept fully informed of the situation.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: If the Government fail to get a satisfactory reply . . .

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

Maulvi Syed Murtaza Sahib Bahadur: May I know if the Government have satisfied themselves that the lives and properties of Indians are not in danger in Abyssinia when Abyssinians are being butchered by Italians?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: They have no reason to suppose that the lives of Indians are in danger, and His Majesty's representative at Ethiopia is taking all possible steps to protect the interests of Indians.

Seth Govind Das: Is it not a sufficient reason, when Abyssinians themselves are being butchered by Italians, that the Government of India should consider that the lives of Indians over there are in danger?

Sir H. P. Mody: May I know whether this is the first case in which action has been taken against Indian traders by Italians, or whether similar action has been taken by them against other traders?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: I think this is the first case of any importance which we have heard of.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Do Government propose to despatch a contingent of British force in order to save the lives of British Indians there?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: I cannot say what the Government of India will do. I have said what action Government have taken so far, and I cannot add anything more to my answer at present.

STATEMENTS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 267 asked by Sardar Sant Singh on the 16th October, 1936.

TELEGRAPH MASTERS IN TELEGRAPH OFFICES.

- (a) Sanctioned number of Telegraph Masters in different Telegraph Offices in India for 1936-37 (including 11 temporary) 175
 Number of permanent Telegraph Masters 164
- (b) No, except in the case of the 11 temporary posts mentioned above.
- (c) On the occurrence of permanent vacancies, provided the officiating men are considered fit for permanent promotion.
- (d) The facts are not as stated by the Honourable Member.
- (e) and (h). Do not arise in view of the reply to parts (b) and (d).
- (f) Telegraph Office—

	Sanctioned No. of Telegraph Masters for 1936-37.	No. of officiating Telegraph Masters.
Calcutta	16	2
Bombay	32	2
Madras	8	..
Rangoon	12	1
Agra	9	..
Karachi	8	..

(g) The facts are not as stated by the Honourable Member. Leave salary is regulated according to certain specific rules. The officiating Telegraph Masters, like all other Government servants in superior service, draw leave salary in terms of average pay according to Fundamental Rule 87, if they are governed by the Fundamental Rules, or in terms of full pay or average salary according as the leave is privilege or furlough under the Civil Service Regulations.

Information promised in reply to part (a) of starred question No. 373 asked by Prof. N. G. Ranga on the 5th February, 1937.

PROVISION OF POSTAL, TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE FACILITIES IN RURAL AREAS.

Information by provinces is not available, but the number of post offices opened and the number of new letter boxes provided in rural areas in the different postal circles for the period from the 1st July, 1936, to the 31st December, 1936, is given below :

Postal Circle.	Number of post offices opened in rural areas during the period from 1st July, 1936 to 31st December, 1936.	Number of new letter-boxes placed in rural areas during the period from 1st July, 1936 to 31st December, 1936.
Central	64	72
Sind and Baluchistan	15	20
Punjab and North-West Frontier	45	732
Bihar and Orissa	19	86
Bombay	60	105
Bengal and Assam	53	117
United Provinces	16	182
Madras	43	182
Burma	19	41
Total	334	1,537

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 414 asked by Mr. F. E. James on the 23rd February, 1937.

DISREGARD OF THE RULES FOR THE SUPPLY OF ROAD DRESSING MATERIALS FOR MILITARY PURPOSES.

(a) Government have examined the case mentioned by the Honourable Member and cannot find that any rule has been disregarded.

(b) Does not arise.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 465 asked by Sardar Sant Singh on the 2nd March, 1937.

RECRUITMENT IN THE SORTERS' CADRE IN THE OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.

(a) (i) 66.

(ii) 41.

(iii) Yes.

(b) 18.

(c) Yes, a Sikh was at the top in the list. Only one Christian whose name was not in the list was appointed as he had been already earmarked for a sorter's post before the system of recruitment by the Selection Board was introduced.

(d) In view of the reply to part (c) above, the question does not arise.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 525 asked by Mr. Sri Prakasa on the 6th March, 1937.

PROPOSAL OF THE GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY TO REMOVE THE WIRE-FENCING OF THE RAILWAY LINES.

(a) and (b). The following policy in regard to the fencing of railway lines has been adopted on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway in the interests of economy and with due regard to its effect on the safety of human beings and cattle :

(i) Fencing alongside tracks carrying mail trains around station yards, alongside tracks in close proximity to villages or municipal areas, etc., and alongside tracks in other important sections and areas as well as at manned level crossings, is to be maintained.

(ii) Fencing in places other than those detailed above is considered as surplus, but will be allowed to remain in position until such time as it is required to repair existing fencing belonging to the categories detailed in paragraph (i) above, when it will be removed and utilised accordingly.

(c) Government have no reason to believe that this policy will result in any danger to the lives of human beings or cattle. In this connection attention is invited to the statement explaining the views of Government on fencing which was laid on the table of the House on the 2nd September, 1929.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 602 asked by Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal on the 9th March, 1937.

DISABILITY PENSION OF MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

(a) Yes, provided that the circumstances of the case warrant such a treatment.

(b) The Government of India are empowered to withhold, in individual cases, the grant, in full or in part, of service, disability or family pensions, children's allowances or gratuities, or arrears thereof, where exceptional reasons exist for withholding such grant, *vide* paragraph 202-A, Pension Regulations for the Army in India.

Incidentally I may point out for the information of the Honourable Member that strictly from the legal point of view all pensions are in the nature of a bounty of the Crown to which no body has any legal claim.

(c) The reply to the first part of the question is that Government Regulations do not provide for grants for the purpose of paying debts, meeting marriage expenses, etc. The Indian Soldiers Board, a quasi-Government body, have however at their disposal certain private funds from which grants are made in special cases to ex-soldiers or their dependants for the purposes mentioned by the Honourable Member. Before such awards are made, enquiries are made and every care is taken to ascertain that the case is really a deserving one.

The reply to the second part is that each case is considered on its merits.

(d) As explained above, each case of this nature will be considered on its merits.

(e) The outstanding amount may be paid to a non-eligible heir at the discretion of the Government of India.

(f) India Army Order No. 24 of 1927 has since been superseded by India Army Order No. 440 of 1936, under which the transfer of family pension from one relative to another is not permitted. Such transfers are, however, allowed purely as an act of grace in exceptionally hard cases.

As regards the date of the grant of pension, I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave on the 8th October, 1936, to his unstarred question No. 152 on the same subject.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 622 asked by Bhai Parmanand on the 13th March, 1937.

COMMUNAL PERCENTAGE FIXED FOR SERVICE IN THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
AJMER-MERWARA.

The communal percentage fixed for service in the Education Department of Ajmer-Merwara is as follows :

Hindus 60 per cent.

Muslims 20 per cent.

Others 20 per cent.

The present percentage of Hindu and Muslim clerks is 57.14 and 21.43, respectively.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 660 asked by Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal on the 13th March, 1937.

DISABILITY PENSION OF MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE
GREAT WAR.

(a) The Honourable Member's unstarred question No. 152 of 8th October, 1936, did not mention any particular cases. Unless, therefore, he furnishes me with details of the claims to which he now refers, it is not possible for me to supply the required information.

(b) No.

(c) Government have no information regarding the statements made in the question. I would, however, point out that Government do not recognise any pension claiming agencies or correspondents unless claims are submitted through the recognised official channels prescribed in Appendix VII to the Regulations for the Army in India.

(d) All payments are made direct to the individuals concerned. Government are therefore unable to furnish the information required.

(e) No.

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 673 asked by Mr. Sham Lal on the 15th March, 1937.

ABSENCE OF LIGHTS ON THE ROAD ON THE RIDGE LEADING TO THE ANTI-
RABIC CENTRE IN DELHI.

(a) and (b). Of the roads leading to the Anti-Rabic Centre at Delhi which is situated in the Hindu Rao Hospital on the Ridge, the Hindu Rao Road, which is the steepest, is lighted. The ridge road is not lighted as it is very little used at night.

(c) The number of persons visiting the Anti-Rabic Centre for treatment at night is very small.

(d) It is the case that a considerable proportion of the cases treated come from the Delhi Province.

Information promised in reply to parts (b) and (c) of starred question No. 714 asked by Seth Govind Das on the 20th March, 1937.

INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF PAPER MANUFACTURED IN INDIA.

(b) The number of paper mills with rupee capital actually operating is in British India eight and in the Travancore State one. Of these four mills in British India are under European management and the rest appear to be under Indian management. No further information is available.

(c) Since the grant of protection to the paper industry, nine Joint Stock Companies have been registered with the object of manufacturing paper, board, and pulp, etc., eight in British India and one in the Mysore State. All of them have rupee capital and are under Indian management. Of the nine Companies so registered only one appears to be at present in actual operation.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

ARREST OF CONGRESS LEADERS AND VOLUNTEERS IN DELHI.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Motion for Adjournment. I have received a notice of motion for adjournment from Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar to this effect. He proposes to make a motion for the adjournment of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the arrest of local Congress leaders and volunteers at Delhi yesterday in connection with the *hartal* proclaimed by the Congress. I should like to know from the Honourable Member what are his reasons.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, in view of the fact that there is another motion of the same kind in the name of my friend, Mr. Asaf Ali, which he proposes to move, I wish to withdraw the motion standing in my name.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then the Honourable Member withdraws his motion.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Yes, Sir.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then, the next motion stands in the name of Mr. Asaf Ali. He proposes to move a motion for the adjournment of the House today to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the indiscriminate *lathi* charge on the public and the arrest of local Congress leaders and volunteers in Delhi yesterday in connection with the *hartal* proclaimed by the Congress against the introduction of the New Constitution. I should like to know if there is any objection.

Mr. J. A. Thorne (Government of India: Nominated Official): Sir, in the unavoidable absence of the Honourable the Home Member

Some Honourable Members: Louder please: we can't hear you.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: I shall try to make myself audible. In the unavoidable absence of the Honourable the Home Member, I have objections to raise. The first objection, Sir, is one which, if you accept it, will make it unnecessary for me to adduce other objections which, in our opinion, are available to the Government. I must crave your indulgence and the indulgence of the House being an inexperienced Member of this House and also having this sprung on me rather at the last moment. I gave Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar the credit for intending to move his motion which we received yesterday

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal: Landholders): On a point of order, Sir. Are we discussing the motion of Mr. Chettiar or of Mr. Asaf Ali?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There is no point of order.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: I understand that he has withdrawn the first motion. I do not know whether he has also withdrawn his second motion or whether that. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): We will deal with it later.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: This motion refers to the alleged misbehaviour of certain officials of the Delhi Police Force generally, and in particular to three incidents, or rather only one particular incident and two other allegations, which are no doubt connected with the demonstration and the action taken to counter that demonstration yesterday. Now, Sir, in a sense, I think, it can be held that everything relevant to the discussion of this motion, whether in favour of the motion or in opposition to the motion, cannot help having some bearing on a matter which is under adjudication in a court of law.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What is the matter under adjudication?

Mr. J. A. Thorne: My information, Sir, is that cases are proceeding against sixteen persons, five of whom are charged with an offence committed at a certain mill, five others of whom are charged with an offence committed at another mill, five more with an offence committed elsewhere in the city and one individual for another offence committed elsewhere in the city. All these persons were arrested for acts committed in the course of yesterday's demonstration. I do not know what precise stage these cases have reached, but I am certain that they are all under adjudication in a court of law. Charges have been filed, in some cases proceedings have actually begun, and in all the cases the Magistrate or Magistrates have taken cognisance of the cases. It is, Sir, I submit, impossible to discuss generally "the misbehaviour of certain officials of the Delhi Police Force" or "other acts of grave provocation calculated to disturb a peaceful demonstration by the citizens of Delhi", without, either on that side or on this, making some statements, some allegations or some suggestions which will prejudice the hearing of the cases now pending. That is my general objection on this point, but in particular I invite attention to "rough handling a respectable Congress woman by two European Policemen". My Honourable friend will perhaps agree with me that the lady referred to is one of the persons against whom proceedings have started. (After a pause). My Honourable friend is not conceding anything.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali (Delhi: General): I want to hear the whole of what my Honourable friend has to say.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: I have a newspaper account to go on, and according to it—owing to the absence of other newspapers I have only one newspaper account,—this lady is Miss or Mrs. Satyavati who complained, when she was brought into Court yesterday, that she was roughly handled by police officers. I am, therefore, I think, entitled. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is there any charge against her?

Mr. J. A. Thorne: Yes. She is charged with an offence under section 7 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act (XXIII of 1932), along with four other persons; the short title of the section is "Molesting a person to prejudice of employment or business". The Court has taken cognisance of that, and in fact, according to the newspaper account, the allegation of mishandling by the police was actually made by this lady before the Magistrate. I submit to you in the absence of contradiction. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is there any complaint by her?

Mr. J. A. Thorne: That I cannot say. She has, however, made a representation to the Magistrate, and I understand from the newspaper report that the lady desired that some enquiry should be made into that allegation. But my point is this. The rough handling is supposed to have occurred in the course of her arrest, in other words, a charge made by the police of illegal behaviour on her part is countered by a charge made by her of improper behaviour by the police. I think, therefore, that it is quite impossible to discuss that particular case without prejudice to the proceedings in the Magistrate's Court. That is my first point, and on that I submit that it will be legitimate to hold that, sixteen persons having been arrested for four different offences committed in the city in the course of yesterday's happenings and one of these persons being a person particularly referred to in a part of this motion, the subject matter of this motion is under adjudication in a court of law.

My second objection is that this is not a matter of public importance. (*Cries of "Oh" from the Congress Party Benches.*) It is unnecessary to go into that if my first submission is accepted. If I have your permission to develop that later on, I would ask you to give your ruling.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member has any other objection to take, I think he had better do so now.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: Well, Sir, as I have said, I am handicapped by the absence of what we ordinarily depend on for, at any rate, some of our facts, and that is, newspaper reports.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Will the Honourable Member be able to furnish further facts later on? In that case I shall take the motion later.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: May I refer to the facts as far as they have come to our notice?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member wants to have time to get more facts, I shall have no objection.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: I am quite prepared to put forward what I have to say as regards this matter, not being of public importance now.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That, of course, the Honourable Member can deal with now.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: But to do that, I have to try and indicate to you

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): On a point of order, Sir. If it is desired that he should have more time, then it must be asked for. If he does not desire it, the matter must be decided on the information now before us.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I thought he said that he was handicapped because he had not enough facts and wanted to get more facts. I asked him if he wanted further time for that purpose. Now I understand he wants to argue the question whether the matter is one of public importance.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: On the statements in the notice.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: I was merely saying that I was in the first instance handicapped in forming an opinion as to whether the matter is of urgent public importance, by the absence of newspapers. However, from the *Statesman's* account, it is impossible to read it without forming the impression and coming to the conclusion that, on the whole, yesterday's proceedings passed off with singular peacefulness and, I might almost say, general amity. If I may say so, I think all parties concerned are much to be congratulated on that; and in particular I would like to pay a tribute to the appeals made by Honourable gentlemen opposite for a peaceful atmosphere. The only mention of any occurrence of any incident in the *Statesman* account is this:

"A minor incident, which created temporary confusion, occurred when the procession was passing Chandni Chowk. A mounted policeman's horse shied at the crowd and charged into the line of the procession which was disturbed. The horse, however, was soon controlled and order was restored."

Now, that is the newspaper account. I have here the telegrams of the Associated Press, which I have not succeeded in finding in the *Statesman*.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member really wants time, I will give him time.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: I think I can show that there is nothing in yesterday's happenings which can be held to . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then the Honourable Member does not want time.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: It is impossible to read the Associated Press report without coming to the conclusion that everything went off on the whole with extraordinary peacefulness. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Has the Honourable Member got in his possession any other account, apart from the Press account. Press accounts are apt to vary at times.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: I am giving everything to my Honourable friends opposite, because I do not want . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): My point was that accounts in the papers are sometimes liable to vary according to the point of view of the observers and that is why I suggested that if the Honourable Member wants time I am willing to give him time.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: I was not proposing to burke that in the least. I have the report from the Chief Commissioner and I have been in communication with the Chief Commissioner this morning and to put it in a nutshell all the information at the disposal of the Chief Commissioner is to the effect that the impression produced on any one by the newspaper report and all these telegrams is entirely correct, that apart from a few sporadic incidents which led to arrest in a few cases, the demonstration yesterday went off with great peacefulness. There were no acts of grave provocation calculated to disturb the public peace. There was no misbehaviour of officials generally and in fact the day was one of general placidity. That, Sir, is my objection. If that is so, it is impossible to hold that a matter of urgent public importance has arisen, which is entitled to be discussed in this august Assembly. If I may refer again to these telegrams, I would say that all that can be found is only mention of a few minor incidents.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): This refers only to Delhi?

Mr. J. A. Thorne: Yes.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then I do not know what telegrams the Honourable Member is referring to.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: These are the telegrams of the Associated Press and the United Press and those telegrams will, to any impartial observer, bear out the impression obtained by the Chief Commissioner and his officers, that things went off very peacefully and that there were no serious incidents of any kind and, therefore, I submit that there was nothing which can support the view that a matter has arisen of urgent public importance within the meaning of the Legislative Rules.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): At this stage, I want to know what was the misbehaviour of the officials? There are three or four charges.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Yes, I will take them one by one—first, the rough handling of a respectable Congress woman, second, deliberately insulting the national flag. I will also give you details of the acts of grave provocation referred to in item (c).

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I want to know what was the misbehaviour of the officials under these three heads.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: Taking the statement of the Honourable the objector in this matter, it is rather difficult, if he would not take any offence at my saying so, to understand what he said. I do not mean any offence but it is a fact that he has failed to convey to this House what his objection was in fact, except using two words which occur and which are common place objections in matters of this kind. First, that this matter is *sub judice* and that therefore these three items could not be discussed, second, that none of these matters is a matter of urgent public importance. Taking them in that order, so far as he stated anything here at all, the reference to the matter which is *sub judice* may be in some manner connected not as a matter of law, but as a mere matter of events with item (a) which is the subject of this motion—the rough handling of a respectable Congress worker. He must be aware . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is it a fact that she has been arrested?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: It is a fact that she has been arrested and it is equally a fact . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Has she lodged any complaint?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: I am reading from the very newspaper to which Mr. Thorne referred. So far as this particular objection or complaint of hers is concerned, the Magistrate himself has observed that it is a matter which has nothing to do with the matter which he is deciding and, therefore, declined to deal with it and expressed inability to deal with it and in fact said that it was up to her, if any report was given to him or otherwise, to directly send it on to the proper authorities, so that on the very statement of the man before whom this matter is *sub judice*, it is perfectly obvious that all that Mr. Thorne said is utterly irrelevant. The fact remains that a person may be arrested. . . . (Mr. Thorne rose in his seat) I refuse to give way. I am dealing with the materials which he has himself mentioned. What I am submitting is this: that so far as Satyavati was taken to the court and put up before the Magistrate the matter is not being discussed before this House at all. It was never our intention. It does not form part of the motion. Secondly, it is equally clear that a person may be lawfully arrested and yet during the course of those events another series of events may occur which are not *sub judice* on the very finding of the magistrate himself, who refused to take cognisance of it. She made no judicial complaint in the sense of a complaint before criminal court, of an assault, which might have been the subject of a complaint, had she been so advised. But today, as the facts stand, the manner of her arrest and the circumstances attendant upon it are not the subject of any judicial inquiry of any kind or of a complaint before any judicial authority.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): She made no complaint?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: She made no complaint; all she said to the magistrate was: "this is what happened", that notwithstanding her remonstrances to the two European police constables that she was willing to be arrested if there was any charge against her, they insisted upon putting their hands (both of them) on each of her shoulders and touching her body when she was quite willing as a peaceful citizen to submit to any arrest. (*Cries of "Shame, shame."*)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): She made no complaint?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: She made no complaint, but she does not wish to make a complaint. A person may wish to suffer insult by another. It is no ground, therefore, for saying, "why don't you come and complain before a Criminal Court"—it is no ground for saying that the incident—assuming it is true, and the contrary is not stated by Mr. Thorne notwithstanding the report he has in his possession—cannot be raised. Sir, the most singular part of Mr. Thorne's statement is that he has not denied the facts under items (a) and (b). Of course they will be further discussed. He has not denied, for instance, that there was a deliberate insult to the Indian national flag—an instance of which he must have been aware.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What was the nature of the insult?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: The police arrived there in the presence of Mr. Scott, the Superintendent of Police, and in his presence (without my saying anything more for the moment), from the motor car which was there standing, a police constable took off the national flag, put it under his feet, and tore it up (*Cries of Shame, shame*), and further mutilation of it took place, which will be detailed to this House. Sir, Honourable Members opposite may understand what it means to pay respect to their own national flag, so that as regards what the details are, it is unnecessary to detain the House for the moment. The fact remains, and this fact is not denied: and if there was nothing else in this motion, this alone is sufficient. Now we can understand the point of order that was raised by the acting Leader of the House, and I was amazed that an honourable Englishman should have allowed himself to raise such an objection. Sir, for their own national flag they have died in their hundreds of thousands and millions, and rightly,—for that is patriotism. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The objection taken was that there was to be no display of flags or emblems on the table of Honourable Members within the Chamber.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: I think he might have easily appreciated that there are technical objections which can be taken, but the rules of decency and courtesy require that you may waive them,—so that I am not objecting to these, I am merely answering some of the points, and along with others of my colleagues I put the flag on my person,—which may, at least some day, answer some day to a challenge to its protection and honour (Loud Applause). As regards the first point, the only incident to which I wish now to refer is the conduct of the two police officials in this centrally administered area during the course of the arrest of Shrimati Satyavati;

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

har conduct in so far as the Delhi workmen are concerned, or the conduct of others concerned otherwise, would not be in the remotest way referred to. So far as the deliberate insult to the national flag is concerned, it may even be a matter of opinion but the facts being what I have already stated, that is an incident by itself and we do wish to express our opinion before the House, to the extent to which the House feels that it is a matter of public importance: I do not think even Mr. Thorne ventured to suggest, so far as the insult to the national flag was concerned, that it was a matter not of public importance.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There is another item (c).

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: As to (c), I ask your leave to allowing Mr. Asaf Ali, who was present and saw what happened with regard to the incident covered by item (b), and who was personally present at the time when this outrage to the national flag was carried out, to say. . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is stated that other acts were also committed?

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: I am only answering two points,—the point regarding it being *sub judice* and (b), as to which, the facts are not denied, and I submit it requires some courage for an Englishman to come here and say that if a national flag is trampled under foot by a policeman that it is not a matter of urgent public importance to be discussed by this House.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I hold this motion in order, but objection has been taken, I should like to know how many Honourable Members there are who are in favour of permission being granted to taking the motion for adjournment up. Will Honourable Members, who are in favour of this permission being granted, rise in their places? (Several Honourable Members then rose to their feet.) As there are more than twenty-five Honourable Members in support of the motion being taken up, this will come on. As regards the time, I understand that the Honourable the Home Member is not in Delhi today, and, if the Opposition have no objection, it might be taken up tomorrow. . .

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Sir, we have no objection to it being taken up today.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Very well, it will be taken up at 4 o'clock this afternoon. I may say this that the matter that is going to be discussed as regards item (a) is rough handling. Nothing should be said or alleged which would bear upon the case which now is *sub judice*.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE STANDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have to inform the Assembly that upto 12 Noon on Thursday, the 1st April, 1937, the time fixed for receiving nominations for the Standing Advisory Committee for

the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department, only three nominations have been received. As the number of candidates is equal to the number of vacancies, I declare Mr. J. Ramsay Scott, Pandit Krishna Kant Malaviya and Raizada Hansraj to be duly elected.

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

Secretary of the Assembly: Sir, the following Message has been received from the Council of State:

"Sir, I am directed to inform you that the Council of State has at its meeting held on the 1st April, 1937, agreed without any amendment to the Bill further to amend the Indian Army Act, 1911, for a certain purpose, which was passed by the Legislative Assembly at its meeting held on the 4th March, 1937."

RESOLUTION RE INTRODUCTION OF HOMOEOPATHIC TREATMENT IN GOVERNMENT HOSPITALS AND RECOGNITION OF HOMOEOPATHIC COLLEGES IN INDIA.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin (Punjab: Landholders): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to introduce homoeopathic treatment in Government hospitals and give homoeopathic colleges in India the same status and recognition as in the case of allopathic colleges."

Sir, this science of homoeopathic treatment was first invented in Germany by a man called Dr. Hahnemann, who was a royal physician in Germany and was a scholar of a many languages. This person was also a scientist of great eminence. The system is based on the principle of *similia similibus curantur*, that is to say, that "like cures like". For instance, if some medicine or drug is administered to a healthy person and it produces certain symptoms, the same medicine or drug, if given to a sick person, will cure those symptoms. After some time, Sir, this system of treatment achieved some popularity in most parts of Europe, and it was introduced into India by a gentleman—I do not know if I am pronouncing his name rightly—called Dr. Fabre Tonnerre. This system received the patronage of high officials like General Sir John Litter, who was Deputy Governor of Bengal, and other distinguished personages. It rapidly acquired popularity and among its patrons in India there are persons like Mahatma Gandhi, Dr. Tagore, Sir J. C. Bose, Sir P. C. Roy and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. In other countries there are also hospitals working under this system of medicine and they are patronised by eminent scientists and also other notables. For instance, the patronage of the Royal family is enjoyed by the Homoeopathic School in London and also an eminent homoeopath was appointed personal physician to His Majesty, King Edward VIII. Sir, it is not for me to say much about the relative values of the two systems of treatment because, not being a scientist myself, it is not safe for me to wander into these regions. All I can say is that these two systems are working side by side in other countries and the homoeopathic system is being worked with great success in these countries.

The chief features of the system are; firstly the cheapness of its medicines. Ours is a poor country and in order to supply medicines to the

[Mr. M. Ghiasuddin.]

vast population, we require medicines which can be had cheap. As under this system we can have medicines very cheap, it can be recommended to the Government to be introduced. Then, there are good many diseases which this system can cure better than the allopathy, so is claimed by homœopathic doctors. This system is especially useful in epidemics, like cholera, etc. Another thing in favour of this system is that it does not require surgery to the same extent as the allopathy does. Good many diseases can be cured just by giving medicines for which there are no medicines in the allopathic system, such as, appendicitis, etc. Good many scientists, both in this country and abroad, who were practising allopathy started this system instead and among their names can be mentioned that of Dr. Beir and Dr. Mohindra Lal Sircar, who were both eminent doctors and surgeons.

Now, Sir, one more plea that I am going to make on behalf of the homœopathic system is this. Already in this country there are four systems for curing diseases working side by side. There is the allopathy and the homœopathy which, although not officially recognised, is making quite a good progress. Then there is the Unani system and the Vedic system. If this system is given the patronage of the Government and is duly recognised, all these sciences can pool their resources together and some new system can be evolved which will ameliorate the conditions of the suffering humanity. I admit the fact that I am making this request rather late in the day. The provincial autonomy has come in and the Central Government have been shorn of good many of their previous powers. Still, I do hope that they will show some sympathy to this demand and will at least use their moral influence on the Provincial Governments by doing something here for the sake of this science, which will be a good example to the self-governing provinces. There is a genuine public demand for this system to be introduced. Since yesterday I have received shoals of telegrams and all sorts of literature which I have not been able to read. That shows that there is a genuine demand and I hope the Government will be sympathetic towards it.

Sir, I move.

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

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to introduce homœopathic treatment in Government hospitals and give homœopathic colleges in India the same status and recognition as in the case of allopathic colleges."

Dr. R. D. Dalal (Nominated Non-Official): Mr. President, I warmly appreciate the good intentions of my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghiasuddin, in moving this Resolution, and with your permission I propose to address to this Honourable House a few remarks on the subject of the Resolution. In the first place, let me explain very briefly what homœopathy is. Homœopathy was introduced in 1796 by a German physician by name Samuel Hahnemann, a native of Meissen in Germany. Hahnemann was born at Meissen in 1755, and he died in Paris in 1843. Hahnemann received his medical education in Leipzig and Vienna. After finishing his medical education, he started private practice at Leipzig. Very soon Hahnemann was very much struck by the fact that symptoms produced by drugs, such as quinine, in healthy individuals were similar to those of the diseases which they were administered to cure. Hahnemann further found that drugs in much smaller doses than were generally employed effectively exercised their curative action. These are the essential

tenents of the system; and this system Hahnemann called Homœopathy. But at Leipzig, the members of the medical profession were hostile to the system, and they viewed it with much mistrust—in fact, homœopathy was absolutely denied by the members of the medical profession generally, what is more, even the members of the homœopathic school were divided into factions. So, Hahnemann was forced to leave Leipzig and to go to France. He settled in Paris, where he died in 1843. At the present day homœopathy has comparatively speaking very few practitioners, and very few homœopathic institutions have been founded. Sir, every institution that seeks or professes to alleviate human suffering deserves the sympathy of every right-thinking person. But Great Britain and other countries of Europe, America, Australia, Africa, Egypt, Japan and China are all agreed on a common system of scientific medical education, and in all countries it is quite competent for a registered medical practitioner to make use of any reasonable form of treatment—homœopathy, hydropathy or hypnotism which he thinks will be beneficial to his patient. Sir, I am the pioneer of red cross travelling system of medical relief in India; and while the Honourable the Mover desires the introduction of homœopathic treatment in Government hospitals, I would suggest that as a beginning, every tahsil and taluqa should have a travelling dispensary in charge of a qualified medical man trained in western medical science. The observations and clinical experience of medical men trained in western medicine, which has stood the test of centuries, are of immense benefit to the masses in this country. Western medicine has been adopted and practised with considerable success in the remotest corners of the world.

Sir, if a man is a qualified doctor, there are his qualifications to secure his registration; but in the present state of affairs how are the homœopaths without any definite standard of education to be registered? The illiterate and ignorant would suffer considerably in consequence of any one setting up as a practitioner of homœopathy. Sir, the expense of introducing homœopathic treatment in Government hospitals and establishing homœopathic colleges would be enormous, and the funds at the disposal of the Local Governments are very strictly limited. Sir, I fear that this Resolution interferes with the powers of the Provincial Legislatures. Provincial Autonomy has just been inaugurated, and I am sure that this question would be strongly resented by the Provincial Legislatures and would be considered as interfering unnecessarily with their powers. This subject is a matter entirely for provincial Ministers. We should leave it to the provincial Ministers; they will do what is right and what is demanded by the people of the different Provinces. I am quite confident that interference in provincial matters is the last thing which this Honourable House wishes to countenance. Sir, I think the best course for my Honourable friend, the Mover, would be to enlist the sympathy and assistance of his friends in the different Provincial Legislatures; and I hope that the Honourable the Mover will be induced to withdraw the Resolution, and to leave this matter to the Local Governments to do as they think best in the interests of the masses committed to their care.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I give my whole-hearted support to this Resolution. After hearing my Honourable friend, Dr. Dalal, I thought that he was giving his blessing to this system of homœopathy and I thought, expert as he is, his word will be considered as a very weighty one. But, Sir, I am sorry that he whittled down all his sympathy and his enthusiasm when he said that the Government cannot

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

do anything. It is the Local Government that should take care of this business. But what is asked for in the Resolution, put in the words of the Mover, is that he wants sympathy, moral sympathy and also some way of procedure that may be laid down by the Central Government. Even under the present constitution there are certain provinces which are centrally administered areas which lie within the power of the Central Government. I submit it cannot be said that the Central Government have nothing to do with this business in the centrally administered areas. The Government can certainly lay down procedure and precedent for other Governments to follow.

Sir, I need not take much time of the House. The marvellous attainments of this science of healing needs no introduction at the present time when it is universally accepted as the most economical and efficient mode of treatment for the human ills and which is sure to prove a boon to the suffering millions of this country. This scientific system is recognised by almost all the civilised countries of the world which include America, Germany, France and Russia. In Great Britain also we find that the homœopathic physicians are being given the same rights and privileges as their colleagues of the other system. The London Homœopathic College and Hospital enjoys the proud patronage of the Royal family. It would be recognised that the history of this homœopathy coming into India was this. A homœopathic hospital was started in Calcutta by Dr. C. Fabre Tonnerre, M.D., a French homœopath, under the patronage of Lieut.-General Sir John H. Litter, J.C.B., the then Lieutenant Governor of Bengal and Sir Henry Maine, the great jurist and a Member of the then Council of the Governor General. Since then this natural law of cure has widened its boundaries over the length and breadth of this country. Today, we find that notable men, like Dr. Rabindranath Tagore, are among its supporters. He says:

"I have long been an ardent believer in the science of homœopathy and I feel happy that it has got now a greater hold in India than even in the land of its origin. It is not merely a collection of a few medicines but a real science with a rational philosophy as its base. We require more scientific interest and inquiry into the matter with special stress upon the Indian environments."

Nothing can be a better certificate than this. It is also a fact that so many eminent physicians, who, having practised allopathy for a considerable number of years and that also successfully, have given up their lucrative practice and embraced homœopathy. Dr. Bair, the world renowned surgeon, late Dr. Mahindra Lal Sircar, M.D., C.I.E., founder of the all India Science Institute, and others.

Sir, the poverty of this vast country is proverbial and a treatment which effects great economy in the matter of saving of life, time and money can only come to its rescue. I am told the Calcutta Corporation is doing immense service to its citizens by giving financial aid to the Calcutta Homœopathic Medical College Hospital which is being managed by the Calcutta Homœopathic Hospital Society. What is asked for in this Resolution is a very modest demand, namely, that steps should be taken to introduce homœopathic treatment in Government hospitals, and to give homœopathic colleges in India the same status and recognition as in the case of allopathic colleges. I hope the House will be unanimous in accepting this Resolution.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Before the discussion proceeds any further the Chair would like to mention that Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena sent to the Chair today an amendment which he wanted to move. In the first place, he ought to have sent any amendment, that he had in mind, to the office officially; secondly, he is too late; and, thirdly, he did not even get up to say that he wanted to move an amendment.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra (Presidency Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, I rise to say a few words in support of this Resolution which is an absolutely harmless one and a very modest one. We have been much too frequently engaged in warfare between this side and that and it is very seldom that an occasion arises here when we can think of devising some means of introducing the healing art. Today's Resolution comes to us as a bathos for we were to move the Constituent Assembly Resolution and from the Constituent Assembly we have climbed down to homœopathy. Be that as it may, I now ask the House to seriously consider the question whether the Government of this country should any longer continue in their attitude not only of apathy towards this system of treatment but also of active antipathy to it.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): No, no.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: My Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, says, "No". Perhaps my Honourable friend does not know that this Government have issued a notification in which they absolutely prohibit all Government servants from taking part in homœopathic practice.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: He cannot be a Government servant and a homœopath at the same time.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: I see no anomaly in it, but the circular says that whoever being in Government service practises homœopathy for profit or gratis will be amenable to certain pains and penalties. But why should private practice for charitable purposes be banned?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Because he is a whole-time servant of Government, and he cannot serve elsewhere.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: I do not understand what my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, means. Is a Government servant debarred from doing any acts of charity? I am, however, referring to this notification of Government to show that far from rendering any assistance to homœopathy, the Government have adopted measures which go directly against the growth and stabilisation of this system of practice in this country. I do not know much about medicine and materia medica of the science, but I know that this has been a system of treatment which has found favour in this country. And speaking from my personal experience of my own province of Bengal, I can say that this system has made enormous strides during the last 50 years. It is indeed a fact that the first homœopathic college was established in Calcutta, and today we find clusters of well-equipped homœopathic colleges growing in different parts of Calcutta and outside wherein students are taught this science with

[Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra.]

Anatomy and Physiology, etc. Sir, it is a well-known fact in Bengal that in Calcutta homœopathic practitioners command very large and lucrative practice, and in fact their practice is in no way inferior to that of the greatest allopaths of the city. Sir, mention has been made by an Honourable Member of Dr. Mahendra Lal Sircar. Is it realised what his adoption of homœopathy meant? He was in those days one of the most outstanding personalities of India, one of the greatest medical luminaries, and he was the founder of the Indian Institute for the cultivation of science in India. Dr. Mahendra Lal Sircar when he took to homœopathy firmly believed in it and went on practising it and abjured allopathy altogether. It is gratifying to find that some of the most authoritative books on homœopathy written by foreign experts frequently make appreciative references to him. This homœopathy is something which was not unknown in this country. There was in ancient India something similar to this system of treatment and its underlying principle *similia similibus curantur* has also its parallel in Sanskrit: a mild and humane system of treatment akin to homœopathy was in vogue in India at the time of King Asoka. When this great king embraced Buddhism he wanted to introduce a system of healing art which would eliminate the necessity of operative surgery and the violent form of treatment which the Ayurvedic system then meant. And a kind of homœopathy in this country arose in that way. It might seem fantastic and raise smiles here and there, but the fact remains that homœopathic principles were known in this country, and that is the reason why in this country the homœopathic system of treatment found great favour and even greater favour and popularity than the land of its birth; and homœopathic practitioners are now carrying on their trade with considerable success. If Government had turned on the scene and regulated the growth and development and the cultivation of this noble science, probably we would not have seen the pitfalls and defects and many other ugly features which disfigure its practice today. We see today legions of quacks growing up here and there with a box of a dozen or so of homœopathic medicines and setting themselves up as practitioners. That is because Government have not done anything to help its growth and expansion on healthy and salutary lines and they have not been able to control the situation. Sir, it seems that Government also in some of their activities accept, occasionally, the principle of *similia similibus curantur*, (like cures like). Whenever there is an isolated act of terrorism by a misguided youth, Government turn round and meet it by an intensified form of organised terrorism with the help of their military and police! So they are following that! They are also turning this country, whenever convenient, into a vast laboratory in which they carry on all manner of experiments. Let them make one more experiment and that with homœopathy in this country.

I think, Sir, it is time for Government to seriously address themselves to it, to giving it recognition and encouragement. Sir, homœopathy is eminently suitable for the climatic and economic conditions of this country; and I hope that a measure like this which does not call upon Government to make any very great sacrifices, pecuniary or otherwise, will receive at least that amount of recognition which has long been its due. I can sympathise with my friends the allopaths who fear that in the event of its recognition by the Government they will have formidable rivals to

grapple with. (*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney*: "Question") I have every sympathy with them, but I believe that every form of the healing art, whether homœopathic or ayurvedic or unani, when it seeks to alleviate the pain and sufferings of humanity, should have the encouragement, sympathy and support of every section of mankind. Sir, I support this Resolution.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I have one or two difficulties in connection with this Resolution. The first is this: everybody knows that the strength of a homœopathic medicine technically called potency increases with the amount of adulteration with water. If you take one part of medicine and mix it with 100 parts of water, the potency is supposed to have increased to 100, not diminished to 1/100th; and if this 1/100th part is again diluted with 100 parts of water, the potency becomes 10,000 and the strength of the medicine is supposed to have increased 10,000 times. If you go on diminishing the actual quantity of medicine the potency of the medicine increases: as a mathematician, I would then say, if this process continues *ad infinitum* then the proportion of medicine in a doze will be diminished to zero, potency of the medicine must be increased to infinity. In other words if you take simple water, without putting any medicine in it it must have the highest potency.

An Honourable Member: Are you a doctor?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I am putting forward my difficulties and I put a common sense question and I hope that some of the advocates of homœopathy will answer my difficulty. (Interruptions.) Has every one finished his speech?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks the Honourable Member had better address the Chair.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I say, therefore, the whole treatment is ultimately reduced to treatment by water: plain water will have the highest potency. I admit there are *hakims* in this country who treat every disease by giving water alone and this homœopathic treatment is nothing better than that.

My second difficulty is this: the basis for every other system of medicine is scientific. It is based on physiology, pathology and inateria medica —allopathy, unani system and the ayurvedic system are all like that. But in this case I should like to know whether they have anything of the sort. I have talked with some homœopathic doctors and they say: "We do not care what the disease is, we are only concerned with the symptoms." . . .

An Honourable Member: They never say that.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: That is what they say: and this is the way they administer the medicine. First, they give medicine to a healthy man and find out what symptoms it produces. That is the whole scientific basis of this system. If more scientific basis exists, I hope some Members will get up and correct me. If any medicine produced symptoms, say, minus A, give another dose and it becomes zero again. The treatment practically means $-1 \times -1 = +1$. We have been told that it finds favour

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

among the people. I quite admit it; but treatment by means of *sadhus* and *fakirs* also finds favour among certain classes of the people, treatment with amulets and with holy water and so on also find favour among certain people. By analogy, therefore, *sadhus* and *fakirs* ought to be recognised as qualified doctors and should find places in all hospitals.

An Honourable Member: Have you made a study of this?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I have not made any study of
(Interruptions)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Let the Honourable Member not take note of the interruptions.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: The fundamental basis of homœopathic treatment has not been established to be scientific, nor the theory of potency varying inversely as the quantity of medicine appeals to me. It is said in the Resolution that the same recognition ought to be given to homœopathic colleges as is given to allopathic colleges. Now, in the allopathic colleges, scientific subjects, like chemistry, physics, physiology, Pathology, diagnosing of diseases and other things are taught: how is it possible to teach these subjects in a homœopathic college? They do not believe in diseases, they believe only in the symptoms. I hope that some of the supporters of the Resolution will explain the points I have raised.

Maulvi Syed Murtaza Sahib Bahadur (South Madras Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to accord my whole-hearted support to the Resolution before the House. Before doing so, I was under the impression that at least non-official Members will support this whole-heartedly; but I am sorry to see my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, himself is opposing the motion. So far as my Honourable friend, Dr. Dalal, is concerned, he is not opposed to it nor does he say that this is not based on science. But our doctor friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, has come forward to say that it is not based on science. What has potency to do with this? (Laughter.) Many of us do know something of potential energy and kinetic energy in our college days. But even that has no bearing on the subject before the House. The very fact that so many eminent doctors and founders in allopathy have surrendered allopathic treatment in favour of homœopathic treatment is sufficient proof that this should not only be recognised, but also patronised by the Government. Sir, I am one of those responsible for this Resolution. The Honourable the Mover in his closing remarks has said that this modest request may be responded to by the Central Government so that some moral pressure may be brought to bear on Provincial Governments and they may open their eyes and come forward to patronise this as it is being done in Calcutta and in other places. My friend, Dr. Dalal, has entertained some fears that we are interfering with the powers of the Provincial Governments. We know what the present Provincial Governments are. ("Hear, hear" from Congress Benches.)

Mr. Sri Prakasa (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions, Non-Muhammadan Rural): Homœopathic doses. (Laughter.)

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: As has been very aptly remarked by my Honourable friend, Mr. Sri Prakasa, they are homœopathic doses. So, it is the duty of the Central Government to see that the system which has found favour even with the Royal family, even with our former Majesty King Edward VIII, should be patronised by them.

Sir Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): And, therefore, he had to go.

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: No, Sir; he lives a very honourable life. (Hear, hear.) He did not care for the Throne. . . .

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Again it is a case of potency. (Laughter.)

Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: There the question of potential energy comes in. (Laughter.) The question of kinetic or potential energy comes in when we know that our former Majesty gave up even his Throne. (Laughter.)

Sir, when professional men, like my friend, Dr. Dalal, don't come forward to say that this system is not based on science, I am simply astonished to see laymen trying to do so. We know definitely that several eminent allopathic practitioners have given up the allopathic system and are successfully practising the homœopathic system. The very founder of the All-India Science Institute is one of those who has surrendered allopathic treatment in favour of homœopathy. I mean, the late Dr. Mahindra Lal Sircar, M.D., C.I.E.

Then the other fear entertained by my Honourable friend, Dr. Dalal, was that some quacks might practise this. We do not advocate the cause of quacks in this Resolution. We know that there are many graduates who have qualified themselves in the homœopathic system of treatment. The Government can patronise them. They can also open schools and colleges to impart instruction in homœopathic treatment and recognise the products of such schools and colleges.

Another suggestion made by my friend, Dr. Dalal, was that we should have itinery hospitals so that the doctors may go from *taluka* to *taluka* or from village to village, and I quite agree with him in the proposal which is a laudable one. But are the Government prepared to support such a proposition? If the Government are prepared to consider that proposal favourably, then they can also consider the question of opening schools and colleges for instructing people in homœopathy. I hope, Sir, this modest request made by us will find favour with all the elected Members, including my friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, and also the professional men in this House. With these few remarks, I support the Resolution.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, it was very refreshing to hear all this discussion about the alleged scientific subject of homœopathy. At the outset, I must say, Sir that I am opposed to this Resolution, and I shall presently give my grounds for it. It is not based on any technical ground, such as, that this is a provincial subject and, therefore, we should not interfere with it. Indeed, I am very glad that this subject has been brought forward in this House so that we could

[Dr. G. V. Deshmukh.]

guide the country by our opinion here. I am not one of those who say that everything scientific is concentrated in the allopathic system of treatment. It is far from my mind to suggest that every other system of treatment is unscientific. But, Sir, I will say this, that the allopathic system of the modern day has absorbed everything that is scientific in the various other systems. The allopath rejects nothing, at the same time he is not willing to accept everything on faith or because a few doctors have given up the allopathic system and taken to homœopathy successfully or that there are some mystic things said about it. To accept any system of treatment, it must be based on solid scientific grounds, and when we come to the homœopathic system, that is so much praised in this House today, what do we find? Nobody will deny that every system of treatment must be based on an accurate knowledge of the human body. What would you say of an engineer or let us say of a taxi driver, if he set himself up and said that he would do all the repairs of motor cars without his ever having dismantled a car? Now, in regard to the homœopathic system, or I may say even in regard to the Ayurvedic or Unani system, I think there is a great defect in these systems in that there is no regular scientific method of teaching the subjects. Nobody can accuse me of being hostile to these systems, because in my own way, Sir, I have tried my best to advance the cause of these indigenous systems so that a good direction might be given to both the Ayurvedic and Unani systems. Indeed, Sir, it might interest the House to know that I even presided at an Ayurvedic Conference, and the point that I emphasised on those who were responsible for that Conference was that they should have a regular scientific method of teaching the systems, so that those who will practise the respective systems should be well conversant with what you may say the fundamental facts of the human body, without which it is absolutely impossible for anybody, except for a superstitious person, to accept treatment under any of these systems. And to my regret, I find that the suggestions I had made nearly 10 or 15 years ago to some very prominent Ayurvedic doctors and to those who were following the different systems have not yet been carried out. I had suggested that they should start schools and colleges in which the dissection of the human body could be carried out. They should have laboratories there to show to the students how the human body is functioning, what the physiology of the human system is. Not only that, I also suggested that no mountebank, because he happens to go about with some old practitioner for a few months, should be allowed to set himself up as a practitioner within six months or even in a year's time. There ought to be properly constituted examining bodies so that those who were going to practise these systems should be properly recognised. So long as these things are not done, I do not think that the Government or the public through their representatives should allow this kind of thing to go on in any civilised country. It will interest many of my friends here who are extolling the system of homœopathy to know that the principle of cure adopted in that system, like with like, is accepted in allopathy. Those who gave us an exposition on the subject ought to know that vaccine therapy is also based on the same method. If a man is suffering from tuberculosis, then he is treated with tuberculine, —it is the poison of the same kind of disease that is responsible for it. The whole of vaccine treatment and a good deal of bacteriology is based on it and it is ridiculous to say that this is a system which is something

very different, and, therefore, there should be a separate recognition for it. By all means, if they have something substantial or something valuable to produce, let them put it before a scientific body, but it is no good coming to a legislative body or a body consisting of laymen and whom nobody is going to contradict. Some Members may say: "Do you know something about it? If you do not, you should not contradict". In return it may be asked: "Have they studied the system?" In that case, are they entitled to bring forward this proposition and say, accept this. The proper position for this kind of Resolution, and I think the right method, is to put it forward before a scientific body. There is no dearth of Indian scientific bodies and very important scientific bodies in this country at the present time. They can sift and choose and whatever is valuable will be accepted and whatever is useless will be rejected. Coming to the actual Resolution itself, it says: "be pleased to introduce homœopathic treatment in Government hospitals". What is the idea of this? To introduce homœopathic treatment, and why? By raw men who do not know the elementary principles of the anatomy, structure and function of the human body? At the same time, let me assure Honourable Members of this House that there is nothing to prevent a well-qualified doctor from using this method. Indeed I can tell you as a member of the Bombay Medical Council as well as a member of the All-India Medical Council, that there is nothing in the regulations to prevent any well-qualified doctor learning homœopathy and trying to cure patients by homœopathic treatment. Therefore, it seems to me that this clause is absolutely redundant. You cannot have homœopathic treatment in Government hospitals or in hospitals at that, carried on by people, who are ignorant of the most elementary things in that particular science. On the other hand, if there is somebody who knows something about it and if he chooses to have any particular drug or wants to follow a certain line of scientific method, he is perfectly entitled at the present day to follow that method. As regards homœopathic colleges in India and giving them the same status and recognition as allopathic colleges, I am not in a position to speak with authority as I come from a province where there is no homœopathic college, and, therefore, I cannot say of the homœopathic college at Calcutta.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Anatomy and physiology are taught there.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: To begin with, I said that I did not know, but what I do say is, let them establish good institutions as schools and colleges, if not absolutely up to date, at any rate, where the elementary principles of scientific teaching are observed. Then let them apply to the scientific institutions. Nearly every province has a university. Let them apply to those universities. The universities will, I know, appoint a commission to go into it and find out up to what standard the school or college is. Perhaps then it might be worth while coming to the legislative body and saying: "Very well, this is the report which the universities have made, and therefore give recognition". But at the present time, to the first part of the Resolution, namely, "to introduce homœopathic treatment in Government hospitals", there is no objection to a properly qualified man giving that treatment, and as for the other part, namely, "give homœopathic colleges in India the same status and recognition as in the

[Dr. G. V. Deshmukh.]

case of allopathic colleges", as no homœopathic colleges exist now to my knowledge, it seems to me that the Resolution is absolutely redundant. Those who are anxious about it, let them send it to the universities or scientific bodies in the provinces, and if they approve of it, then would be the time when not only the Government but we, the representatives of the people here, may think it worth while to pass a resolution like this. But till then I won't say. I am sorry to differ and not to agree to this Resolution, but I do think that the most sensible thing for us to do is not to accept this Resolution unless my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghiasuddin, is willing to withdraw it.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal: Landholders): After listening to the learned speech of my Honourable friend, Dr. Deshmukh, it is with considerable trepidation that I venture to stand on my legs and make a few observations.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Today being Friday the House will adjourn for Lunch now and meet again at 2-15 p.m.

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at a Quarter Past Two of the Clock, Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta) in the Chair.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: In continuation of my speech, I wish to state that I am one of those who hold an impartial view on this subject. I find myself in a position to state clearly that this homœopathic treatment is based on a scientific basis, and, if to illustrate my point, I refer to astronomical things, I hope the House will excuse me. According to astronomy, there are nine planets in this world and the week days are seven. These planets have got their effect on everything in this mundane world. This homœopathy is also on a scientific basis and it is useless to say that it is the business of the quack. Many people hold that view; I am glad to hear from Mr. Bajoria that he does not hold that view. Then there are two other planets which are working in a reverse direction and it tells upon the spiritual world. In every part of the world, it is calculated that seven days complete a week and with the change of seasons, the human elements also change and human nature is also scientifically affected. Summer, winter, the rainy season and spring all have their effect on the human system.

This homœopathic treatment was first started by Hahnemann, who had a perfect knowledge of pathology and also other technicalities of this allopathic treatment. Homœopathy affords a treatment which can be availed of by every one. We want homœopathy for the simple reason

that allopathy is very expensive. I have witnessed with my own eyes thousands and millions of people dying in the villages and they could not get any treatment for want of money. This is a vital point which should not be ignored. I can personally testify to the miraculous results produced by homœopathy. I have a mastiff dog which was suffering from blood dysentery and I took the risk of consulting a homœopathic physician, instead of a Veterinary Surgeon, and to tell you frankly the dog was absolutely cured of the disease by one dose only. I can tell you of another instance in Calcutta. My personal assistant had a boil in the abdomen and the allopathic doctor said that it must be operated. Fortunately or unfortunately, the doctor had gone away for a week on some mufasil call, and, in the meantime, my cousin, who has some experience of homœopathic treatment, advised him to try the homœopathic medicine and with one dose the boil subsided and my personal assistant was absolutely all right. The allopathic doctor, when he came back, would hardly believe it. But after examination he was satisfied that the boil had really subsided. Being an allopathic doctor, he could not give his whole-hearted support to it, but he said that it seemed miraculous to him. I can give you many more illustrations like this of the value of homœopathic treatment.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: What is the quantity you require for your treatment?

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: That generally depends upon the Honourable friend who put the question. Sometimes a lighter dilution will do, sometimes a higher dilution is necessary. The higher the dilution, the more efficacious the medicine. That is the theory. I may add that there is a regular five years' course for this subject in France, Germany and America. In Calcutta, there is a Homœopathic College where there is a regular dissection class, a class of pathology, a class of anatomy, and generally the efficient doctors, who are coming out of this institution, are doing immense service to the suffering people, especially in the rural parts. It is a fact that rural people are dying in thousands for want of proper treatment. (*An Honourable Member:* "What about bio-chemical treatment?") That is all the more good. Bio-chemical treatment is the outcome of homœopathy. In this country we have got Unani, Kabiraji or Ayurvedic, homœopathic and allopathic treatment. Today, we are only pleading the cause of homœopathy. We hardly get an occasion to plead the cause of Unani and Kabiraji systems. When such a Resolution has been brought before this House, I want that the Government will treat it very sympathetically, and if they do so, I know full well that they will render an immense service to the poor people of India. It ought also to be remembered that this treatment, which is absolutely based on a scientific treatment, should be generally taught in this country in such a way that it gets wider scope in this country.

Sir, I may remind the House of one resolution that was passed a few years back at Calcutta at the Tropical Congress. In that Congress we had the good fortune of meeting many of the eminent doctors of the world,—even the inventor of emetine, tuberculine and the inventors of all those bacteriological treatments happened to come over to Calcutta to join the Tropical Congress, and what were the resolutions passed? I shall stand corrected if I am wrong, but the substance of those resolutions was this

[Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury.]

that that day perfection of treatment will be reached when every kind of treatment which is in existence in this world will be mixed up and a singular treatment will be found out for the human race. As for the allopathic treatment, I may relate one instance which may interest this House. Sir, the Medical Council was meeting at Simla and I was unfortunately present at that time during the Simla Session and I had the good luck to meet some of the eminent doctors who came up in connection with that Medical Council and I arranged in their honour a luncheon at Hotel Cecil, but unfortunately that day I was attacked by flu' and was suffering from a high temperature. Then, I told the doctors that I may be excused from taking share at the table; they said: "don't you worry, we are so many doctors present here, and even if you suffer from high fever, we shall prescribe such medicine for you that won't do any harm". Many of these doctors were eminent in their profession and some of them said to me: "to be frank with you, we have got no faith in medicines", some others said: "I only believe in tincture of iodine and salts". (An Honourable Member: "Kruschen salts".) Sir, the fact is that quite often 70 per cent. of the diseases are cured by nature and only in 30 per cent. lies the efficiency of treatment and credit of doctors. Moreover, in the case of homœopathy there is one thing which is to be remembered, viz., that there is no danger in this treatment; if the dose is a little higher or misplaced, it does not cause any harmful result to the patient and that is the greatest advantage. There is a dictum that doctors differ, but according to Dr. Khare patients suffer also. In the case of homœopathy, however, it merely deals with the symptoms, it goes to the root cause of the disease and it is based on a very scientific method, and, generally speaking, every doctor who practises homœopathy will agree that if the symptoms are similar, the treatment is bound to be uniform.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: In conclusion, I may add that this is a subject in regard to which nobody should lose this opportunity of furthering the cause of homœopathy, and I strongly support this Resolution.

Some Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The question is.

"That the question be now put."

The motion was adopted.

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): Mr. President, I must begin by an apology for a somewhat rheumatic huskiness of the voice today. (An Honourable Member: "Take a dose of homœopathy.") I was going to say that, if I had heard of the marvels that have been recounted today about the efficacy of the homœopathic system of medicine, I might have tried it yesterday in the hope that I should have been able to effect a cure overnight. As it is,

I must ask the House to put up with what I fear vocally is likely to be a some what feeble effort. The Resolution, Sir, of my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghiasuddin, has had a mixed reception, if I may say so. There are those who have spoken with great enthusiasm for and great faith in the homœopathic system. It is impossible for me to join the chorus from my personal experience, because such recollections as I have of the homœopathic system of treatment go back to a somewhat remote childhood, and the only clear impressions that I have, Sir, are, first, of gratitude for the exiguity and tastelessness of the dose, and, secondly, of admiration for the demonstrative perfection of these minute globules as physical models of the mathematical zero. (Laughter.)

An Honourable Member: You might have taken "mother tincture".

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: Well, I have not had any tinctures. The other school, of which the most influential and authoritative exponent was Dr. Deshmukh, was inclined to challenge, with a considerable amount of scepticism, the claim of homœopathy to be treated as a science. I do not propose to enter into this dispute as to whether homœopathy is a science or is not a science. And I have already ventured to explain to the House that I cannot speak from personal experience of its efficacy or otherwise. But there are certain general considerations which, I think, ought to be brought to the notice of the House. There seems to be some sort of an impression that either the Central Government or Provincial Governments impose restrictions on the practice of homœopathy, and it has been urged that, because this is both an efficacious system of treatment and a cheap system of treatment, therefore the Government should put no obstacles in the way of the dissemination of this system. The fact of the matter is that Government do recognise and have recognised for some time that, in a country of the size of India, with the population of India and with the poverty of the people of India, any system of medicine capable of alleviating human suffering should have free play, and that is the reason why there is no legal limitation on the practice of any system of medicine,—whether it be the allopathic system or the homœopathic system or the Unani system or the Ayurvedic system. And, as some Honourable Members are aware, Provincial Governments have in different provinces aided and subsidised the distribution of the Ayurvedic and Unani medicines. So, if any Local Government chooses to give a similar countenance to homœopathy, I can assure my Honourable friend that nobody will be happier than ourselves; we have no objection to that being done at all. So, Sir, the first thing the House has got to realise is that there is no legal restriction whatsoever in any part of British India on the practice of the homœopathic system of medicine.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Your Government cannot give any recognition. They have already issued a circular on the subject.

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I will come to that point also by and by. My Honourable friend believes in homœopathic doses of speech when a matter of this kind is being explained. I can assure my Honourable friend it is not so easy.

Now, Sir, the Resolution falls into two parts. The first is a recommendation to the Governor General in Council that homœopaths should be appointed to the staff of medical hospitals, and the second is that Government should extend their recognition to the status of homœopathic

[Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai.]

colleges, presumably as teaching institutions. Now, I think it is just as well that the House should appreciate at the very beginning that, so far as the greater part of British India is concerned, whether it is the first part or it is the second part of the Resolution, adoption of it, action on it, depend upon Local Governments. They do not depend upon us. Medical administration, medical education and hospitals are all entirely transferred provincial subjects. The question is whether, as regards the directly administered areas, the Government of India are in a position to do anything and, if so, what?

Now, Sir, let me take the Resolution in the two parts, which I have already stated, and define the attitude of the Government of India. So far as hospitals in the centrally administered areas are concerned, there is absolutely no objection whatsoever to any doctor on the staff of these hospitals applying the homœopathic system of medicine to the treatment of his patients. There is no objection to that at all. Equally, if a person suitably qualified for an appointment on the staff of a Government college or teaching institution possesses, in addition, specialised knowledge of homœopathy, that by itself is not going to be a disqualification to his appointment to the staff of that college. But I do not think that either the House wishes or any Honourable Member wishes that we should appoint to the staff of these colleges or extend recognition to individuals whose education has no scientific grounding either in physiology or in anatomy or any other subjects that go up to make the corpus of the medical science; that we should extend our recognition to anybody who comes along and says: "I have read a book by the founder of the science or for six months I have meditated in solitude upon the miracles of homœopathy and I am now in a position to come along and tell you—No disease, however, fell, I have merely to touch and it will be cured". I am quite sure that if Government adopted an attitude of such promiscuous recognition, whether by way of appointment or for the purposes of registration or anything else, the very first people who will get up here in the House and belabour Government for having shown callous indifference to the health of the multitude of this country will be the Honourable Members who sit opposite.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Why put a ban on the homœopaths by issuing a circular?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: There is no ban. I was not going to refer to the circular in the course of my speech because I am not aware of the facts; but if what my friend is suggesting is that some circular has been issued prohibiting homœopathic doctors from practising homœopathy, then all that I can say is that I have no knowledge of any such circular at all.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Government servants have been prohibited from practising homœopathy.

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: But Government servants are supposed to be the wholtime servants of the Government for the purpose of doing the duties of the post to which they are appointed. It is not fair really that a Government servant, who by rules is required to devote his time to his special duties, apart from the question of seeking to supplement his

income—it may be that somebody does it for charitable purposes—it is not right that such an individual should be allowed to practise homœopathy. In any case, I submit that that particular matter does not come within the purview of this Resolution at all. The Resolution seeks the introduction of homœopathic treatment in Government hospitals. Is it the suggestion of any Honourable Member, is it the suggestion of my Honourable friend that all these gentlemen whom this circular affects are members of a Government hospital staff? They are not. Similarly, the next thing is that Government should give recognition to homœopathic colleges. Is it the suggestion of my Honourable friend that any of these servants is the principal of or a professor in a homœopathic college in Delhi? I am not aware of the existence of any such college in Delhi. What my Honourable friend is talking about has nothing to do whatever with this Resolution. I think I can have your support, Sir, in saying that that particular question does not arise.

Now, Sir, to go on. The question that I was dealing with was the question of the eligibility of persons who are specialised in homœopathy for appointment to the staff of Government hospitals. The next question that has been raised is the question of the recognition of homœopathic colleges. Well, I am not aware of any homœopathic college in any centrally administered area. I made some inquiries and the result of these inquiries has been that no such institution exists. My Honourable friend, Dr. Deshmukh, who, apart from his eminence in the profession, happens to have had a very distinguished public career as well relating to such matters as medical education, and so on—he is a member, for example, of the All-India Medical Council—, even he found that in his experience he knew of no homœopathic teaching institution outside Calcutta. That being the position, the question of giving recognition to a homœopathic college is not a practical question for the Government of India at all because the college does not exist in a centrally administered area. If there is a homœopathic institution in a province, it needs recognition either by its own Local Government or by the University of the area in which it is situate. Then, I submit the proper course for that institution is to approach the University or the Local Government, as the case may be. The Government of India are not concerned with that. The Government of India in the matter of the recognition of medical qualifications are concerned only with the All-India Medical Council and, as my Honourable friend may be aware, section 11, sub-section (2) of the All-India Medical Council Act (XXVII of 1938) provides :

“That any medical institution in British India which grants a medical qualification not included in the first schedule (a number of qualifications are recognised here) may apply to the Governor General in Council to have such qualifications recognised and the Governor General in Council, after consulting the Council, may by notification in the Gazette of India amend the first schedule so as to include such qualifications therein.”

Now, Sir, if there is a homœopathic college in Calcutta or Bombay which seeks recognition by the All-India Medical Council or for purposes of the All-India Medical Council, the procedure described in the sub-section, which I have read out to my Honourable friends, is the procedure which is open to that institution. There is no reason why that institution should not adopt this procedure.

[Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai.]

So, Sir, to sum up, the position is this. As regards the appointment to staffs of medical colleges, there is no prohibition for suitably qualified people. As regards recognition, to the extent that the Government of India are concerned at all, the matter has to be dealt with by the All-India Medical Council in the first instance. Any institution which seeks recognition has its path clear. It has got to make an application in the prescribed way. My Honourable friend said something about it being the system of medicine that needs recognition. I have already tried to explain to the House that, if recognition means the right to practise, or absence of recognition means the absence of right to practise, the problem does not exist because the practice of no system of medicine is prohibited in this country. That being so, I do not know that there is any practical issue before Government. Anybody who wants to practise can practise.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: It is a negative thing.

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: It is not a negative thing. Practice is a positive act, and the positive right to practise can be exercised by anybody who likes to practise. So that the position is this, that really it is not possible for the Government of India to take any direct or positive action under this Resolution. I have been asked for an expression of sympathy, moral sympathy, on behalf of the Government towards this. My answer is that Government have moral or, indeed, every conceivable kind of sympathy with any system of medicine which tends to alleviate human suffering, and if it would please my Honourable friends that a record of the discussion in the House today should be forwarded to Local Governments—because after all action, if any action has to be taken on this over the greater part of British India, must be taken by Local Governments—I am prepared to do that. But if what we are required to do is to go beyond that, in other words, if we are required to extend indiscriminate patronage, if you like to individuals who profess homœopathy, but who have not the requisite scientific foundation, then in that case, I submit that with our responsibility to the people of this country, with due regard to ordinary humane and humanitarian considerations, it is not possible for us to do that. Sir, that is all I have to say.

Mr. M. Ghasuddin: Sir, I wish to say just a few words by way of reply. First of all I take the arguments of my Honourable friend, Dr. Deshmukh. He says that homœopathy is no science. Sir, it is something for the scientists to decide whether a certain subject is a science or not, and not for a layman like myself to say. Without going deeper into the whole thing, whether it is a science or not, I will say that I only judge a thing by its results. As far as the results are concerned I have got before me ample statistics to show that people treated by homœopathic method were cured in all epidemic diseases, like cholera, plague, etc., and other diseases. The other point raised by my Honourable friend, Dr. Deshmukh, was that there is no proper college or institution where this science could be taught or is being taught. He said there was no where any institution where human anatomy could be taught to students of homœopathy. I am afraid on this point my Honourable friend, the learned Doctor, is misinformed. I have just now been given information that there is a College in Calcutta where the course extends to over five years and regular diplomas are granted and these holders of

diplomas have a right to practise homœopathy. On the authority of my Honourable friend, Sir Abdul Halim Ghuznavi, I say that human anatomy and everything else is taught there.

The other point is, there are a good many quacks in this profession who call themselves homœopathic doctors. Sir, I admit this charge. But I consider this is an argument in our favour. If there are quacks, it is for the Government to stop them. It is for the Government to provide proper education and debar those persons from practising who are not qualified. I think the boot is right on the other leg in this matter. All I can say is that at present in a good many civilised countries of the world this system is prevalent, and I have just been supplied with a list of a few hospitals in America and other places which are serving the people there very successfully. There is a hospital in New York after the name of the inventor of homœopathy and it has got 2,500 beds. There is another hospital in Chicago, a homœopathic hospital with 2,000 beds. Then there is a medical college at Philadelphia with the same number of beds. All these persons cannot be fools. We may not prove on the floor of the House, scientifically speaking, whether it is a science or not. But all these persons who go to the homœopathic hospitals and those who finance them cannot be all fools. I admit the helplessness of the Government of India. A good many powers have been taken away in this respect. Provincial autonomy is in full force, and so the Government of India cannot dictate to the Provinces. I admit this much of excuse. But I do submit that the Government of India should give some indication in a practical way, and start some small institution. If that lead is forthcoming, I think I will be pleased to withdraw this Resolution. With these words, I resume my seat.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The question is:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to introduce homœopathic treatment in Government hospitals and give homœopathic colleges in India the same status and recognition as in the case of allopathic colleges."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—44.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.	Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.	Kailash Behari Lal, Babu.
Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.	Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
Bajoria, Babu Baijnath.	Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
Banerjea, Dr. P. N.	Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
Bhagavan Das, Dr.	Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.
Chaliha, Mr. Kuladhar.	Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra Nath.	Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.	Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed.
Das, Mr. B.	Pant, Pandit Govind Bahadur.
Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.	Parma Nand, Bhai.
Gadgil, Mr. N. V.	Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.
Gauba Mr. K. L.	Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.	Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.	Sant Singh, Sardar.
Ghuznavi, Sir Abdul Halim.	Sham Lal, Mr.
Giri, Mr. V. V.	Sheodass Daga, Seth.
Hans Raj, Raizada.	Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Hosmani, Mr. S. K.	Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
Ismail Khan, Haji Chaudhary.	Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
Muhammad.	Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
Jedhe, Mr. K. M.	Sri Prakasa, Mr.
	Varma, Mr. B. B.

NOES—36.

Abdul Hamid, Khan Bahadur Sir.
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab Sir.
 Aikman, Mr. A.
 Bajpai, Sir Girja Shankar.
 Bansidhar, Rai Sahib.
 Chanda, Mr. A. K.
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.
 Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
 Griffiths, Mr. P. J.
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.
 James, Mr. F. E.
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.
 Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri.
 Lalit Chand, Thakur.
 Laljee, Mr. Husenbhai Abdullabhai.
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
 Mackeown, Mr. J. A.
 Mehta, Mr. S. L.
 Menon, Mr. K. R.

Metcalfe, Sir Aubrey.
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan.
 Nagarkar, Mr. C. B.
 Naydu, Diwan Bahadur B. V. Sri Hari Rao.
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
 Rau, Sir Baghavendra.
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
 Roy, Mr. S. N.
 Sale, Mr. J. F.
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
 Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar Sir.
 Spence, Mr. G. H.
 Thorne, Mr. J. A.
 Tottenham, Mr. G. B. F.
 Witherington, Mr. C. H.
 Zafrullah Khan, the Honourable Sir Muhammad.
 Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE INDIA'S WITHDRAWAL FROM THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Seth Sheodass Daga (Central Provinces: Landholders): Sir*. I move the following Resolution:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to withdraw the membership of this country from the League of Nations and to discontinue the payment of the annual contribution thereto."

Mr. G. H. Spence (Secretary, Legislative Department): Sir, on a point of order, I would refer you to rule 14 which provides that:

"The business of the Indian Legislature shall be transacted in English, provided that the President may permit any member unacquainted with English to address the Council in a vernacular."

I am credibly informed that the Honourable Member is not unacquainted with English and that he has in fact. . . .

Some Honourable Members: What is your source of information?

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Order, order. The Chair would like to inquire if the Honourable Member is acquainted with English?

Seth Sheodass Daga: Sir,* I do not know English.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable Member can proceed in his own language.

* English translation of the speech delivered in the vernacular.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh (Chota Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, may I know if the report of this speech is being taken?

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Certainly, it will be reported.

Seth Sheodass Daga: The League of Nations was established on the 10th of January, 1920, and its aim was to settle the disputes between the Members of the League by arbitration and negotiation. The organiser of this League was the United Kingdom, and from the very beginning, India was one of the original members of it. At that time only 17 or 19 Nations joined it, but many of the nations of the world did not join the League. All this happened after the Great War. America and Russia did not join the League at that time, and, even up to now, America has not joined. Russia joined a year ago. Germany also did not join up to 1936. Japan which was one of the original members resigned the League in 1933, because she wanted some portion of China to which perhaps other nations would not agree. The aim of the League was a noble one, but in practice every thing is going on quite contrary to the original idea. May I be permitted to say that the League instead of being an Arbitrator in the cause of peace has turned a band of brigands and a set of butchers.

Sir, even today important countries, like Japan, Germany and America, are not there and so the League is not able to do anything in the cause of peace. Therefore, the League instead of helping and supporting the weak countries has been the cause of their ruin. I am giving some instances below.

Japan wanted to conquer Manchukoa and when the United Kingdom intervened and objected, it was asked by Japan to give up India, and so the League failed. Thereafter, Japan resigned its membership of the League and the League sat with folded hands and were not able to save Manchukoa.

It had been settled by the treaty of Versailles that the Rhineland was not to be occupied by German soldiers and in spite of that Germany garrisoned the Rhineland and took possession of the same and the League found itself helpless to prevent it.

Now, I will give the latest instance of the League's brigandage. We are all aware of the fact of Abyssinia and Italy being the members of the League of Nations and also painfully aware of the fact as to how Abyssinia was devoured by Italy. It was the duty of the League to interfere when two members were at logger heads and to punish the one that was in the wrong. Italy treated Abyssinia very cruelly and the League which claims to be an apostle of justice was quietly watching what was happening. Left to herself, Abyssinia would have settled her differences with Italy directly without the aid of the League, and would have, as we see today, been much better off. But the worthy members of the League raised false hopes in her mind, and went on delaying matters until the whole of Abyssinia was practically allowed to be swallowed up by Italy. This loot and butchery went on under the very nose of the League, and, I may be permitted to say, by their connivance. According to the principles, which the League proclaims and for which it came into existence, it should have sided with Abyssinia, but the only outward symbol of sympathy which it was able to extend consisted in

[Seth Sheodass Daga.]

giving faint expressions to their opinion that Italy was in the wrong. It also went as far as to sanction the control of petrol supply to Italy, but this sanction remained a dead letter. Several nations, including the U. S. A., undertook to supply petrol to Italy and yet the League instead of openly siding with Abyssinia in order to exert pressure on Italy remained a silent spectator of the naked brutality until poor Abyssinia was practically wiped out of existence. Sir Samuel Hoare realising the force of world opinion had ventured to suggest that Abyssinia be left to settle her affairs with Italy herself, but that suggestion cost him his office. All the humane principles laid down by the League to be observed in the time of war, such as to refrain from bombing or exposing to gas attack the civilian population centres of Red Cross Society, hotels, churches, mosques, etc., were trampled under foot and the League closed its eyes to this open challenge to its authority by Italy. This inglorious drama finally ended in the disappearance of the Negus from the Assembly. Will it be far wrong to suggest by way of an explanation to the League's attitude in this matter that, Italy being a white nation and Abyssinia a coloured one, the League sympathised with the former with the result that the latter, though in the right, became its victim? What hope can there be for India which is not a white nation in constant fear of being swallowed up by one white nation or other. Some people lay a great emphasis on the fact that India is one of the original members, but this serves no useful purpose, except enabling the British Government to nominate one of their favourites as a delegate, and, thus, increase their strength by one vote in the League Assembly.

Though an original member, India is not represented on the Executive Council of the League and has no voice in important matters. It is true that there has been some reduction in India's contribution, but it is not to an appreciable extent. The representation of India in the staff of the League is very meagre, as will be clear from the following figures showing the contribution paid by each country, and the return it gets in the form of salaries to its officers:

Name of the country.	Contribution in Swiss Francs.	Salary of the officers in Swiss Francs.
Britain	3,189,462	925,147
France	2,390,690	1,468,692
India	1,670,670	51,625

When the British Government was suppressing the Indian nation with all its might and main in its struggle for the attainment of its birth right in a non-violent manner in 1932, what did the League do for India?

The attitude of the League towards the affairs in Spain is a living example of the failure of the League of Nations which claims that it is an apostle of justice. All the members of the League profess that they are neutral, but Italy has been sending 60,000 soldiers and some high officers and still claim to be maintaining its neutrality, but the League

has not been taking any steps to punish these delinquents. It is obvious from the above that the League can serve no useful purpose and it is also not humanly possible for it to do any good.

As I have observed, above the League is a gang of robbers and a set of butchers, who are in the habit of standing aside to let one of them have recourse to plunder, so that they may in their turn be permitted to do the same when occasion arises.

Under these circumstances, Sir, I propose that India should withdraw from the membership of the League and the payment of the annual contribution to the League be discontinued, and I hope and trust that the Assembly will whole-heartedly support my Resolution.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Resolution moved.

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to withdraw the membership of this country from the League of Nations and to discontinue the payment of the annual contribution thereto."

Dr. Bhagavan Das (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I regret that I happen to know English, otherwise I might perhaps have been able to speak as eloquently and as fully as my Honourable and very worthy friend, Seth Sheodass Daga, has done, in his and my mother-tongue. As it is, I am compelled to speak in English, by the rules.

Sir, I support the Resolution, which has been so ably moved by him; but I confess that I do so with much sadness, because the ideal of the League of Nations, as conceived in the mind of that noble-hearted idealist, President Wilson, the third truly great President of the United States of America, is very dear to my heart. When I first read of the establishment of the League, it appeared to me as the dawn of the millennium, the realisation of the poet's dream of "the Parliament of Man and the Federation of the World". It is only because the machinations of the cunning diplomats of the Great Powers, mainly, Great Britain and, secondly, France, have perverted the League wholly away from that ideal, that the Indian people no longer wish to remain connected with it in any way. Even the British editor of that influential paper, the *Statesman* of Delhi and Calcutta, wrote not long ago, towards the close of the Italo-Abyssinian war, to the effect that the time had come when nations, which had any self-respect left in them, could only feel ashamed to have had and to have anything to do with the League of Nations. The League represents the last of the fourteen points suggested by President Wilson for embodiment in the Treaty of Peace between the belligerents in that epidemic of murderous madness and mutual butchery, called the Great War. When he toured in the countries of Europe after the Armistice, he was everywhere hailed as the Prince of Peace. But when the Treaty came to be actually drawn up, the Big Ten, and then the Big Four, and finally the Big Two, namely, the Prime Minister of England, Mr. Lloyd George, who very often literally "quotes the Bible for his own purpose", and Mr. George Clemenceau, the "tiger" of France, successfully outwitted the simple-hearted, straight-minded idealist, and whittled away thirteen of his points, and left only the last. President Wilson yielded point after point, hoping perhaps to win everything back through his League. His clever colleagues knew better,—very clever in their own conceit, but very foolish in the eyes of God, as perhaps the survivor of them, Mr. Lloyd George,

[Dr. Bhagavan Das.]

is realising now, in view of the greater preparation for a worse Armageddon. At the Sorbonne University, when they gave him a degree to show him honour, President Wilson said: "My conception of the League of Nations is just this—that it shall operate as the organised moral force of men throughout the world". Today, the general feeling is that the League has become a puppet of Britain and France, instead of the organised moral force of mankind.

Sir, I had the high honour of having, for a brief hour, under my roof in Benares in 1920, the daughter and the son-in-law of that noble-hearted idealist, President Wilson. Prof. and Mrs. Sayce were naturally reticent, and could not tell me much on the subject; but I learnt more from another American visitor, as to how President Wilson had died, broken-hearted, of paralysis, because of the frustration of the high hopes he had set upon the League. Not only had the diplomats of Europe deceived him, but his own people disowned him. In the U. S. A. a conspiracy had been formed, of Republican Senators, for economic-political purposes, to belittle the President and make his mission for world peace a failure. The Senators were tools of the international clique of capitalists and armament-makers who have been at the back of most of the wars of this century, including the Great War. The former President Theodore Roosevelt declared publicly, shortly after the Armistice: "Wilson has no authority whatever to speak for the American people at this time. His leadership has been emphatically repudiated by them".

The first Assembly of the League of Nations met in Geneva in November, 1920. Over 16 years have gone by since then. The League has deteriorated steadily in effectiveness as a moral force, till the time has come when even a British editor says that no self-respecting people should have anything to do with it. The Disarmament Conference held by the League proved a fiasco, even as the World Economic Conference held in London proved a fiasco. The military preparedness of the nations for another outbreak of butchery is far greater today than it was before the outbreak of the World War. About a year ago, if I remember rightly, Mr. Lloyd George, in one of his public speeches, bewailing the mad race in armaments, of the Powers, but not confessing that it was the consequence of his own excessive cleverness at the time of the framing of the Treaty of Versailles, said that the total of the expenditure of the Great Powers on the armaments was one thousand million pounds a year, and that something like thirty million men were employed, as the standing armies and reserves, without counting those engaged in the manufacture of arms and munitions. He should have said they were mis-employed, in preparing for the work of mutual butchery, and, far worse, for the butchery of the civilian populations. I was amazed and horrified to read recently, in a paper which professed to quote reliable statistics, that the total of the budgeted military expenditure of the Great Powers during the last year, that is to say, for 1936-37, was twenty-five hundred million pounds. One thousand million pounds a year was unbearable and intolerable burden enough for 'the workers of the world'. But—twenty-five hundred million pounds in one year! If all those thirty million men were properly employed, and all that vast amount of money spent in organising the human race for peace instead of organising the nations for mutual war, employed and spent in works for promoting the

general welfare of mankind, what incalculable blessings would rain upon Humanity! The whole surface of the earth could be turned into one blooming garden, and, indeed, the Kingdom of Heaven could be established on the earth. But the League looks on, and can do nothing to stop this disastrous misuse of men and money. So many wars have taken place during the last 16 years, wars between several Republics of South America, wars between Japan and China, and the League has been able to do nothing. Japan openly says that if Britain is to hold India as its private property, why should not Japan hold China similarly: "Hands off China"! Such is the consequence of the malignant example of imperialism set by Britain, and her refusal to help India to establish genuine self-government. "Sins come home to roast". "The mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small". The grinding of the mills of God is the circling of the cycles of human history and psychology.

India in particular has nothing to gain from remaining a member of the League, except the contempt of all other nations, the contempt of the British most of all in their heart of hearts, for being the merest catpaw of the British Government, and for paying for the diplomacies of British statesmen at the cost of yet worse privation of the already half-starved and ragged hundreds of millions of our people. I understand, Sir, that next after Britain and France, and perhaps, one or two others, India makes the largest annual contribution towards the upkeep of the League, and has been paying up very regularly, while many other nations are in arrears. What is the result of all this? Instead of being the organised moral force of mankind, the League looks on, while the so-called Great Powers—Powers of Evil and Darkness—are becoming organised martial forces, between which, when they clash, India, the humble serf of Britain, will probably be ground to dust. We cannot forget that India lost from war-fever, during the *four months* of 1918, principally because of the drain of her resources to supply the war-requirements of Britain, and her own consequent lack of food and clothing, and the resultant depletion of disease-resisting vital power, over 12 millions of human beings, by the statistics of the Government of India themselves—as many as, or more than,—were killed in battles in *four years* of the Great War. World-wide disarmament is sure to come, either by world-wide slaughter, or by mutual agreement. It seems that it will come by slaughter, and soon, since the League cannot usher it in by agreement.

The ostentatious pretence is that India is an independent member of the League, but every one knows that this is only brazen diplomacy. The representatives of India on the League have always been only the nominated tools and mouthpieces and megaphones and microphones of the British Government. I am not aware that India has derived any single benefit from her membership of the League. The League has a Committee of intellectual co-operation. One of our most famous men, a world-celebrity, Prof. Sir Radhakrishnan, has been put upon it. I have had some correspondence with him and one very brief talk. I got the impression that nothing substantial can be done by the Committee, in respect of really improving the moral quality of the education in the European countries, and the quality as well as the quantity in India. We see that instead of teaching peace between the creeds and the nations, children of 8, 10, 12 years of age are being trained in all European countries in military discipline, are being soaked in war mentality, and taught

[Dr. Bhagavan Das.]

to hate the people of other nations. The League looks on. It is an axiom of ancient Indian tradition that education is the seed and root, and civilisation is the flower and fruit. As is the quality, cultural and vocational, of the education, such will be the quality of the civilisation. Wrong education has dethroned God in Europe and enthroned capitalist Mammon instead; has given to him, for archangel councillors and ministers, militarist moloch on his dexter side, and diplomatist Mephistes on his sinister side; and has provided him with boon companions in the shape of Comus, Momus, and Priapus, the ministers of sensualism, high living, and all that is known as the night-side of the great capitals, the modern Babylons, of Europe! The League consists of courtiers and *durbaris* who enjoy and applaud the cinema, dance and Bacchanalia. It is only by right education and not by such superficial services and artifices, and show of enormous industry over trivial details, and many processes of whitewashing and eyewashing and leaf-washing, as the League indulges in, in common with all bureaucracies—that all the ills of mankind can be cured, and all their problems solved, as nearly as is humanly possible to cure and solve them. The League has not been of any help to India in this vital respect.

The League has a Committee on Foods, as the physical basis of life and of civilisation. It has published large books full of minute statistics, which I have been looking into recently. The net result is that cereals, green vegetables, fresh fruits, milk and milk-products are the best foods, and these, together with eggs and certain meats for non-vegetarian folk, are solemnly recommended. Now, India has known all this for thousands of years, and she needs no advice as to what food to take; but she needs the food itself, which she produces too, but is deprived of, ruthlessly.

I have had talks in Benares with two Secretaries of the League, one an Australian gentleman, and another a Dutch lady, if I remember rightly, who were attached to departments concerned with the Drugs and Drink Traffic and the Sex-slave Traffic, respectively. The opium traffic of India with China has decreased; but, so far as I am aware, the consumption of cocaine and of alcoholic drinks of various kinds, indigenous and foreign, has increased, especially among the students of universities, and among those generally who regard themselves as "educated", to the horror of all those who wish well to the younger and the future generations of India. The Hindu and the Muslim religions say that *Sur-a-patakam*, the drinking of spirituous liquors is one of the five *maha-pataka-s*, "heinous sins" and the Holy Quran says: "Al-khamro amal-ish-Shaitani", "intoxicants are the work of the Devil". And yet the British-Indian Government are pursuing diligently the policy of deriving income from this deliberate debauching and degradation of human nature, and while they profess and pretend to restrain and regulate the consumption of intoxicants, in practice stimulate it directly and indirectly, and the Indian States, which formerly never touched money from these infernal sources, are now naturally and eagerly imitating the British-Indian Government in this respect. The League has done nothing to mend the ways of the British-Indian Government in this matter, which is a matter of life or death, of body and soul to the Indian people.

There are many more things to say. Many have been said by my worthy friend, Seth Sheodass Daga, and more I trust will be said by

other speakers. I will conclude with just two more observations. If the League were worth the money and the energy spent upon it, and if India were really an independent member of it, the horrible civil war of mutual extermination now going on in Spain would have been impossible; and the other civil war, now going on in India for the last sixteen years—truly *civil*, non-violent, on the side of the Indian people, and, therefore, perforce, not too violent on the part of the British people, because of the intuitively far-sighted wisdom and philanthropy of our God-given leader, the saintly Man of Peace—this civil war too would have ended in an amicable treaty of honourable inter-dependence between India and Britain long ago.

Sir, the League of Nations, having thus proved itself a failure, and become perverted from the philanthropic ideals of its noble-minded and generous-hearted Founder, President Wilson of the U. S. A., India has every reason to sever its nominal and farcical connection with it. Sir, I support the Resolution. (Applause.)

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab): Sir, the League of Nations never appeared to me as the dawn of the millennium as it appeared to my Honourable friend, the humanity loving Dr. Bhagavan Das, when the League of Nations was first established. Before the Manchurian crisis, or the Chaco crisis, or the latest Abyssinian disaster developed, it was very clear to me that the establishment of the League of Nations was the biggest fraud committed by the British diplomacy upon the world. If any evidence were needed to prove my attitude towards the League of Nations as an institution it would be forthcoming from the fact that since my election to this august House in 1931, not a single year has passed in which I have not tabled questions asking the Government to withdraw from this League of Nations. It was in answer to my questions that a statement of the total amount of contribution so far made by the Indian Government to the League of Nations was laid on the table of the House, and it amounted to no less than 1,58 lakhs with an annual contribution of about Rs. 14 lakhs from our revenues. Sir, when after the close of the Great War the idea of collective security found favour, it was not with the intention of creating what was called a self-determination spirit in the countries, which were still subject to the Imperial Governments of Europe, but it was a sort of collective security for those big dacoits who had gathered together the loot, and appropriated, or I should say, misappropriated the various territories to themselves from Germany and other defeated nations. It must be said to their credit that this idea was clothed in a humanitarian form and laid before the public. I may safely concede that it was the greatest triumph for British diplomacy when they made India as an original member of the League of Nations. What was given to us was but a sentiment to which even a very shrewd gentleman like Dr. Bhagavan Das fell an easy prey, and the country began to praise the Government that India had become an independent member of the League of Nations, an original member of the League of Nations. But what was our real status? A Secretary of State sitting about 6,000 miles away from India was to nominate a few persons to represent us. Who were our representatives? Mostly Englishmen.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): Not quite true.

Sardar Sant Singh: Mostly Englishmen, I said.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Not mostly.

Sardar Sant Singh: If they were not mostly Englishmen, then it was those Indians, who were 60 per cent. Englishmen, who were nominated to these gatherings. And how did they vote? They voted at the bidding of the Secretary of State, not at the bidding of this House, or at the bidding of the country. This has been the shameful and disgraceful history of our connection with the League of Nations. We were there not to help in the humanitarian task of preventing war, but we were there to vote at the bidding of England so that English Imperialism might live. Are our revenues meant for that? Talking about the various activities of this League of Nations, I think, I had better quote from some of the books, rather than give my own views about it. Here is a quotation from a book called "World Politics, 1918-1936" by R. Palme Dutt:

"Three factors may thus be traced in the formation of the League of Nations. The first was the aim of the victor Imperialist Powers to maintain the fruits of their victory. The second was the aim of capitalism as a whole to maintain its threatened rule against the revolution of the subject masses and of the colonial peoples. The third was the aim to prevent or hinder future wars. These aims were in fact contradictory; and the subsequent history has brought out more fully these contradictions."

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

Here is a picture drawn by a writer, and a true picture it is, about the League of Nations. Let us take the latest history of the Abyssinian War. In the case of the Manchuria crisis, Japan could put forward some plea of justification as regards its aggressive policy in Manchuria. In the case of Chaco, some case was made out but in the case of Abyssinia no justification was possible? And what did the powers do? Fifty powers gathered together to protect the rape of Abyssinia. They hesitated and hesitated. And when did they make up their mind to apply the sanctions which are so much applauded? It was only when Mussolini sent troops to Libya and threatened Egypt that England jumped up and supported the sanctions. It was then that the Mediterranean fleet was collected. It was when the Imperial route to India through the Mediterranean and the Red Sea was threatened and was in danger of being interrupted that the British fleet was collected. It was then that the sanctions were given. May I ask the Honourable the Finance Member why he asked us to suffer the loss, which we suffered by applying those sanctions against Italy, about which in this year's budget he had lot to say? Sir, we are always made the victim. What did France do? She had one agreement with Mussolini and another agreement with Britain. Why did not Blum, as the Prime Minister of France, give any further sanctions against Italy? Because he knew that if he deprived Italy of this conquest of Abyssinia, Italian forces may turn upon France and conquer them. That was the reason and not any humanitarian idea that prevented them from bringing about that small pressure, called sanctions, against Italy. Subsequent history has shown that the continuance of the League of Nations as a power for collective security of the nations is a huge fraud and sham. Why should we pay for this fraud and sham? The League's failure is very well recorded in a paragraph in the *Round Table Journal* for the month of June. It says:

"All these truths have been abundantly vindicated in the history of the League of Nations. Few will contend that anything like a world patriotism or a European patriotism has yet emerged at Geneva, to overbalance the struggle for national

interests and security. Hardly any of the vital changes made since 1918 have been made through the League. Reparations and war debts were ended in effect by repudiation. Arms equality was taken by Germany unilaterally after she had twice left the Disarmament Conference and had resigned from the League because the League members had been unable to give her the arms equality she had been promised through their own disarmament. It was the same with the re-militarisation of the Rhineland. Germany could not allow the completion of the Franco-Russian pact of military assistance to pass without answer. She gave full warning of her strong objection to the diminution in her own security involved in the pact. Yet the League was unable to do anything to solve the Rhineland problem by agreement before the period of crisis arose. Nor has the League yet been able to make those frontier rectifications that seem to be indispensable to the relaxation of tension in the Balkans. The inability of a league of sovereign States to bring about that constant revision of the economic *status quo* which is manifestly necessary in the modern changing world is even more obvious. By far the most serious cause of present day unemployment, dictatorship, unrest, armament expansion and drift towards war is economic nationalism—the attempt of all sovereign nations, and particularly of twenty-six nations in Europe, to live in economic water-tight compartments, separated by unbalanced indebtedness, prohibitive tariffs, quotas, embargos and currency depreciation."

The League has failed in this long list of their activities. I ask why should we be paying for such a League? What is the idea behind it? What is the sentiment which should compel us to pay? The League of Nations has been nothing but a big failure and it has been demonstrated that the League of Nations may serve no useful purpose in preventing aggression. Abyssinia was a member of the League, and yet the powers would do nothing to protect it. This reminds me of the famous speech made by the Prime Minister of France, Mr. Blum, in the French Senate. I quote from memory but he said that if they contributed to the defeat of the Italians in Abyssinia, the prestige of the white man as against the black races would have suffered tremendously. Is that the idea for which the League is working and is that the idea for which we are paying? Do we want that bullets manufactured with the money which we have been contributing to this League, may pierce our chest. If India ever wanted to be independent, the League will be on the side of Britain and will utilise all its resources in crushing us and in massacring us.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: How will the League do it?

Sardar Sant Singh: I know that only two persons have benefited by the League, one is the British and the other is our friend, Mr. Joshi, who makes constant trips to Geneva. When I say that this League of Nations is going to be an instrument for strengthening our chains of slavery in India, I am not overstating the case. I am really feeling it. Sir, the sooner we finish our connection with the League the better for the country and better for humanity. In very plain language, this League of Nations is nothing but a sort of balance of power or alliance between European nations to maintain their Imperialism in the world today. We are not parties to it. Why should we be parties to the League of Nations. It is time that we reconsidered our policy and told the League of Nations that "you don't live for the Asiatic races and nations, but only for the European nations". If the European nations want it, let them contribute towards its maintenance. We do not want it. Let the verdict of this House make this fact clear to the Government. So long as we allow ourselves to be a party to this big fraud and camouflage, so long we are not contributing anything to humanity. That is why we must tell Europe plainly that we stand in no need of this League of Nations. My submission is,

[Sardar Sant Singh.]

and I conclude by saying, that I really cannot understand why the Government of India have been making such huge contributions so long. Why don't they reconsider this question? Why don't they accept the advice of the people of this country and cease connections with this League.

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

Sardar Sant Singh: Now, Sir.

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

Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I am afraid, I am unable to claim an acquaintance with the intricacies of European foreign policy, which my Honourable friend, who has just sat down, seems to claim. I have no doubt that he thoroughly grasps the very difficult problems of foreign policy in Europe, but this much I can say, that I do not attribute to those great nations the callousness which he seems to impute to them.

An Honourable Member: How charitable and generous you are!

Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid: Will you kindly keep quiet?

An Honourable Member: Please address the Chair.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): On a point of order, Sir, can the Honourable gentleman say: "will you kindly keep quiet"?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member, if he is interrupted, should in the first place appeal to the Chair.

Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid: Sir, the Honourable the Mover was in your absence speaking in a language, which it was difficult indeed even for me to follow, and I am sorry about that, particularly, because, I fancy that he must have very cogently put his case, but by speaking in that language, which I am sure he could not help, he deprived us of the chance of following his arguments. My intervention in this debate is mainly due to the fact that I happened to have formed part of the Indian Delegation to the Twelfth Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva in 1931 (*Voices*: "Ah, ah!" "The cat is out of the bag").

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member need not take any notice of that.

Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid: I thus had an opportunity of gaining an insight into the working of that institution, of taking part in its deliberations and acquiring some knowledge and experience of the conditions in which the Indian Delegation functioned at that international assemblage. I am afraid, Sir, that the Resolution betrays a certain amount of pique, and a lack of appreciation of the true significance of our membership of the

League. The preceding speakers seemed to labour under the misapprehension that India's membership of the League is an imposition and a Machiavellian subterfuge of the British Government to promote its imperialistic designs. They have tried to make out that the Indian Delegation is, so to speak, tied to the apron strings of the British Delegation, and, generally, acts as its mouthpiece and as an automaton without any distinct individuality or independence of action or initiative. Well, such an interpretation of the functions of the Indian Delegation is completely at variance with the facts. With the exception of one British delegate, one only, whose inclusion was an asset to our Delegation, Sir Denys Bray, the entire delegation was Indian with an Indian leader and I believe that this has been the case with subsequent Delegations. In London, we foregathered and held discussions on the agenda with the League experts of the India Office. At Geneva, we maintained our separate entity. We used to meet the Empire delegations and as far as possible acted in a spirit of co-operation, but we received no instructions from the British Delegation. (*Voices*: "Question".) In matters of foreign policy, of course, the British Delegation took the lead, and this was only to be expected in view of the well-known fact that of the foreign policy of the empire, the British Government is our trustee. Our delegates were elected to the various committees, where we represented the viewpoint of our Delegation and of our Government, the Government of India. I recollect that one of us was elected chairman of the Bureau of the Assembly—rather unusual and coveted honour. The Committees explored problems of wide and varied interest, legal and constitutional, technical organisations, armaments, budgetary and financial, social and humanitarian, and political. The work of the Committees is even more important than the plenary session of the Assembly. Our delegates gain invaluable experience, and come into contact with the world problems affecting the peace and social welfare of the world. This, Sir, is a brief summary of the activities of the Indian Delegation. The social side is not unworthy of consideration. The delegation meets other delegations in the Assembly, in committees, and socially. Misconceptions and prejudices wear off, and the foreign countries learn to appreciate the fact that both intellectually and socially Indians are not inferior to any of them. This is a national propaganda, which is of immense value to our relations—intellectual, commercial, social and political with other countries—and this is an aspect that should be kept in view.

Sir, a great deal of stress has been laid on the heavy annual contribution of India towards the League organisation. That this is a cause for genuine complaint on this score cannot be denied, and successive delegations have, at the behest of the Government of India, taken steps to agitate the question in the appropriate committee year after year. As a result of these sustained and unrelaxed efforts, the contribution has been reduced, though to a small extent, and may possibly be further revised to our advantage at no distant date. Sir, the Resolution suggests that India should withdraw from the League of Nations and discontinue payment of her contribution. The discontinuance of our contribution would be the inevitable corollary of our withdrawal.

To my mind, Sir, the Resolution is unfortunate. It has been sought to justify it on the ground of powerlessness of the League to thwart aggression and its failure to live up to its ideals and on the ground of

[Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid.]

financial economy. Our contribution is heavy, but a reduction has been made, as I have stated before, and a further reduction is possible. The Government of India, however, have themselves been, it must be said to their credit, fully alive to this fact, and their representatives have spared no pains to press home this point of view, but this is clearly no ground for withdrawal. To interpret our international status and obligations in a purely material sense would be unworthy of us. Other countries, which have withdrawn from the League, had other reasons for their decision. I hope, India will not present to the world the spectacle of a great country seceding from the League and forsaking its international activities and obligations on purely financial grounds.

Now, Sir, take the other ground—the League's ineffectiveness. No one will dispute the fact that the League has had bad failures and great defeats. The Abyssinian and Spanish imbroglions are the latest additions to a long list of disasters! But the League, on the other hand, has many triumphs to its credit. (Interruptions.) If this were not so, Soviet Russia, Turkey and Mesopotamia would not have recently joined and Egypt would not apply for admission to the League. Why have these countries taken this step? Sir, India is an original member of the League. The countries, I have mentioned, are the latest recruits and for many years since its inception have not belonged to it. Why then have they come into it now or wish to come into it? The answer is clear. They were or are anxious to crown their independent status by joining that international organisation of independent States and, despite the failures of the past, still rightly believe in its beneficent efficacy. It is true that India is not a fully self-governing country, but in the comity of nations she has been treated on that basis. She has been admitted to the League on a footing of equality, together with all self-governing dominions of the British Empire. Logically, admission to the League should have followed our acquisition of Dominion Status but the process has been reversed in our case. Our international status is identical with that of the fully self-governing countries. Our delegates come into contact with international statesmen, rub shoulders with them and collaborate with them.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra (Presidency Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Are you reading from a book?

Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid: I am reading from my speech. It would be the height of unwisdom to sacrifice an international position and status which ranks us with the free nations of the world and is pregnant with vast potentialities. If you leave the League once, it will not be possible for you to re-enter it easily.

Some Honourable Members from Congress Benches: We do not want to enter it.

Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid: It is not a sound policy to cut one's nose, to spite one's face and I beg of you not to do so. I feel confident that in approaching this problem the House will be actuated by no pettifying spirit but will be inspired by foresighted statesmanship.

[At this stage, Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai was crossing the line.]

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. No Honourable Member should cross the line between the speaker and the Chair.

(Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid resumed his seat.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Mr. James.

Khan Bahadur Sir Abdul Hamid: Sir, I have not yet finished my speech.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Another Honourable Member has been called upon to speak. Mr. James.

Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European): Sir, I listened with the greatest respect to the speech of my Honourable friend, Dr. Bhagavan Das. There is nobody in this House who is more greatly respected for his intellectual abilities and the probity of his character than the Honourable Member, Dr. Bhagavan Das. Therefore, anything that he says, particularly on a subject involving the question of international politics, is entitled to the greatest possible respect and I very much regret that on this particular issue I am not able to follow him all the way. I think, I detected in part of his speech a misconception of the League of Nations, as an organisation, which is very widely current. I would like to remind him that the League of Nations is not a super-organisation. It cannot be any better than the member States of which it is composed. It is not a super-organisation which can impose its will upon the sovereign States, who are its members. I admit that one of the greatest difficulties, which the League of Nations has to face in pursuing its policy of collective security, is that the member States are not willing to surrender any portion of their sovereignty. I am one of those who believe that a complete system of collective security based upon a league of nations is impossible unless the nations of that system are prepared to surrender at least a part of their own sovereignty, and that is the very thing which the member States composing the League are today not prepared to do. May I, Sir, bring to the notice of my Honourable friend, Dr. Bhagavan Das, a quotation from a recent book by Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, the eminent historian, in which he makes this point in much better language, than I possibly can use. It is taken from Volume III of the History of Europe. He says:

"The League of Nations can be no better than the member States of which it is composed."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is now 4 o'clock 4 P. M. and the adjournment motion will now be taken up.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

ARREST OF CONGRESS LEADERS AND VOLUNTEERS IN DELHI.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali (Delhi: General): Sir, I move:

"That this House do now adjourn."

Mr. President, as you know, I am one of the least vocal members of the House, and I may also add that I am not given to an excess of emotion. The occasion for this adjournment would not have arisen but for the fact, that, unfortunately for the metropolis, it has been entrusted to the

[Mr. M. Asaf Ali.]

care of a pinch-beck Hitler. The Police Chief, who has been entrusted with the maintenance of law and order in Delhi, it appears, took it upon himself to demonstrate his power rather than the power of the British Government in Delhi yesterday. In fact clouds had been gathering for some time and I cannot do better than read out to you a passage from the National Call which has described the state of affairs as they existed a day before the 1st of April. Describing the preparations which were being made by the local Congress Committee for the observance of a hartal on the 1st of April as ordered by the Indian National Congress in order to mark the people's protest against the new constitution, the paper's reporter says:

"A regular tug-of-war, it is understood, is going on between the Congress and the local authorities. While the local Congress workers are organising demonstrations, exhorting shopkeepers and other businessmen of the city to close their premises and not to transact any business on the 1st April in accordance with the wishes of the All-India Congress Committee, the local authorities are leaving no stone unturned in persuading (*the reporter may easily have said 'in boercing'*) the shopkeepers . . ."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has not read the words of the report. Is that the wording of the report?

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: The actual wording of the report is "persuading" and I simply added my comment by saying "it might easily have been coercing." To continue the quotation:

"The local authorities are leaving no stone unturned in persuading the shopkeepers not to close their shops. In this connection a notice in Urdu and Hindi has been issued by the Senior Superintendent of Police, Delhi Province."

And then runs the language of the notice. This report goes on to say:

"Information has been received in the office of the Delhi Congress Committee that local police officials had been summoning business men, shopkeepers and Tongawallas to the police stations with a view to bringing pressure to bear on them not to observe hartal on the 1st April. Regular propaganda is also being carried on by the Senior Superintendent of Police through handbills and radio suggesting that business should not be suspended."

And here I have in my possession the various notices which were issued by the Senior Superintendent of Police and others whom the Senior Superintendent of Police or somebody else, who was in league with him, had persuaded to publish. Here are a number of notices which were put up, all intended to restrain people from pursuing in a peaceful manner what they intended to do, that is to suspend their business. And that was not all. On the 1st April, early in the morning I received a communication before eight o'clock that about a dozen or more arrests had been made in various parts of the city. That looked like an ugly situation and therefore I had to run down to the Congress office to see what was happening. Well, I was in the Congress Office, and this was at about eight o'clock. The first step that I took was to try and ring up the Honourable Sir Henry Craik. He was not up yet. Therefore I had to try some one else and before I could ring up the Deputy Commissioner or the Chief Commissioner, a noise was heard on the road and immediately afterwards somebody ran upstairs bringing this flag and this rod. It was really adjusted to a Congress car and had been torn down or rather knocked down.

The flag was torn by a policeman who trampled it under his feet (Shame) and this was done in the presence of the Senior Superintendent of Police. I immediately ran down to go and speak to the Senior Superintendent of Police because the situation was becoming more and more ugly. Thousands of people were going about in the streets and this incident was taking place in the presence of these people. It might have infuriated any person into committing any act of violence. We could certainly control hundreds and thousands of people, but we could not control every one. It was impossible for us to do so. The police were making our task more and more difficult by these acts of provocation. This was not a single act. Other acts of similar nature were reported to me that morning. However, I went straight up to the Senior Superintendent of Police. Unfortunately for me I did not know him and he did not know me. So I had to introduce myself and tell him who I was and without any courtesy, or politeness or exchange of greetings, I was just told, "Well, what do you want us to do". He was saying something to that effect. I told him that these acts on the part of the police were provocative and that the people were perfectly peaceful and therefore the police should not interfere with them and that as things happened the situation was becoming more and more ugly and that I intended ringing up the Honourable the Home Member.

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): What was the name of the Superintendent of Police?

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: I think that gentleman must be somewhere about the premises of this Chamber. If you look round, you may find him.

Sardar Sant Singh: Was it not Mr. Scott who was connected with the beating of Lala Lajpat Rai? (Shame.)

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: I believe he is the Officer. I went up to him and told him the whole of this affair. He turned to me and was going to say something when his orderlies charged the people who were standing at a distance of about a hundred paces and the Senior Superintendent's attention was drawn to this. I also had to go and pacify the people and tell them to go away. Then I came back. In the meanwhile another thing happened. I am just giving you, Sir, unvarnished facts without the least embroidery or exaggeration. I am just giving the exact facts and nothing more. At the time I was speaking to the Senior Superintendent of Police a number of national flags which had been entrusted to one of the Congress volunteers had been wrested from this volunteer and were thrown on the ground. When I was talking to the Senior Superintendent of Police, he said, 'Look here, I do not want these flags. If you want them you can take them away'. They were all lying on the ground. This was not a solitary incident. As I said this was done in different parts of the City. When the Senior Superintendent of Police was watching or was not watching, I do not know, the tearing down of this flag took place. This flag was knocked off the bonnet of a Congress car and if the House likes, it can see how it is torn. My Honourable friend, Mr. Thorne, could satisfy himself by examining this flag, as to how it was torn. It must have been knocked off with a blow. Howsoever it was done this flag was lying on the ground and it was trampled upon by the orderly of the Senior Superintendent of Police. The Senior Superintendent of Police was there and it is for him to say whether he saw it or

[Mr. M. Asaf Ali.]

did not see it. At any rate this was done at his instance, or at least the flag was removed at his instance. However this is one of the many incidents. Another boy was carrying a flag. This orderly of the Senior Superintendent of Police snatched that flag from the hand of this boy and trampled it under his foot. All these, I submit, Sir, were acts definitely calculated to provoke people who were standing round this flag. This morning Mr. Thorne very complacently said, "I do not know why this should be considered a matter of public importance". Mr. Thorne does not seem to know up to this day that not less than 20 millions of people walked behind this flag to the polls and returned more than 750 candidates to various Legislatures who might have held the portfolio which he seems to hold now and who might have ordered the flying of this flag from every Government building, in fact from every house possible. (Hear, hear). Therefore it is a matter of public importance. Sir, it is this flag for which hundreds have given their lives, nay thousands have died (Applause), this is a flag under which a majority of the people of India are prepared to walk to the gallows, if necessary. (Applause.) If you have not got the decency to respect the feelings of the people who honour this flag the sooner you get out of this country, the better.

There is one other incident to which I must refer. Unfortunately the time at my disposal is very short. That is the incident of the lady worker, one of the most respectable Congress women, one of the most energetic of our lady workers. (Applause.) She was insulted, in fact, I think she was assaulted in an indecent fashion. Two Europeans, I do not know who they were, had the audacity to lay their hands on this lady's shoulders (Shame), they actually tore her blouse. (Shame.)

Some Honourable Members: What cowards.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: This is an outrage *in excelsis*. No Indian can possibly stand an attack of this kind by any one, whoever, he may be, least of all by foreigners who pretend that they are civilised human beings. I hope, Sir, this House will be satisfied with the plain, straightforward and unvarnished account of the facts I have given to them and that this motion will be carried. (Applause.)

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

"That this House do now adjourn."

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): Sir, the mere statement of facts put before this House by my Honourable friend, Mr. Asaf Ali is sufficient to indicate the depth of depravity to which the powers-that-be can go under certain conditions. It is impossible to conceive for me that officers who misbehaved themselves so ignominiously yesterday when the demonstrations were going on have done all these things in the presence of their superior officers without feeling confident that these things would be applauded, appreciated or at any rate will be connived at by those who were standing behind them, that is their superior officers. And why was it so? What was the occasion for them to make an exhibition of their temper, to show such pettiness of mind like that? Possibly the very idea which brought the demonstration into existence

was troubling their minds. The demonstration was, as you know, intended to register the nation-wide protest against the inauguration of a constitution which was not wanted by the nation. It was thrust upon the people in spite of them and the demonstration was intended to register their protest. This attitude of the nation naturally had its reactions on those who wanted to thrust it upon us, and the officers who misbehaved were representatives of that reactionary bureaucracy which wanted to thrust this constitution upon us. But they must remember that they were responsible for the maintenance of law, order and peace in the country. In fact that is the pretension which they always put forward in justification of all the enormities, indefensible and unjustifiable, perpetrated by them from day to day.

Now, any police officer who has the slightest experience of managing big demonstrations or attending big processions could have easily conceived that it is not easy to keep the mass mind under control if an extraordinary provocation is given to them. And if there had been the slightest retaliation on the part of any of those who were in the mass there or in the demonstration, they would have a right to say, "Here are those who are pledged to peace and non-violence, and they have done this and that", and so on. Was this kind of misconduct on the part of these officers due to an innate desire on the part of the authorities that the non-violent attitude of the masses should not continue and there should be some kind of violence which might provide them an excuse to wreak further vengeance upon them? Was that the inner motive of these persons? Is there the slightest attempt on the part of persons on those benches to deny the facts given here? Even if they deny them, it is no use. There are persons who have seen these things perpetrated before their very eyes. There is my Honourable friend, Mr. Asaf Ali, himself who was present when these brutal things were perpetrated. The flag was trampled under foot. You may not call it a national flag because you do not admit that India is a nation at all. You are prepared to owe allegiance to some other nation and you greet over and pay your salutation to that flag. But you must at least know as responsible administrators of this country that there are lakhs and crores of people who regard this flag as a symbol of all the best aspirations of this country. It is this flag they look up to and they hope to instal this flag one day upon the pedestal of their powers. That is the attitude of the whole nation towards this question. Is the fact not known to the Honourable Members on the Treasury Benches or their agents who work outside under their orders that there has been a flag *satyagrah* in this country when hundreds of people from all parts of India flocked to the city of Nagpur to protect the honour of the flag? It was in fact the first important *satyagrah*, the first important civil disobedience movement in which the spirit of civil disobedience became manifest. That agitation by itself should have convinced Government, if they had cared to read aright the sentiments which move the people of this country and the aspirations which are beating in their hearts, that the flag is not for the people of this country a mere rag with three colours in it, but it represents to them the embodiment of their future hopes and prosperity and the status which this country is to have in the comity of civilised nations hereafter. The flag represents to them all that; and when you insult that flag you treat the popular aspirations and the popular ambitions and sentiments with contempt. It is fortunately due to the teachings of that great man that even under a provocation like that this big mass that was gathered there took it calmly

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

lying down and nothing untoward happened. I think if I had been there and had seen that police officer do such a thing in my presence, had he even been ten times as high as I am, I would have kicked him there and taken all consequences, thereby showing him that no treatment of that kind can be tolerated by any Indian worth the name. I really wonder how my friend, Mr. Asaf Ali, succeeded in keeping all these gentlemen under control in the face of a provocation like that. Credit for that is all due to that great saint who is living in Wardha and preaching the gospel of non-violence credit is not due to the order that you keep with the little band of police officials who move there. The credit is not due to them but to the deep lesson of non-violence which has been engraven in the hearts of the Indian people through the teachings of that great man who is dedicating his life not only to the service of this land but to the service of the whole of humanity.

After this flag incident, when I come to the story of the molestation to which a respected lady worker of this town was subjected, my voice shakes with indignation. Have these Englishmen not even the least sense of chivalry in them? One thing which they said in this country was that Indians lack in chivalry because they do not take their wives with them and parade them in the streets. But where was the chivalry of these people when they laid their profane hands on the shoulders of this lady worker, who would have willingly submitted to be taken to jail or even to the gallows? She was pledged to the creed of non-violence and there was no trouble in arresting her when she did nothing against your order or against your law. If they say there was resistance on her part, a thing which we have not heard up to this time, I shall not believe it, because I know the lady. I have seen her working in this city for years. I know what a respectable and unselfish public worker she is. When at the time of arrest hands were laid on her shoulders and she was shaken like that, it was too much for any one to put up with. And when these things are brought to the notice of this House, instead of giving a promise to consider patiently what we have to say, childish attempts were made to raise technical objections to hush up the discussion. No sense of decency, no sense of ordinary courtesy or politeness on their part seems to have remained. They are so much carried away by their sense of prestige to protect people who work under their orders outside that all their sense of decency and courtesy and politeness seems to have vanished for the time being from their minds. Tickish objections were raised and the result was that there was a terrific outburst from my Honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition who is very seldom excited. Today when on a subject like this when lakhs of people are feeling over this thing and an attempt was made to hush it under some technical plea, even that cool-headed politician who sits there day in and day out was at once excited and made an excited reply which I have not been used to hear from him for many years. You can imagine, Sir, therefore, the depth of popular feeling, to what extent the people are feeling the indignities to which the members of the demonstration were put that day; and what was the occasion? Why were efforts being made by the Government, as my Honourable friend, Mr. Asaf Ali, has shown, counter-efforts to dissuade the people from not observing the *hartal* in the way in which they were minded to do it? What was the idea behind these things? Why were you coming in the way of people exercising their judgment and regulating their

conduct in accordance with their own idea, so long as they did not break any law of yours? Your responsibility, in my opinion, is to see that laws are not broken by the people. To that extent you will be justified in restricting their liberties. But so long as they want to keep within the limits of the law and take upon themselves the responsibility of observing peace and order, there is no justification whatsoever on the part of Government or their officers to come in the way of the people's activities and to take up the work of counter-propaganda. The thing was going on for a day or two previous to the demonstration—that has been brought to our notice. I really congratulate my Congress friends who were in the demonstration—I was not in the demonstration yesterday unfortunately, because I had been called to perform another duty in the village of Panipat, where some other things had occurred—but when I came back and learned of all these things, I was really congratulating these men for having observed an exemplary attitude of neutrality and patience in the midst of provocations when an ordinary man would have cut away and taken to violence naturally. Government must thank Mahatma Gandhi, thank the National Flag which their servants had the profanity to trample on, for it saved them yesterday and it saved the people: it is that flag which will save you hereafter and this country also. With these words, I support the motion for adjournment.

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhamadani Rural): Sir, I have heard with rapt attention and with a sense of shame the description of the outrage which Mr. Asaf Ali has given to this House. I would ask every European gentleman here what he would have done if an Indian had treated their national flag in this way. I would ask whether they would not have brought out their machine guns to slaughter unarmed people there wholesale, raid houses, insult women and show their respect for the flag. Here, unprovokingly, non-violently a procession, a most constitutional procession, to show their indignation at the forcing of these reforms on an unwilling nation, was going on, and the myrmidons of the Government who are paid by Indian money to keep peace go and insult the flag of the nation—a nation not of a handful of men, but a nation of 350 millions who could if they willed destroy the whole fabric in a moment, but who are placing themselves under the guidance of the best of human beings, the leader of the human race, who has been preaching in season and out of season for peace and for non-violence all over the world: and today in this House we have to hear this outrage without being told by this time that that officer has been sacked, that that officer has been turned out the officer has been punished.

An Honourable Member: He will be promoted.

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: Yes. I know. We in Bengal experience these things, and to us it seems to be mere pin-pricks: we have been accustomed to this sort of insults; and today simply because all these hundreds and thousands of our young men are passing their days in jails, we do not at this moment want to send our young men in Delhi to jails. Our leaders have been showing the greatest composure even under the highest provocation and we have simply to pass a vote of censure. Whom shall we pass a vote of censure on? Have the British Government that sense of delicacy, that sense of decency, that sense of self-respect, that a vote of censure would mean anything to them, would improve them, would improve their morals? I am ashamed that here we have our European friends who would not come with us to vote for a censure. Why?

[Mr. Amarendra Nath Chotopadyaya.]

Does not this outrage deserve their support? Do they feel that Europeans have a right to trample down upon our national flag? Do they feel that Government is justified in dishonouring our national flag? If they do so, they had better say so in plain language. If they do not vote on this motion with us, we shall know that they have lost their manhood; they have lost their sense of self-respect, they have lost what made them great and naturally they will be cowed down by a Mussolini in Italy or a Hitler in Germany. I believe that instead of placing this description here with such high feeling, Mr. Asaf Ali's dead body would have spoken far more feelingly if he had stood there and laid down his life for maintaining the prestige and the respect of the flag. We should have had one life less—and that would not have mattered much: we would have lost one life but we would have gained the whole country. But the whole thing is being controlled by one man: that one soul pervades the whole of India today; and the bravest man, the most courageous man, the man who could lay down his life at a moment's notice, feels the efficacy of patience. 350 millions of people have to be educated, and I will say that this kind of outrages only serve to test the progress of our struggle, of our nationalism and of our patriotism. I know there were young men, young women in the procession who could have laid down their lives for the flag, but they did not. Sir, I appeal to this House in the name of all that is sacred, in the name of all that is noble, that they should pass this vote of censure unanimously, because the Government have failed to take any steps against the offending officials who committed this outrage. If the Government had communicated to this House that they had taken suitable action against the offending police officers, I am sure this House would have been spared of this censure motion, but no, the Government did not care to take any notice of the mischief done by their police officers. I hope, Sir, this House will pass a vote of censure with a majority, the like of which it had not seen before.

Maulana Shaukat Ali (Cities of the United Provinces: Mulanmadan Urban): Sir, I think it is my duty to intervene in this debate, but before I do so, I want to make my position very clear. Every one knows that I was present here yesterday instead of joining the procession as a protest against the new Reforms that have been forced on the people of this country. Some of us had decided to get the best out of these reforms, and, in accordance with that decision, I came here. Sir, I have got the courage of my convictions; I have been an old Congress man. I left it when I found that it would not satisfy us. I have fought against the Congress, I had stood out in the Bombay City when the Civil Disobedience Movement was at its height and people wanted to boycott. I have seen English girls and women being laughed at when they went to buy chiffons or a bit of silk from Whiteaways by a jeering crowd of Indians. I had to stand up against my own brethren and fight them. They are my old friends and co-workers, and I am looking forward to the day, sooner or later, much sooner than later, when we shall again be working hand in hand for the advancement of our country. Sir, I had taken no part in yesterday's procession. When some people asked me for my views, I advised Muslims not to join in the boycott. I have done all that, and yet I feel it is my duty to speak out when I find that incidents have happened and facts

have been clearly placed before the House which make one's blood boil. I have been carefully listening to every word that Mr. Thorne was uttering this morning, and I think he practically gave a very fine certificate to the whole body of Congress workers in the Delhi City when he said that it was a very orderly procession. Now, he must either accept the facts as stated by the Mover or deny them. The whole House wants him to speak out and to let them know the real facts. If the facts are as stated by my friend, Mr. Asaf Ali, then the whole House should unanimously censure this Government and ask them to express regret for the unfortunate incident and punish those who were responsible for misbehaviour. I know Shrimati Satyavati Devi,—she is a lady worker of honesty, and character. She was perfectly willing to be arrested. I have myself been a prisoner. All people know that my brother and I have been prisoners. But as long as people were courteous to us, there was no trouble. There was no chance of my running away when there was a warrant issued for my arrest; also, because of my size, I am incapable of running away and evading the arrest; but if, unnecessarily, people wanted to pull my beard or my ears, I would never have hesitated to hit them back. Sir, in this case, this respectable lady worker was perfectly willing to be arrested, and, therefore, it was the duty of the Government and of those who were responsible for law and order to see that she was arrested alright and courteous treatment was accorded to her. When she was perfectly willing to be arrested, where was the justification for assaulting her in the manner the police officers on duty did. That a young, respectable public worker like Satyavati Devi, should have been roughly handled by police officers, especially when she was perfectly willing to be arrested, is a perfect disgrace for the Government. I appeal to the Government to see that there is no repetition of such incidents. By all means they could have taken strong action if any attempt were made by those who were arrested to run away or to resist arrest. But in this case she was perfectly willing to be arrested, and yet she was treated in a manner,—I don't want to use strong language,—which no self-respecting Government would allow its servants to practise. I hope Mr. Thorne will be able to place all the facts before the House, and that he will take action against the offending over-zealous police officials in a manner which will do credit to his Government. Sir, I do not know what is in store for this country, I do not know what will happen to this country, if we go on in this mad way. I do not know that—God alone knows best, though day and night five times in a day I, as a humble sinner pray for the deliverance of this country,—my mother and younger brother both died with the same prayer on their lips. They expected to see a change in the country before they died, they expected India to be a free and independent country, but they were disappointed. Sir, I have many friends on that side (official benches), but if their subordinates misbehave and insult the public, especially when the procession was perfectly orderly, if they lose their head and get excited for which there can be no justification, I think Government must punish those people who have misbehaved with a heavy hand so that it may serve as an object-lesson to the entire police force.

Mr. J. A. Thorne (Government of India: Nominated Official): Sir, I wanted to intervene in this debate, because I was expecting some facts to be adduced in support of this motion. I fear, Sir, that we have gone

[Mr. J. A. Thorne.]

astray from the precise terms of the motion, but may I remind the House of its terms? To be fairly accurate, there is one quite specific incident—rough handling a respectable Congress woman by two European policemen; another incident or set of incidents is fairly specific,—deliberately insulting the National Flag; and the rest of the motion refers to the misbehaviour of certain officials of the Delhi police force generally, and acts of grave provocation calculated to disturb a peaceful demonstration by the citizen of Delhi. Well, Sir, the only speech which has adduced any facts is that of my friend, Mr. Asaf Ali, and I think I should be correct in describing his speech as more sensational in manner than in matter, and I am still rather at a loss to make out what case the Government have to answer. (Laughter from the Congress Party Benches.) However, I shall try to tell my humdrum story, and I fear, or shall I say? I hope, I shall not be sensational either in manner or in matter.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Manner we see that.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: Well, Sir, it was known for some time before the 1st of April that a demonstration would be held in Delhi. Meetings were held and some intemperate speeches were made, but I do not wish to lay any stress on that. The attitude of the Congress was defined in, as I said this morning, a peaceful and conciliatory fashion. I will read, for instance, one communication from the Delhi Provincial Congress Committee. "The Delhi Provincial Congress Committee has once more to notify to its subordinate committees and the general public that suspension of business should be voluntary, that is to say there must be no molestation, no intimidation or anything of that kind". I should perhaps mention that there was a little, not a very powerful, sting in the tail of one of these communications, and that was to the effect that all those who still believe in police protection should refer back to the past to the amount of the protection they actually received. Well, that is rather an ambiguous remark, but it does, I think, slightly take away from the generally peaceful intimation of the Congress's intention. Now, Sir, the Chief Commissioner in view of these developments,—if I may quote his own words:

"After consulting the District Magistrate and Senior Superintendent of Police, I decided that prohibitory orders were unnecessary. No processions or meetings were prohibited. But I gave clear instructions that molestation and intimidation were to be suppressed firmly and promptly, and reminded the District Magistrate and the Senior Superintendent of Police . . ."

if I may paraphrase his words,—of their powers and duties, in particular under section 7 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1932, which refers to molestation of persons in the pursuit of their ordinary avocations. That was the situation before the 1st April. As for the incidents of yesterday which are considered to be derogatory or unworthy of the administration, I have still to rely on the text of Mr. Asaf Ali's motion and such statements as he made in support of the statements therein. The first of these is the rough handling of a respectable woman by two European policemen. I cannot help feeling that there must be some misapprehension as to what actually happened. (*An Honourable Member on the Congress Party Benches:* "No.") Well, Mr. Asaf Ali,—I made a note of his words at the time—said that this lady was "assaulted in an indecent fashion by European police officers who tore her blouse off." I agree that, if that had happened, not only Mr. Aney's blood would boil, but I may say that of

every gentleman in this Assembly. But I cannot, as I said, believe that this statement—which is made for the first time in Mr. Asaf Ali's speech—has any foundation.

Sardar Sant Singh: May I ask . . .

Mr. J. A. Thorne: I cannot give way.

Sardar Sant Singh: On a point of information, Sir . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): No interruption will be allowed.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: As I said this morning we are handicapped for lack of newspaper information. My Honourable friend, Mr. Desai, who for some reason is rather amused at that—professed to read from the *Statesman's* account this morning; but not very accurately. I will read the very words of the newspaper's account:

"She said she was passing near the Delhi Cloth Mills in the morning when one of them (one of the two policemen) held her by one shoulder and the other by her other. She pointed out to them that they could arrest her, but had no right to touch her."

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: That was an assault and an indecent assault.

Mr. J. A. Thorne: I leave it to the House to decide whether that very unsensational account, which I understand to indicate that she considered that the technical requirements of an arrest were exceeded, that is to say, she was referring to the terms of section 46 of the Criminal Procedure Code, —whether that is compatible and reconcilable with Mr. Asaf Ali's description. Sir, I have here a statement made by the officer responsible, and I hope I may be permitted to refer to that:

"The Assistant Superintendent of Police and the Traffic Inspector arrived at the above place and found a large crowd collected. It was attempting to dissuade employees inside to abandon work. A few policemen had already been posted there and with their help the crowd was cleared to one side to allow free access and exit to and from the works. About two minutes later Shrimati Satyawati accompanied by Birla millhands and others arrived and came right up to the gate."

What follows I will not read because it may prejudice the trial. But the gist of it is that the Assistant Superintendent of Police considered that she had committed an offence and found it necessary to arrest her:

"The crowd swarmed round on both sides and there was the possibility of an ugly scene. The Assistant Superintendent of Police laid his hand on her shoulder and told her that she was under arrest. On this some of her followers ran forward and the Traffic Inspector placed his hand on her shoulder and indicated that she should stand near the gate until a police lorry should arrive from Subzi mandi. She told him not to touch her and he left her alone. The crowd was then quietly pushed back but portions commenced to throw brickbats. The police party was a small one and no further action could be taken until a lorry with a small reinforcement of police arrived. Meanwhile the crowd continued to stone the police. On the arrival of the lorry the crowd was pushed back to a distance of 150 yards and the prisoners were taken away in the lorry."

That statement gives the correct facts and it corresponds to the lady's own statement so far as we know it. I do not think that the circumstances are such that a very great deal of passion should be aroused upon the facts as they have happened.

Now, Sir, the next reference is to deliberately insulting the National Congress Flag, and here we have Mr. Asaf Ali as an eye-witness. I listened with attention to his speech and I found it extremely difficult to find what precisely Mr. Asaf Ali saw with his own eyes; what he saw, what he presumed to have happened from what he saw after it had happened, and

[Mr. J. A. Thorne.]

what he did not see at all. However, may I refer to a statement of the Superintendent of Police, who was on his way home after patrol at about 8-20 A.M. :

"I noticed a saloon car with a small Congress flag on the bonnet. There were other people about, one man with a Congress flag on a long pole and another with red flags. As there was a fair crowd about, I got down to enquire if there was anything the matter. Some patrolling police came up at the same time and I noticed the red flags lying on the ground. I ordered them to be left alone and removed by whoever owned them. There was a slight confusion in the crowd and they were possibly dropped. When the crowd cleared I noticed the small flag gone from the bonnet of the car. I cannot say how, as my attention was taken up by the confusion around.

Meanwhile Mr. Asaf Ali came up and demanded to know in an extremely overbearing manner why the police were acting in so provocative a fashion. He started to threaten to report me to Sir Henry Craik and to raise questions in the Assembly on the conduct of the Delhi Police and myself, telling me to be careful. I ignored his threats. The Deputy Superintendent of Police had meanwhile arrived and had moved on a portion of the crowd which had collected while he was arguing. No violence was used by the police, and on any ordinary day no notice would be taken of the incident."

I may say that, in conversation with me, Mr. Scott said that he recollected saying to Mr. Asaf Ali at that stage—"You too had better be careful", or something to that effect.

I did not understand Mr. Asaf Ali to assert positively that anything which might be interpreted as an insult to the Congress flag was done by Mr. Scott, or in his presence or with his connivance. But if the allegation is that anything of that sort was done by Mr. Scott or with his knowledge or connivance, I have his authority to say that it is untrue that the flag was removed at his instance or that it was trampled upon by his orderly; that it is untrue that his orderly dragged down the pole of the flag.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Does he deny?

Mr. J. A. Thorne: I have found it extremely difficult to make out what the assertion is. However, I submit that there is no case to meet. These are all the incidents that have been alleged; and Government cannot admit in any way that the officials of the Local administration have behaved in any manner other than one which does them great credit.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal: Landholders): Shame, shame.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That kind of expression cannot be allowed. The Honourable Member knows that.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I own to a considerable degree of surprise at the manner in which Mr. Thorne put forward his last plea that this Government cannot admit—I want you to note it—that this Government cannot admit that any of its officers acted in a manner so as to deserve censure. I should certainly have expected a gentleman in his position to have been more honourable and frank after admitting the facts than to put a gloss on them and attempt a defence of Government. It seems to me that none of the material facts have been denied by Government today and the House must remember the background of these incidents. This morning, a newspaper, not too friendly to the nationalists in this country, reported that throughout the length and breadth of this

country peaceful *hartals* have successfully taken place as a protest against the inauguration of a disgraceful subterfuge in the form of the Government of India Act of 1935, but added to that is the fact that three days before in the House of Commons, when Mr. Butler replied to a question as to the ordained *hartal*—if that expression has any meaning in it—he said: “Yes, the Government are aware of the ordainment of the Congress and Government are also aware that it is a method by which protest is usually expressed against wrong measures in India.” If that is what the Under Secretary of State said in the House of Commons, you can easily understand the desire on the part of those dressed in little authority in this land to be able to report that their apprehensions were incorrect, that it was a failure and that people hugged this great Constitution in this land. Without remembering that background, you cannot understand these incidents and you cannot appreciate them. I am quite certain that even Mr. Thorne, if he were the actor in this scene, would have judged very differently but he realised that you must dissociate the background, treat these as if they were two trivial incidents and lull this House into a belief that we are a set of fools and cannot understand the significance of these things.

We are of those who believe that the world will someday come to the recognition that force is not a method by which national disputes will be settled. Therefore, while they may have force behind them, they may laugh at us, pacifists, but I wish to live and hope to live until the laugh is turned against them when the great holocaust takes place next year or the year after or earlier than that in their own land. I hope they are waiting to see what it is not to disturb peaceful men but to respect them for not using the strength which they possess. That is a state of mind which it is impossible to bring home to the mind of men who had exercised undisputed sway, acted insolently for half a century and more. They cannot realise that sometime a tide in the affairs of men will come and that we shall demand the respect that is due to yourself in your own land and in other lands. It is a thing of which you cannot make light. Even if there were a single flag called the National Flag, it has more than mere political significance for us. They do not understand that. They cannot understand it. To them, after all, the Union Jack may be a matter of political independence. To us, the National Flag stands for something very much higher and for a very good reason. We are not yet free and yet in that flag we see not merely the freedom to come but the sign of the great peace by which the world will be ruled in times to come. To us, therefore, it is much more sacred than a political symbol, for which men may die and men may surrender. To us, it stands as a sacred symbol not merely of India but of the world to come but if they believe in machine guns, aeroplanes and every other engines of force, let them laugh, but let them also remember that we in this land are made of sterner stuff, that we have faith in what we do, faith in our methods and that we shall stand by them in the teeth of their laughter, until some day, their own contempt and their own laughter will be a canker in their own souls. The Congress Flag was taken off from the bonnet of the car of a Congress worker and the Superintendent of Police was idly looking on—that was the account he gave, but he was able to say no more. He does not and cannot contradict what our friend, Mr. Asaf Ali, has told us. We are told that he did not see it. I dare say, he did, but I would not judge about that. So far as I am concerned, I will say this, that so far as I am aware, a peaceful citizen of Delhi, a highly respectable citizen owning several shops in several parts of this City, came

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

to me two days ago for advice. The Assistant Superintendent of Police went to him and said: "Mr. So and So, are you going to close your shop?" He said: "Yes, why not?" "But why should you? You have the whole Police at your back." He said: "No, I wish to close it, because I wish to close it, and what face can I show to my countrymen, if I don't?" After all, there is such a thing as public opinion which in this country is regarded as oppression, the freedom to commit suicide, the freedom to commit traitorous acts. I take it that that is the kind of freedom which the police was out to enforce. Otherwise what was the need of all these cautions and posters, of all the military appearance and show against one of the most magnificent meetings that has ever been held in this city since the year 1919. Where was the need for that show of force? It is a matter of no consequence. They can maintain their force, but we will balk them of the pleasure of using it by the methods that we have deliberately adopted. Then comes the account which he coldly gave of the manner in which two men behaved—it does not matter to which race they belonged—it is a matter of no consequence to me. He would have known if he had only cared to inquire that she was the granddaughter of Shradhdhanand, a most respected citizen of this City and this land. She is a young lady who had been five times to jail, so that the police are not unaware of her antecedents in the national cause. This lady was not going to shirk or run away from any arrest. She was prepared for the consequences of her action which was undoubtedly misinterpreted, but that is for the Police Magistrate who tries it. Later on, two men, one after the other, put their hands on her and tried to keep her in that condition and it is seriously stated in this House that it is not an act of outrage. I dislike to put that question and I hate it, but he must understand that even if a hundredth part of that occurred to any woman in his land or, for the matter of that, to any Englishwoman in this land, then even the cold Mr. Throne would have been boiled up to a point where he would not have been able to make a speech. I confess the officials here have reached a stage where callousness is the rule of their life where others are concerned.

Sir, if this is the standard by which we are to be judged, we refuse to be so judged so that the two incidents, which are not sought to be justified so far as the facts are concerned, because in the one case there is no denial at all but there is a halting explanation and an absence of knowledge, on the part of whom?—these two incidents are there. Sir, the incident was reported to me immediately it occurred and I rang up Sir Henry Craik in response to the request of my friend, Mr. Asaf Ali. So far as what occurred between us is concerned, I won't tell this House because he is not present here, but I will say this in corroboration of what occurred that the incident was related to me in all its details at the very time, within a few minutes of its occurrence, from the Congress House itself. Whether it was represented to others or not I do not care. I think myself that the testimony of an Honourable Member of this House corroborated by another who was there within a few moments of its occurrence is worth a million times more than any statement of any other kind (Hear, hear.) If, therefore, other police-men in other cities did not insult women and did not tear up the national flag, it is not to their credit but it is to the credit, as my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, pointed out, to the spirit by which now moves this country, inspired as they are by the teachings of the great saint. (Hear, hear.) Sir, you must recognize that

the rarity of the instances is not because of their forbearance or kindness. In fact it is obvious from the manner in which the police in the City proceeded with their *agents provocateur* right through the City throughout the previous week, that they wanted blood, but they did not get a taste of it, and that is their despair. (Hear, hear.) It only shows that what they could not do, to their credit, they could do that, to their disgrace. Sir, I support the motion. (Loud and prolonged Applause.)

Honourable Members: The question may now be put

Mr. T. Chapman-Mortimer (Bengal: European): Sir, in the circumstances in which this House is discussing the motion now before us, it is perhaps natural that some Honourable Members should give a somewhat excited expression to their feelings, but I hope, Sir, that I may be able to follow the admirable restraint of the speeches of my Honourable friend, the Maulana Sahib and my Honourable friend, Mr. Thorne. I trust in anything I have to say, my Honourable friends opposite will recognize that we too have a case.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Who are you? Are we opposite to you? Are you the Government?

Mr. T. Chapman-Mortimer: I did not suggest that; I am not speaking for the Government. My Honourable friends here challenged the European representatives in this House, they accused us of a lack of chivalry, we have been called liars and dishonourable men, and other things.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Who said so?

Mr. T. Chapman-Mortimer: My Honourable friend there.

An Honourable Member: He did not say so.

Mr. T. Chapman-Mortimer: I beg your pardon, but he certainly said that we would be lacking in chivalry if we could not support this motion.

An Honourable Member: That will depend upon your vote.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Let there be no interruptions.

Mr. T. Chapman-Mortimer: Sir, I entirely agree with my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, when he says that this discussion is pointless and useless unless it is considered in regard to the background in the country today. Sir, the circumstances in which we meet tonight are without precedent possibly in the history of the world. In no other country, I believe, has there been such a situation, and coming as I have come recently from Germany, France and Italy and having seen something of what happens in other countries when ladies, however high in rank, do things which are against the Government of the day, I think, I know what I am talking about. Sir, I was in Germany, when a lady, a countess, was beheaded because she offended the Government of the day (Voices: "Oh, Oh!")—If Honourable Members will bear with me for one moment, —I will only say that, whereas in these other countries, you have seen acts of violence and abominations such as we have never seen here and I hope we shall never see here in spite of what my Honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, said, when he talked about a holocaust,—whatever that may mean. . . .

Mr. Shulabhai J. Desai: I meant "in Europe, in Western countries"; you ought to have understood it.

Mr. T. Chapman-Mortimer: I hope we may not see such scenes in this country. I entirely agree with him and other speakers when they say that the main reason for the peaceful conduct of processions and demonstrations yesterday is due to the action and preachings of Mr. Gandhi. (Hear, hear.) I entirely agree that Mr. Gandhi's teaching has contributed towards the peaceful progress from one state of affairs, where a country is governed by a bureaucracy, and by another country, to a state of affairs where that country governs itself. With that, I entirely agree, but I also suggest, and I would beg some of my Honourable friends opposite to consider this point, that, though I do not speak for the Government and, obviously, cannot speak for the Government, I do suggest that the Government of this country also deserves some credit. (Voices: "Oh, Oh, Oh, Oh, Oh!") Yes, they do! And, not only in this case, but in respect of a great many other matters as well. Sir, if the police and the Government were really as bad as some Honourable Members make them out to be, if they constantly put forward *agents provocateur* and mean to stir up strife in order that they may then put in troops or police to beat down innocent people who have been so stirred up, as it is alleged, surely they would have done all that. . . .

An Honourable Member: But they have done that over and over again!

Mr. T. Chapman-Mortimer: Not yesterday; we are discussing yesterday! (Laughter.) If they were really as bad as all that, if it is true that negligent officers are invariably called back quietly and warned without censure, things would have been different, and then there might be some substance in this motion, but I submit that when you consider this amazing situation in which we appear to have had only one small incident to talk about, that I suggest is a very remarkable thing, however much some Honourable Members may dislike what was alleged to have taken place. (An Honourable Member: "There are many others also".) We are not discussing others: I have not heard that suggested by other speakers. I come now to the second part of this motion where it deals with a deliberate insult to the National Congress flag. Well, Sir, I was not present, and I know nothing about the facts of the case whatever. (An Honourable Member: "Then don't talk".) I may know nothing about the facts of the case (Laughter), but I do know this, that, until the Congress Party can get the other parties in this country to agree as to what is or is not the national flag of India, they cannot claim that, however much they may admire the Congress flag, that flag represents anything more than the emblem of their own particular party and their friends. They cannot claim it as the flag of the Indian nation.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: It has behind it twenty million voters!

Mr. T. Chapman-Mortimer: But you cannot suggest that you are the "nation"? My Honourable friend cannot suggest that his is the only party in this nation? (Interruptions.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member should be allowed to go on. Honourable Members have made their own speeches, but they were not interrupted like this.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai: But, how can we otherwise take objection to a speech of this kind? How could we anticipate such a violent distortion of truth which we are being treated to, *viz.*, that this national flag does not represent the Indian nation. . . .

Mr. T. Chapman-Mortimer: I must really ask the Leader of the Opposition not to say that—he called me a liar, and I object.

Several Honourable Members: No, no, he has not said that.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has not used that word.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: "Gulity conscience". (Laughter.)

Mr. T. Chapman-Mortimer: If he did not actually use the word 'liar', he certainly implied that I was at the best a pretty cheap sort of chap. That is the least I can say. Nevertheless, in spite of what Honourable Members opposite may claim, there are parts of this country, which will shortly be within the Federation, where the Congress flag is not even allowed to be shown at all. (*An Honourable Member:* "Which is that part of the country?") Mysore, and there are no doubt other parts of the country. I am merely pointing that out to prove that you cannot claim it is more than a party flag.

Finally, I come to the remarks of the Honourable Member who sits behind me and who also comes from the same province that I come from. He charged the Europeans with callousness and as lacking in self-respect and that generally we had fallen very far from the standards and ideals of our forefathers. I emphatically deny that. I am just going to point out that Honourable Members cannot maintain that we are lacking in chivalry or in self-respect or in honour when you will see us voting as we shall do on this motion. As I have said, if ladies of whatever degree take part in public life, whether it is in Assemblies like this, where one is open to be called all sorts of names, or whether it may be in other spheres where they are handled by men, roughly as they suggest, or merely have a hand heavily laid on their shoulders, they do so at their own risk and they cannot in fairness claim to have all the benefits and advantages of what is known in mediæval language as chivalry. After all, women are sometimes rather difficult to deal with. We all know that. No woman is more difficult to deal with than a woman who is aiding and abetting law-breakers. (Interruptions.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member need not take notice of these interruptions.

Mr. T. Chapman-Mortimer: I say that when a woman comes into public life of that sort, she must do so at her own risk, and however much we may deplore what happened to her, I suggest that if you are going to make appeals to chivalry, then ladies must withdraw from the public arena and should confine themselves to their proper sphere. I oppose the motion.

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

Sir Cowasji Jahangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I am sure every one of us has listened to every one of the Honourable speakers with a considerable amount of attention and I may also say that every one of us wants to do the right thing. I was, therefore, very anxious to hear the Honourable Member who represents Government. The issues before us are not difficult to understand. We are not dealing with complicated questions of law. We are dealing with fairly simple facts and, having to deal with such simple facts, I consider that I am also capable of expressing an opinion. Now, Sir, there are two issues before us. The first issue is: Did a police man, it does not matter who he was, take a flag off from a private motor car and trample it under foot? That is the first issue. There may be difference of opinion as to whether that was an outrageous act, whether it was an amazing act, whether it was an act done in the performance of his duty, whether he was out to amuse the public roundabout,—there may be differences about that. But the issue is: Did he take off a flag which was on a bar as is usually stuck on the cars of Honourable Members opposite? Did he take off that flag and did he trample it under foot? Well, Sir, we have an Honourable Member of this House who says that he saw it done. (*Some Honourable Members*: "No, he did not say that.") I beg your pardon. What he said, then, was that the flag was immediately brought to him after this act had been done and he came down to investigate. I am now told that there are several eye-witnesses to this incident. The fact also remains that the message explaining this incident was conveyed to the Leader of the Opposition very soon after it is alleged to have happened. Well, Sir, the evidence that has been brought forward by my Honourable friend, the representative of Government, is that the officer denies that he ever took off that flag from the bonnet of the motor car or trampled it under foot or instigated such an action or saw such an act being done by any of his subordinates. Therefore, we have here a statement of facts corroborated by witnesses also who are outside this House and who are able to testify to it. But we have the denial of the officer who is accused. It is left to Honourable Members to decide as to whose word they will accept.

Now, Sir, as to the importance and the gravity of the offence. It may not be the national flag of my Honourable friends opposite. It is not my national flag. My Honourable friend, who has just spoken from the European Group, does not admit that it is a national flag but he must admit that it is an emblem respected by millions in this country today. (*Hear, hear.*) That is a fact that cannot be denied. If a Government officer or a non-official took a revered idol from a temple and threw it under foot and was accused of doing so and it was proved that he had done so, then I am certain every Honourable Member opposite would say that he had done a very indiscreet act, an act that must rouse the feelings of many who do not even profess the religion to which that idol belonged and it would certainly rouse the feelings of people who worshipped that idol. Therefore, those of us who do not worship idols cannot estimate the feelings of people who worship an idol. I think my Honourable friend does not really realise or has come to a proper judgment as to what other Honourable Members and millions of other people of this country feel when their sacred emblem—it may be only a piece of cloth—is treated in the manner they believe and allege it was treated. Undoubtedly their feelings would be roused. Now, Sir, we are passing through very critical

times, and I am sure we are going to pass through more and more critical times in the near future. I take it and I must admit that I cannot but come to the conclusion that this incident did take place. It may have been done on the spur of the moment, it may have been indiscreet. The officer who did it may not have realised what he was doing, but that it was done and that it did hurt the feelings of a large number of people is the conclusion I have come to. I would, therefore, appeal to my Honourable friends opposite to try and realise that in these critical times, such action on the part of their officers should be strongly condemned (Hear, hear), and unless that condemnation comes from Government, such acts will be repeated and will do more damage in the future than they have done today. We have seen in the past, and in our experience a great deal of bloodshed due to an indiscreet act perhaps of a Government officer, sometimes of a non-official, which roused the religious feelings of another caste or community. What appeared to a man to be an innocent act has been taken offence at by a whole community and it has been resented by a whole community and the resentment has taken the form of riot ending in bloodshed and a great deal of trouble. We have seen that in the past in ordinary times. But now if an act of this sort is to be allowed to take place without condemnation it is a very serious matter. Of course, my Honourable friends opposite may say that they do not believe that it has taken place and that the officer denies it. I would ask them to reflect a little bit over this question. But naturally I do not say that the officer in this case deliberately is denying something that he did. I am not saying that; but naturally he is inclined to give as good an explanation as he possibly can. That is only human. We have got to judge for ourselves. If there is strong evidence on this side that there was such an incident, it must be discouraged, that is the point, now and in the future. Sir, I have had experience of intimidation, by my Honourable friends to my right in the past. (Laughter.) I know very well what that intimidation means, and I know how it can be done and with what success it can be done, and also know how helpless the police can be when such intimidation takes place as a mass movement. I know that and I can quite understand the Government desiring to protect those who do not wish to be intimidated and I would be the first to complain on the floor of this House and in the public if any Government whether it be this or the future Government of Honourable Members sitting to my right, if they refuse to protect the people, men and women in this country, who do not want to be intimidated and who want to stand on their rights and who are forced by any organisation to do things they do not want to do, and I would expect a Government if it be the government of the opposite benches or of the benches to my right, to protect these people against any mass organization or intimidation. But that is a very different thing to an officer taking an emblem which is after all greatly respected by millions of people, from the bonnet of a motor car and throwing it on to the ground deliberately. Such actions do undoubtedly rouse the feelings of resentment. Well, Sir, in these circumstances, while strongly condemning the intimidation that takes place, knowing that it does take place and strongly condemning it—and having nothing to do with these *hartals* and not approving of these *hartals* with my Honourable friend, the Maulana, I cannot but say that any officer who acts like this ought to be taken to task and it ought to be seen to by the authorities that no officer in the future will take the liberty of so acting.

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

(Hear, hear.) Unless that is done, there will be more trouble in store for all concerned. I know that my Honourable friends will say that I am simply taking the word of my Honourable friend to my right against the words of the officer in question. I am not doing that. I am weighing things. I have never seen this officer. I have never heard of this officer, and I do not know anything about him. I have during my career met many excellent police officers for whom I have the greatest respect and I have nothing to say against this particular officer, I do not know him, but weighing all the evidence as I see it today, I have come to the conclusion that this occurrence did take place whether with his knowledge or without his knowledge, it did take place, and now is the proper time to condemn it. One condemnation of this sort may help a great deal in the future. (Hear, hear.) Let it be neglected, it will give encouragement to others to act in a similar way, condemn it straightaway and a great deal of good might arise. This is one of those questions on which, I, for one, am certainly not excited, my passions have not been roused. I desire to respect the feelings of others as I hope they will respect mine. (Hear, hear.) If my religious feelings are hurt, I trust my Honourable friends to my right will come to my rescue, just as if their religious feelings are hurt, if their sentiments are hurt, if they have a case, it is our duty to say so and give them moral support.

Now, Sir, as to the question of this distinguished lady worker in the Congress cause, may I say that I have seen in other parts of the world ladies who take part in politics being dragged by their feet and thrown out. I have seen it with my own eyes.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In which country?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: In England, in France, I have seen it. I have seen women treated, in a way my Honourable friends in this House would call, brutal. I am inclined to agree with my Honourable friend who spoke for the European Group that if ladies showed a desire to take part in politics, they must take the rough with the smooth and if this lady was a little roughly handled, she should not worry about it. But if she was ill treated unnecessarily, then I agree with the Honourable Member who spoke from the Government Benches that such treatment is worthy of condemnation. But it is not quite clear to my mind as to how she was treated.

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

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Leader of the House): Sir, my days in this country are numbered and so are my days in this House. I had hoped that it would be possible for me to get through my five years of office without intervening in a debate of this character. I had hoped to keep that record until the end, but I cannot allow the speech of the Honourable Member who has just spoken to pass without some comment from one who finds himself in the unenviable position of temporary Leader of this Assembly. My Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir,

appears to me to have based the whole of his speech on an entirely wrong assumption, and that has vitiated the whole of his argument. As I understood him, he suggested that the senior Superintendent of Police removed the flag himself.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: I did not say that. I said the allegation is that he may have done it, he may have instigated it or he may have seen it done by some officer of his own. That is what I said the allegation is.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: If that is so, it makes my Honourable friend's speech so much the worse. He says the senior Superintendent may have done this, he may have done that. It is alleged he may have done it, he may have instigated it, he may have seen it done. On what basis did he bring this charge against this officer? If my Honourable friend, Mr. Asaf Ali, had seen anything done, I should have been content to accept his evidence. But all that we have is hearsay evidence that there was some sort of a scuffle in which a flag was removed. There is no evidence whatever that the senior Superintendent removed the flag himself or saw it done or knew anything about the way in which it was done. These are the facts. The senior Superintendent has definitely denied that he knows anything about it. And I submit, Sir, that we on this side are justified in accepting that denial. There is no clear evidence as to what happened; and we all know perfectly well what different accounts are given of incidents that occur when there is commotion of this kind and when feelings are running high. We have heard something about eye-witnesses, but we have not been told who they are or what measure of credence can be attached to them.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Graduates of Cambridge and Oxford.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: So much for the incident of the flag. I am prepared to agree that, if this flag was wilfully removed by any officer of Government or any member of the police, that would have been a provocative act which at a time like this would deserve severe reprobation. But I submit, Sir, that there is not a scrap of evidence that that was the case.

As regards the case of the lady against whom undue force is alleged to have been used, that has been sufficiently dealt with by my Honourable friends, Mr. Chaman-Mortimer and Sir Cowasji Jehangir. As far as one can gather from such evidence as is available, it is a question of how long two hands were laid upon two shoulders. I think, Sir, it is perfectly clear from the lady's own statement that no undue force was used. As has been said in the course of this discussion, if ladies engage in politics they have to run the risks incident thereto.

I do submit, Sir, that we are in danger of losing perspective this afternoon, and I should like to bring the House back to reality. I think my Honourable friends opposite, small blame to them from their point of view,—have taken advantage of two small incidents; they may agree with me or not but they are two very small incidents. They have taken advantage of those two small incidents to raise a discussion varying over a very wide field, and I should like to bring the House back to

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

the terms of the motion. The terms of the motion are to censure Government for their action in regard to these two cases. I submit there is no justification whatever for that. Nothing has been established in regard to the senior Superintendent; and I am quite certain that at any other time than this when tempers are apt to be frayed and passions are high, the other incident would have passed without any comment of any kind or description. I submit, Sir, that far from Government or their officers deserving censure, they ought to be congratulated on their successful handling of yesterday's proceedings. (Applause.)

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

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

"That the question be put."

The motion was adopted.

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

"That the Assembly do now adjourn."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—61.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.
 Ahsan, Maulvi Muhammad
 Aney, Mr. M. S.
 Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.
 Ashar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
 Banerjee, Dr. P. N.
 Bhagavan Das, Dr.
 Chahliha, Mr. Kuladhar.
 Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra
 Nath.
 Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
 Das, Mr. B.
 Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
 Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
 Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
 Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
 Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.
 Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
 Gauba, Mr. K. L.
 Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
 Ghulam Bhik Naizang, Syed.
 Giri, Mr. V. V.
 Govind Das, Seth.
 Gupta, Mr. Ghanashyam Singh.
 Hans Raj, Raisada.
 Hosmaui, Mr. S. K.
 Ismail Khan, Haji Chaudhary
 Muhammad.
 Jodha, Mr. K. M.
 Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.
 Jogendra Singh, Sardar.

Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Kailash Behari Lal, Babu.
 Khan Sahib, Dr.
 Lahiri Chaudhary, Mr. D. K.
 Lalchand Navalraj, Mr.
 Laljee, Mr. Huseebhai Abdullabhai.
 Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
 Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.
 Mangal Singh, Sardar.
 Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
 Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi Qazi.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed.
 Pant, Pandit Govind Bhabha.
 Parma Nand, Bhai.
 Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhary.
 Rangas, Prof. N. G.
 Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
 Sant Singh, Sardar.
 Santhanam, Mr. K.
 Satyamurti, Mr. S.
 Sham Lal, Mr.
 Shankat Ali, Maulana.
 Sheodass Daga, Seth.
 Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Anagrah Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Shri Krishna.
 Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
 Sri Prakasa, Mr.
 Usar Aly Shah, Mr.
 Varma, Mr. B. B.

NOES—40.

Abdul Hamid, Khan Bahadur Sir.
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab
 Sir.
 Aikman, Mr. A.
 Bajpai, Sir Girja Shankar.
 Bansidhar, Rai Sahib.
 Bhide, Mr. V. S.
 Buss, Mr. L. C.
 Chanda, Mr. A. K.
 Chapman-Mortimer, Mr. T.
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.
 Ghuznavi, Sir Abdul Halim.
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.
 Griffiths, Mr. P. J.
 Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.
 James, Mr. F. E.
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur
 Sardar Sir.
 Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur
 Chaudhri.
 Lalit Chand, Thakur.
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
 Mackeown, Mr. J. A.

Mehta, Mr. S. L.
 Menon, Mr. K. R.
 Metcalfe, Sir Aubrey.
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya
 Charan.
 Nagarkar, Mr. C. B.
 Naydu, Diwan Bahadur B. V. Sri
 Hari Rao.
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
 Rau, Sir Raghavendra.
 Roughton, Mr. N. J.
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
 Roy, Mr. S. N.
 Sale, Mr. J. F.
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
 Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain
 Sardar Sir.
 Spence, Mr. G. H.
 Thorne, Mr. J. A.
 Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.
 Witherington, Mr. C. H.
 Zafrullah Khan, the Honourable Sir
 Muhammad.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Saturday, the
 3rd April, 1937.