

10th March 1941

THE

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

## Official Report

---

Volume II, 1941

*(28th February to 17th March, 1941)*

---

### THIRTEENTH SESSION

OF THE

### FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1941



NEW DELHI : PRINTED BY THE MANAGER  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS : 1941.

# Legislative Assembly

## *President:*

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

## *Deputy President:*

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

## *Panel of Chairmen:*

DR. S~~ER~~ ZIAUDDIN AHMAD, C.I.E., M.L.A.

MR. M. S. ANEY, M.L.A.

MR. L. C. BUSS, M.L.A.

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

## *Secretary:*

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

## *Assistants of the Secretary:*

MR. M. N. KAUL, BAR.-AT-LAW.

KHAN BAHADUR S. G. HASNAIN.

## *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.*

SYED GHULAM BHIK NAIRANG, M.L.A.

MR. L. C. BUSS, M.L.A.

SIR ABDUL HALIM GHUZNAVI, M.L.A.

SIR H. P. MODY, K.B.E., M.L.A.

FRIDAY 7TH MARCH, 1941—		PAGES:	MONDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1941— <i>contd.</i>		PAGES.
Member Sworn		1129	Motion for Adjournment re—		
Starred Questions and Answers		1129—36	Alleged neglect of the Doctors of the Irwin Hospital, New Delhi, for not giving Medical Aid to a Child—Leave refused		1199
Motion for Adjournment re Placing of certain Political Prisoners in Fetters and Handcuffs on their Transfer from Delhi Jail—Leave refused		1136—37	Treatment meted out to Mr. Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal in Gorakhpur Jail—Ruled out of order		1200
Election of Members to the Standing Finance Committee for Railways		1137	Treatment meted out to Mr. Garg of Ajmer—Disallowed		1200—02
Election of Members to the Standing Finance Committee		1138	Broadcasting of the News regarding the Ballet of Non-Official Resolutions—Disallowed		1202
The General Budget—List of Demands—			The General Budget—List of Demands—		
Demand No. 12—Executive Council		1138—44	Demand No. 12—Executive Council		1202—56, 1258
Reforms in Baluchistan Financial Policy with special reference to War Finance		1154—88	Appointment of a Defence Committee		1202—16
Importance of Propaganda in India's War effort		1178—88	Policy of recruitment to the Army, Navy and Air Forces in India		1216—30
Demand No. 56—Census—		1145—53	Grievances of Government Employees		1230—36
(a) Failure of the Government of India not to supply Urdu Forms; (b) Compulsion on Urdu knowing enumerators to submit Census returns in some Provinces by Census Charge Superintendents; (c) Neglect of Provincial Census authorities in filling up Census Forms; (d) High-handed action of some of the Provincial Census Officers in suppressing and violating instructions issued by the Provincial Census Superintendents; and (e) Deliberate attempts to minimise population of Muslim and other minorities and exaggerate Hindu Population			Repressive Policy of the Government		1237—56
			Demand No. 1—Customs		1256
			Demand No. 2—Central Excise Duties		1256
			Demand No. 3—Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax		1256
			Demand No. 4—Salt		1257
			Demand No. 5—Opium		1257
			Demand No. 6—Provincial Excise		1257
			Demand No. 7—Stamps		1257
			Demand No. 8—Forest		1257
			Demand No. 9—Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works		1257
			Demand No. 10—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)		1258
			Demand No. 11—Interest on Debt and other obligations and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt		1258
			Demand No. 12—Executive Council		1258
			Demand No. 13—Council of State		1258
MONDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1941—					
Members Sworn		1189			
Starred Questions and Answers		1189—92			
Unstarred Questions and Answers		1192—98			

	PAGES.
<b>MONDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1941—contd.</b>	
<b>The General Budget—List of Demands—contd</b>	
Demand No. 14—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department	1258
Demand No. 15—Home Department	1258
Demand No. 16—Legislative Department	1259
Demand No. 17—Department of Education, Health and Lands	1259
Demand No. 18—Finance Department.	1259
Demand No. 19—Commerce Department	1259
Demand No. 20—Department of Labour	1259
Demand No. 21—Department of Communications	1259
Demand No. 22—Central Board of Revenue	1260
Demand No. 23—India Office and High Commissioner's Establishment charges	1260
Demand No. 24—Payments to other Governments, Departments, etc., on account of the Administration of Agency Subjects and Management of Treasuries	1260
Demand No. 25—Audit	1260
Demand No. 26—Administration of Justice	1260
Demand No. 27—Police	1260
Demand No. 28—Ports and Pilotage	1261
Demand No. 29—Lighthouses and Lightships	1261
Demand No. 30—Survey of India	1261
Demand No. 31—Botanical Survey	1261
Demand No. 32—Zoological Survey	1261
Demand No. 33—Geological Survey	1261
Demand No. 34—Mines	1262
Demand No. 35—Archæology	1262
Demand No. 36—Meteorology	1262
Demand No. 37—Other Scientific Departments	1262
Demand No. 38—Education	1262
Demand No. 39—Medical Services	1262
Demand No. 40—Public Health	1263

	PAGES.
<b>MONDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1941—contd.</b>	
<b>The General Budget—List of Demands—contd.</b>	
Demand No. 41—Agriculture	1263
Demand No. 42—Imperial Council of Agricultural Research	1263
Demand No. 43—Agricultural Marketing	1263
Demand No. 44—Imperial Institute of Sugar Technology	1263
Demand No. 45—Civil Veterinary Services	1263
Demand No. 46—Industries	1263
Demand No. 47—Scientific and Industrial Research.	1264
Demand No. 48—Aviation.	1264
Demand No. 49—Broadcasting	1264
Demand No. 50—Capital Outlay on Broadcasting (Charged to Revenue).	1264
Demand No. 51—Indian Stores Department	1264
Demand No. 52—Emigration—Internal	1264
Demand No. 53—Emigration—External	1264
Demand No. 54—Commercial Intelligence and Statistics.	1265
Demand No. 55—Census	1265
Demand No. 56—Joint-Stock Companies	1265
Demand No. 57—Miscellaneous Departments	1265
Demand No. 58—Currency	1265
Demand No. 59—Mint	1265
Demand No. 60—Civil Works.	1265
Demand No. 61—Central Road Fund	1266
Demand No. 62—Superannuation Allowances and Pensions.	1266
Demand No. 63—Stationery and Printing	1266
Demand No. 64—Miscellaneous	1266
Demand No. 65—Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments.	1266
Demand No. 66—Delhi	1266
Demand No. 67—Ajmer Merwara	1266
Demand No. 68—Panth Piploda.	1267

MONDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1941— <i>concl'd.</i>		PAGES.	FRIDAY, 14TH MARCH 1941—		PAGES.
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>			Starred Questions and Answers		1341—58
Demand No. 69—Andaman and Nicobar Islands	1267		Unstarred Questions and Answer		1358—61
Demand No. 70—Indian Posts and Telegraphs	1267		Short Notice Question and Answer		1362—63
Demand No. 71—Indian Posts and Telegraphs—Stores Suspense—(Not charged to Revenue)	1267		Message from the Council of State		1364
Demand No. 72—Indian Posts and Telegraphs—Capital Outlay on Telephone Projects (Not charged to Revenue)	1267		The Excess Profits Tax (Amendment) Bill—Introduced		1364
Demand No. 73—Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour	1267		The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded	1364—1405	
Demand No. 74—Delhi Capital Outlay	1267		SATURDAY, 15TH MARCH, 1941—		
Demand No. 75—Commuted Value of Pensions	1268		Starred Questions and Answers		1407—23
Demand No. 76—Interest-free Advances	1268		Postponed Questions and Answers		1423—25
Demand No. 77—Loans and Advances bearing Interest	1268		Unstarred Questions and Answers		1425—32
TUESDAY, 11TH MARCH, 1941—			Statement laid on the Table		1433
Starred Questions and Answers	1269—83		The Delhi Restriction of Uses of Land Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee		1433
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1283—88		The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded	1433—80	
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Detention in "C" Class of Khwaja Khaleel Ahmad Shah, ex-M. L. C., United Provinces—Disallowed	1288—89		MONDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1941—		
Election of the Central Advisory Council for Railways	1289		Starred Questions and Answers		1481—1520
Statement laid on the Table <i>re</i> Home Department Declaration of Exemption	1289		Postponed Questions and Answers		1520—23
The Indian Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1290		Unstarred Questions and Answers		1523—31
Election of the Standing Committee for the Department of Communications	1290—91		Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Department of Communications		1531
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded	1291—1340		Election of Members to the Standing Committee for the Department of Supply		1531—35
			Election of the Standing Committee on Roads		1535—36
			Election of the Standing Committee for the Department of Labour		1536—37
			Election of the Standing Committee on Emigration		1537—38
			The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded		1538—77
			Statement of Business		1577—78

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Monday, 10th March, 1941.

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.

## MEMBERS SWORN.

Mr. Ramaswamy Ayyangar Gopaldaswami, M.L.A. (Government of India : Nominated Official); and

Mr. Venilal Tribhovandas Dehejia, M.L.A. (Government of India : Nominated Official).

## STARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

### (a) ORAL ANSWERS.

#### CERTAIN BOY FIREMEN ON NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY ELECTING OLD EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE RULES.

269. \*Mr. Lalchand Navhrai: Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the rules for educational assistance to railway employee's children circulated under Railway Board's letter No. 4233-E., dated the 26th September, 1930, provide that employees who joined service before 1st February, 1929, shall be allowed the option of electing old or revised rules;
- (b) whether it is a fact that some of the Boy Firemen who joined the North Western Railway service before 1st February, 1930, elected the old educational assistance rules and they continued to receive assistance under such rules till 1940, when they were told that as they were confirmed after 1st February, 1929, they were not entitled to elect old rules; if so, why;
- (c) whether it is a fact that some of the Boy Firemen who joined prior to 1st February, 1929, were confirmed prior to this date, but the orders of confirmation were issued afterwards to take retrospective effect; and why they are debarred from electing old educational assistance rules; and
- (d) whether it is a fact that certain Firemen on the North Western Railway have been asked to refund the educational assistance received by them during the last twelve months, and that recovery is being made through salary hills?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow:** (a) Yes.

(b) The answer to the first part is in the affirmative; as regards the second part, the North Western Railway's interpretation of the orders supported such action, but the matter is being examined.

(c) and (d). I have called for information and a reply will be laid on the table in due course.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** May I know, Sir, when it was distinctly given to understand that those who were appointed before the 1st February, 1929, could elect old or revised scales, what justification was there to allow the General Manager of the North Western Railway to depart from that rule, and not to follow it?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow:** The Honourable Member seems now to be arguing the case. It is not a question of allowing the General Manager not to follow any rule or practice. He put a certain interpretation, and the matter is being examined.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** Is that interpretation being examined?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow:** Yes.

#### JUDGMENT OF THE CHIEF COURT OF SIND CONCERNING REDUCTION IN PAY OF A RAILWAY SERVANT.

290. \***Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** (a) Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to state whether his attention has been drawn to the judgment delivered by Mr. Justice Weston of Sind Chief Court, published in the *Railway Herald*, Karachi, in its issue, dated the 17th February, 1941, holding that reduction in a railway employee's salary was in contravention of the Payment of Wages Act? What instructions have Government issued to the Railway administrations to stop such reductions? If none, why not?

(b) Do Government propose to refund all amounts illegally recovered from railway employees' wages by way of reduction in salary since the day the Act came into force? If not, why not?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow:** (a) and (b). I have seen the judgment referred to and its implications are under examination.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** Will the Honourable Member please say if there is any likelihood of that ruling being accepted by the Railway Department?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow:** The judgment of courts in respect of a case must be accepted; there is no alternative.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** My point is, if the Railway Department accepts the interpretation that reductions will not be considered under the Wages Act, then the other people will have to follow it. What lead is the Honourable Member going to give to the other people in this matter?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Clow:** I am not proposing to give any lead at present. The judgment is being examined.

**RECRUITMENT TO BE MADE ON BOMBAY, BARODA AND CENTRAL INDIA RAILWAY.**

**291. \*Bhai Parma Nand:** Will the Honourable Member for Communications please state:

- (a) the number of posts in (i) Junior, and (ii) Senior (including European) grades of the various departments, that is, Traffic, Goods and Loco. on Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway for which recruitment is to be made in the near future; and
- (b) the number of persons to be recruited, community-wise, in the aforesaid grades and in different departments?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** (a) and (b). I can furnish an estimate only of the probable recruitment to the gazetted grades in 1942. These are two Engineering officers, one Signal officer, one Locomotive officer, one Audit officer and five Traffic officers. The ordinary rules regarding communal reservation will be applied.

**PERSONS QUALIFIED IN T. 5 COURSES AT THE WALTON TRAINING SCHOOL, NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.**

**†292. \*Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways please state:

- (a) the number of persons qualified in T. 5 courses at the Walton Training School on the North Western Railway and awaiting promotions in each division;
- (b) how many of them are Guards, grade II;
- (c) how promotions are made in grade, class or category for which T. 5 course is prescribed: and
- (d) the percentage allotted in promotion for Guards grade II; if no percentage is allotted, the reasons therefor?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** (a) Lahore 14, Rawalpindi 5, Delhi 25, Multan 6, Karachi 16, Ferozepore 3 and Quetta 6.

(b) 68.

(c) By selection.

(d) There is no percentage allotted for guards, as this is not necessary.

**EAST INDIAN RAILWAY MINUTE SHEET CONCERNING TRANSFERS FROM ONE AVENUE OF PROMOTION TO ANOTHER.**

**†293. \*Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways please refer to the Minute Sheet No. A. E. 2460/8 of 2nd November, 1940, from the Deputy General Manager (P), East Indian Railway, Calcutta, regarding eligibility of Railway Employees for vacancies to be filled by direct recruitment which reads "the General Manager holds as a matter of general policy that staff should not normally be encouraged to apply for transfers from one avenue of promotion to another. It will be appreciated that such transfers are not in the railway interest. This order is not intended to debar officers from transferring staff from time to time from one group of staff or avenue of promotion to another

†Answer to this question laid on the table, the questioner being absent.



if in their opinion it is in the interest of the administration that this should be done" and state whether government propose to consider its harmful effect and rescind it?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** I have not seen the minute sheet referred to and see no reason to interfere in this matter.

#### CONCESSIONS TO RELATIVES OF RAILWAY STAFF BY BALLABHDAS ESWARDAS OF HOWRAH.

†294. \***Maulvi Muhammad Abdul Ghani:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways please refer to the circular No. 94, dated the 24th January, 1940, issued by Ballabhdas Eswardas, 12, Cullen Place, Howrah, to all Refreshment Room Managers and Inspectors, regarding free diet for refreshment room employees, which says, "Note (2) Relatives of the staff partaking occasional meals in the refreshment room at the expense of the staff may be granted 50 (fifty) per cent. concession on the bill under the signature of the Manager; (3) Extra should be charged at scheduled rates less 25 per cent." and state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that refreshment rooms are provided for the comforts and exclusive use of the travelling public; and
- (b) the reasons for not reducing the scheduled rates by 50 (fifty) per cent. for the travelling public?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** (a) Refreshment rooms are provided for the convenience of the travelling public, but are not ordinarily closed to others.

(b) The question implies that concession rates charged by an employer to his staff justify an all round reduction in charges for the public. I cannot accept that proposition.

‡295 and 296\*.

---

#### UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

##### MUSLIM AND NON-MUSLIM ESTABLISHMENT OFFICERS, ETC., ON STATE RAILWAYS.

106. **Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to state how far the undertakings given by the Government of India to the representation of Muslim Members of the Legislative Assembly in 1930, have materialised, and place on the table a statement showing Muslim and non-Muslim Establishment Officers, Office Superintendents, Head Clerks, Establishment clerks and Sub-Heads and Class 1 clerks (Accounts Department) on each State-managed Railway?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** A statement is laid on the table showing the action taken in respect of the undertakings given in 1931. In respect of staff other than officers, the Honourable Member is referred to Appendices O, Q, S and U of the D'Souza Report. As regards

---

†Answer to this question laid on the table, the questioner being absent.

‡These questions have been postponed to be answered on the 15th March, 1941.

officers, the latest statistics available in the Railway Board show the position in August, 1939, when the numbers of staff officers were as follows :

Railway.	Muslim.	Non-Muslim.
East Indian.	2	22
Eastern Bengal.	1	4
Great Indian Peninsula.	1	41
North Western.	4	15

## Undertaking.

## Reply.

- (i) The new rules for the recruitment and training of the subordinate staff should be issued without delay which would make adequate provision for the recruitment of members of minority communities.
- Rules for the recruitment and training of non-gazetted staff other than labourers and inferior staff and for apprentice mechanics and trade apprentices were issued in 1931. Subsequent issues of these rules lay down that in all cases the regulations issued in 1934 regulating communal representation in subordinate services should be adhered to.
- (ii) That the Railway Board would consider the suggestion to appoint one or two officers for a time to look after the interests of Muslims.
- After issue of Government's orders regarding communal representation in railway services, an additional officer was appointed in the Establishment Branch of the Board's office to assist the Board in watching the operation of these orders. This post was abolished in 1939 as a measure of economy but in view of certain complaints, the Board placed two officers on special duty to make a full and complete enquiry.
- (iii) That a review would be made of the posting of officers to duties connected with the recruitment, training and promotion of staff with a view to secure an adequate number of Muslim officers for such posts.
- Government are satisfied that the General Managers have done their best to secure adequate representation for the community within the limitations which exist and that any substantial increase in the extent of their employment on this work could only have been secured by steps which would have reacted on the experience and consequently the prospects of Muslim officers.
- (iv) That the suggestion regarding the appointment of two Muslim officers as Deputy Agents, Personnel, would be considered.
- There were seven Muslim Staff or Personnel officers in 1931, and 32 Muslim officers have actually held personnel posts since that date. There are no Muslims holding the post of Deputy Agent (Personnel), in a substantive capacity at present but one Muslim officer will shortly be appointed to such a post. One Muslim officer has held the post of Supervisor of Railway Labour, a post which has recently been transferred to the Labour Department where it is now held by a Muslim officer of the I. C. S.
- (v) That the suggestion to place Muslims in the posts of Office Superintendents or Head Clerks in the office of the Divisional Superintendents will be considered.
- As promotion is not based on communal considerations, the distribution of appointments in these grades must depend very largely on the communal distribution of the senior men in the ranks from which promotion is made.

## Undertaking.

## Reply.

- (vi) That with a view to securing the representation of Muslims in higher grades as far as possible, the suggestion made regarding direct recruitment to intermediate grades would be considered in respect of certain classes of posts.
- (vii) That Railway Administrations would be asked wherever possible to put a Muslim officer on Selection Boards.
- (viii) That steps would be taken to keep in touch with association and institutions and like committees of Muslim representatives and Heads of Moham-madan colleges and schools when dealing with subjects affecting recruitment of Muslims in the Railway services.
- (ix) That the position on the North-Western Railway would be specially examined in order to see whether recruitment rules could be varied in their application to it with the object of stimulating the recruitment of Muslims.
- (x) That instructions will be issued to Railway Administrations, if on examination, this course is considered necessary, to prepare statistics showing the communal composition of the staff in different categories as a guide to recruitment for future vacancies.
- Orders applicable to all State-managed Railways regarding direct recruitment to all grades higher than the lowest to the extent of 20 per cent. of vacancies were issued in 1937 and such recruitment to intermediate grades is also subject to the rules regarding communal representation.
- The Railway Board are informed that their orders regarding the employment of Muslim officers on selection boards are complied with whenever practicable, although there are occasions when the paucity of Muslim officers makes this difficult.
- The existing orders are those contained in paragraph 8 of the Memorandum of Supplementary Instructions issued by the Home Department in 1935 in connection with their Resolution of 4th July, 1934.
- Two major instructions have been issued by Government to stimulate recruitment of Muslims on the North Western Railway since 1931 : one reserving for Muslims 60 per cent of all vacancies in subordinate posts to be filled by direct recruitment, and the other observing in future, in the recruitment of permanent and temporary inferior staff and labourers, the existing percentage of Muslims. The latter guaranteed Muslims 61.3 per cent. of all vacancies in these categories on the North-Western Railway.
- Statistics are prepared by Railways showing communal composition of subordinate Railway services and the annual recruitment to these services for both permanent and temporary staff. These returns are checked by accounting staff and in the Railway Board's office and are published by the Home Department and in the Report by the Railway Board on Indian Railways.

---

**REMOVALS FROM SERVICE ON EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

107. **Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** (a) Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to state how many employees were removed from service in the East Indian Railway in the year 1939-40? Had the Disciplinary rule been observed properly or not? If not, why not?

(b) Is it a fact that appeals are being withheld without assigning any reason?

(c) Is it a fact that an employee in Carriage and Wagon shops, Alam-bagh, has been removed from service merely on account of the fact that

he saw the Director, Railway Board, without taking prior permission of the Works Manager?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** (a) No register is maintained giving particulars of men removed from service and the information could not be collected for the whole railway without extensive research. Nor would it be possible to say whether all the rules of procedure were observed in every case without a detailed scrutiny of the file of every case. I regret that it is not practicable to undertake this task but if the Honourable Member desires to know the number of subordinates or officers removed in any particular office an effort will be made to secure it.

(b) No such case has come to the notice of Government. The ordinary procedure is to cite the number of provision under which an appeal is withheld and this gives the ground for the action.

(c) I have called for information and a further reply will be laid on the table in due course.

#### STRENGTH OF GUARDS ON NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

**108. Sardar Sant Singh:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways please refer to the Establishment Rolls of the North Western Railway for the years 1923-31 (a copy is in the Library of the House), *vis.*:—Cadre of Guards, and state :

- (a) the reasons for not placing in the Library of the House, copies of the Establishment Rolls after the year 1931; and
- (b) the sanctioned and actual strength of the Guards in each grade in each Division in the years 1932 to 1940, together with the reasons for any difference in any year?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** (a) The North Western Railway have stopped publication of Establishment Rolls in 1931.

(b) Information by divisions and for the period referred to by the Honourable Member is not available and cannot be secured without extensive research. The Honourable Member is, however, referred to the reply to his starred question No. 1849, asked on the 28th March, 1939, and to the reply laid on the table of the House to Bhai Parma Nand's unstarred question No. 78 asked on the 16th November, 1940.

#### REVISION OF THE STRENGTH OF GUARDS ON NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

**109. Sardar Sant Singh:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways please state the dates on which the strength in each grade in each Division of the Guards on the North Western Railway was revised since 1925 and the reasons for such revision of the strength?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** The information available with Government concerning the changes in the total strength of guards in each grade on the North Western Railway is contained in the following table:

Year.	Grade II.	Grade III.	Grade IV.
1926-27 . . . .	602	388	250
1927-28 . . . .	602	393	252
1930-31 . . . .	786	349	177
1931-32 . . . .	645	335	173
1938-39 . . . .	836	176	..
1940 . . . .	838	204	..

The changes in the strength were the result of adjusting it to requirements; in the case of grade IV its abolition was decided on as it was not considered necessary to retain it.

#### PROMOTION OF GUARDS GRADE II ON NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

**110. Sardar Sant Singh:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways please refer to the information given on 14th February, 1939, to starred question No. 1576 (d), asked in this House on the 29th November, 1938, regarding promotions of guards, grade II, on the North Western Railway and state the reasons for not promoting the staff from grade II to grade III, and, if any promotions have since been made, the number of such promotions in each year against the number of vacancies which occurred since 1928, and the reasons for the delay in ordinary regular promotions?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** Grade II guards are now eligible for promotion to grade III, and are promoted as occasion arises. As regards the second part, 13 guards grade II were promoted to grade III in 1928; there were no promotions afterwards till June, 1940, on account of the abolition of grade IV, the reduction in the number of posts in grade III and the existence of surplus guards who had to be absorbed. In June, 1940, 16 grade II guards were promoted to grade III. Government have no information about the vacancies, but vacancies are not filled up unless it is necessary to do so. As regards the last part of the question, the requirements of the work did not call for further promotions.

#### PROMOTION OF GUARDS GRADE II ON NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

**111. Sardar Sant Singh:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways please refer to the information given on the 11th February, 1941, in reply to part (a) of starred question No. 56, asked in this House on the 12th November, 1940, regarding the number of guards, Grade II, promoted on the North Western Railway community-wise, viz. "16 ten Muslims, two Hindus, two Sikhs, two Anglo-Indians and Domiciled Europeans" and state :

- (a) the dates on which the selection committee or board met at the Headquarters and the Divisional Offices for the purpose of making promotion;
- (b) the number of candidates who were eligible for promotion examined by the committee or board and from amongst whom the above number was selected;
- (c) the communities to which the candidates belonged;
- (d) the length of service of the number selected and promoted;
- (e) the number of previous adverse remarks and punishment on record against each man selected and promoted;
- (f) the minimum and maximum number of adverse remarks and punishments of the men eligible for promotion but not selected;
- (g) the constitution of the selection committee or board;
- (h) the number of grade II Guards eligible for promotion to grade III, in each division, and the minimum and maximum duration in grade II; and

- (i) if possible to lay on the table the classified lists of Guards maintained by the Divisional and the Headquarters offices?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** (a) to (i). Government do not receive information in such matters of detailed administration, and could not in any case agree to disclose remarks on conduct contained in officials' personal records.

#### PROMOTION OF GUARDS GRADE II ON NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

**112. Sardar Sant Singh:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways please refer to the information given on the 11th February, 1941, in reply to parts (b) and (c) of starred question No. 56, asked in this House on the 12th November, 1940, regarding promotion of guards, grade II, in the North Western Railway, viz., "There was no general list giving seniority, the men were selected from among lists sent in by Divisional Superintendents", and state:

- (a) the information contained in the lists sent in by Divisional Superintendents; and
- (b) the number of senior men superseded by juniors through the lists sent in by Divisional Superintendents?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** (a) The list contains particulars of service of the recommended men.

(b) As these are selection posts, no worker has a prescriptive right to promotion and extraction of the information required by the Honourable Member would involve unjustifiable research.

#### RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF TRAINS ON NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

**113. Sardar Sant Singh:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways please state:

- (a) the particulars of trains on the North Western Railway which are declared important and less important;
- (b) by whom and how classification of trains is made;
- (c) the criterion upon which important and less important trains, respectively, are declared;
- (d) the working hours in a run of an important and less important train, respectively; and
- (e) the minimum and maximum mileage in a run of an important and less important train, respectively?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** (a) I am not aware that the North Western Railway have made any official declaration classifying their trains as "important" and "less important".

(b), (c), (d) and (e). Do not arise.

#### PRINCIPLE FOR PROMOTION OF SELECTED STAFF IN THE DELHI DIVISION OF NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

**114. Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Will the Honourable Member for Railways please refer to a letter No. 847-P./9, dated the 1st October, 1937, from

Mr. A. G. Griffin, O.B.E., Divisional Superintendent, North Western Railway, Delhi, to the President, Divisional Staff Council, Delhi, *vis.*: "Staff declared fit for promotion by Selection Boards should be promoted on the basis of their relative seniority and not on the basis of priority fixed on relative merit, has already been accepted by me and we are working to this on the Division. I have also passed the acceptance of this view by the Headquarters Office and the Divisional Staff Council may be assured that every reasonable effort will be made by me to have the principle accepted by Agent's Office", and state the dates on which the principles were accepted by the General Manager?

(b) Is the Delhi Division still acting on the principles laid down by Mr. Griffin?

(c) What are the reasons, if any, for not accepting the principles by the General Manager?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** I have called for information and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

#### GUARDS ON NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

115. **Sardar Sant Singh:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways please refer to the information given on the 5th November, 1940, in reply to part (c) of unstarred question No. 26, asked in this House on the 23rd February, 1940, *viz.*, "The classification of grades of Guards on the revised scales of pay is equivalent to grades on the old scale of pay and the allotment of the existing posts under the revised scale of pay is under consideration," and state the result of the consideration, and, if it is still under consideration, the probable date of arriving at a conclusion?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** The matter is still under consideration; it is not possible to state when a decision will be reached but the railway administration is awaiting particulars from divisions before making a final decision.

#### GUARDS GRADE III IN LAHORE DIVISION, NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY, UTILISED FOR WORKING GOODS TRAINS.

116. **Sardar Sant Singh:** Will the Honourable Member for Railways please state:

- (a) if it is a fact that in December, 1940, Guards grade III, Lahore Division on the North Western Railway, who used to work Express-Mail and Passenger trains, were utilised to work goods trains which are worked by grade II;
- (b) if the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, the reasons therefor; and
- (c) if the reply to part (a) be in the negative, what the real facts are?

**The Honourable Sir Andrew Olow:** (a) Yes.

(b) Abnormal sickness and heavy traffic rendered it impossible to maintain normal arrangements.

(c) Does not arise.

## MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT.

ALLEGED NEGLECT OF THE DOCTORS OF THE IRWIN HOSPITAL, NEW DELHI,  
FOR NOT GIVING MEDICAL AID TO A CHILD.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have received three notices of adjournment motions. The first one is in the name of Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad. He wants to discuss a matter of urgent public importance of recent occurrence, namely, the neglect of the doctors of the Irwin Hospital for not giving medical aid to a child who was brought there on account of accident that occurred on Maharaja Ranjit Singh Road on the evening of 6th March and died after three hours without medical aid. What is the nature of the neglect the Honourable Member is complaining of?

**Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad** (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, this boy received injuries on account of some motor accident. He was taken to the Irwin Hospital. There was a junior doctor on duty at the time. He attempted to telephone to various doctors, but nobody came in until a few minutes before the child died.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): How old was the child?

**Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad**: The child was five years old. My information is, that some persons wanted to telephone to the father of the child who is a clerk in the Army Department, but they were not allowed even to use the telephone, and he was informed of it on some other telephone. This is not the solitary instance. There have been numerous cases of neglect of this nature, and I think this is a matter . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is there any objection?

**Mr. J. D. Tyson** (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): Yes, Sir. It is not correct to say that no medical aid was given. No operation was performed, because no operation would have been of any use; but there was no neglect.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There was no neglect?

**Mr. J. D. Tyson**: No, Sir.

**Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad**: My point is that the doctor who was attending was a very junior doctor who had come here for training purposes; the doctors who come to the hospital for purely training purposes don't do their duties properly. In connection with another case, a wrong operation was performed on the veins . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): As objection has been taken, will Honourable Members who are in favour of leave being granted rise in their seats?

(Less than twenty-five Members rose in their seats.)

As less than 25 Members have risen, leave is refused.



TREATMENT METED OUT TO MR. SRI KRISNNA DUTTA PALIWAL IN GORAKHPUR JAIL.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The next one is in the name of Mr. Kazmi. He wishes to discuss a definite matter of urgent political importance, namely, the treatment meted out to Mr. S. K. D. Paliwal, a member of this House, like an ordinary undertrial in Gorakhpur Jail as reported in the *Hindustan Times*, dated 9th March, page 6. Is there any provision for different kind of treatment of undertrial prisoners provided by law?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi** (Meerut Division: Muhammadan Rural): So far as I know, according to rules, prisoners who are entitled to A class treatment are given that class of treatment.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Undertrial prisoners?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi**: So far as undertrial prisoners are concerned in case of people who are entitled to A class . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What distinction is made, the Honourable Member says, say, according to the rules?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi**: That I have not read.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The motion is out of order.

**Sardar Sant Singh** (West Punjab: Sikh): With your permission, may I say one thing, Sir? The distinction has been made in respect of prisoners who are arrested for offences of a political nature in that they are not handcuffed when they are taken to the court . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member who has given notice of this motion is not alleging anything like that.

**Sardar Sant Singh**: The difference is there, Sir.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There may be cases, but it is not mentioned in the motion. The motion is out of order.

TREATMENT METED OUT TO MR. GARG OF AJMER.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then, there is a third motion in the name of Mr. Kazmi. He wishes to discuss a definite matter of urgent political importance, namely, the inhuman treatment meted out to Mr. Garg, Municipal Commissioner, Ajmer, and who was recommended "A Class" by the Court, by the jail authorities, as reported in the *Hindustan Times*, dated 9th March, pages 6 and 12. What is the nature of the inhuman treatment that the Honourable Member is alleging?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** He was asked to work the *chakki* and he fainted. He was asked to do hard labour.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is grinding corn? "A Class" prisoners are not supposed to do that. Is that so?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** Yes. He was recommended by the Court to be put in "A Class".

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is there any particular reason why he was treated in that way?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** That will be known to the Honourable the Home Member.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Can the Honourable the Home Member throw any light on this?

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell** (Home Member): I have no information about this matter. It is a matter of ordinary jail administration. I submit that the question of day to day jail administration cannot be brought up for debate on an adjournment motion.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Are "A Class" prisoners made to work like that?

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell:** "A Class" convicts may be assigned tasks, but the jail rules of all provinces, including Ajmer, enjoin that no person is to be given any task beyond his capacity, and that full allowance is to be made for his previous status and occupation. We may be quite confident that those tests were applied in the case of any prisoner. I do not know whether this gentleman was given "A Class". Even if he were classed B, the same test would apply.

**Sir H. P. Mody** (Bombay Millowners' Association: Indian Commerce): I submit that this adjournment motion ought not to be disposed of without the Home Member putting the full facts before the House, and I suggest that it may be taken up on another day, instead of being summarily disposed of by the Chair or disallowed because a certain number of Members may not have got up in their seats.

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell:** If the Honourable Member had put a question, I could have got the information in the ordinary course. I have no desire to keep back any information from the House. What I was objecting to was to debating the matter as one of urgent public importance.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member suggests that a short notice question might be put, when he will be able to obtain full facts.

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee** (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadian Urban): On the basis of the reply to the short notice question, we should be allowed to move an adjournment motion.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The adjournment motion is disallowed. The Honourable Member can put a short notice question.

**BROADCASTING OF THE NEWS REGARDING THE BALLOT OF NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTIONS.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh. He wishes to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the imperfect and misleading broadcasting on Saturday night, the 8th instant, of the news regarding the ballot of non-official Resolutions when mention of only one Resolution was made, namely:

"Resolution of Captain Dalpat Singh congratulating Indian troops in Middle East."

Is it the case of the Honourable Member that broadcasting must give all the Resolutions that have been balloted.

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh** (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): The reason for broadcasting like this is that where Resolutions of vital importance are concerned, people will begin to think that they are not going to be discussed. It will create misunderstanding.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): People understand quite well that broadcasting cannot give all the news that is available.

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh**: The giving out of news like this will give a wrong impression to the public, particularly the cultivators, whom I represent that the Resolution about low prices of cotton is not to be discussed.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The motion is disallowed.

**THE GENERAL BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—concl'd.**

**SECOND STAGE.**

**DEMAND No. 12—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL—cont'd.**

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House will now resume consideration of the list of demands. The Congress Nationalist Party will move cut No. 24.

*Appointment of a Defence Committee.*

**Sardar Sant Singh** (West Punjab: Sikh): Sir, I move:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The object of my moving this cut motion is to draw the attention of the Government of India to the need of appointing a committee to advise on matters relating to the Defence Department. Before I proceed to deal with the subject matter of this cut motion, I am sure I will be giving expression to the feelings of this House if I take this opportunity to extend a welcome to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief on his new appointment. I wish that His Excellency had been here in this House and had

broken off the old tradition of not coming to the Legislative Assembly. This was a time when he should have made a considerable contribution to the discussion of this problem and would have enlightened the Members of this House with his views. I understand from the report published in the *Hindustan Times*, that in the Upper House, His Excellency was pleased to say on this point as follows:

"There was one main point about which there was a universal and insistent demand and that was a demand for closer co-operation between the Legislature and the Defence Department, especially in respect of giving advice to the Defence Department and receiving information from them."

His Excellency said this had his full sympathy but added that it was not an easy matter to arrange. He hoped before long it might be possible to arrive at a suitable compromise which would be useful both to the House and to the Government. His Excellency in conclusion said he proposed to give this matter his immediate and personal consideration.

After this statement in the Upper House, my task in moving this motion becomes comparatively easier. This is not the first occasion on which this subject has been debated in this House. This subject has been before the House for a number of years. It has formed the subject matter of several Resolutions and it has been discussed times out of number and it was the favourite subject of our friend, Mr. Jinnah, when he used to take a more active interest in the debates of this House. This is an occasion when we are fighting a war full of risks which nobody can foresee at this time. Therefore, if we ask the Defence Department to take this motion in a more responsible spirit than the Defence Department have been taking in the past, I think it will be due to this and it will be showing consideration to the wishes of the people of this country.

Sir, so far the Defence Department has been living in the seclusion of the *harem* with a *burqa* on without giving a glimpse of the personality that is concealed in the *burqa*. Even in the Secretariat, we find the portion allotted to the Defence Department covered with bars all round and admission is denied except with permission obtained from the officer who is sought to be interviewed. So, the time has come when the Defence Department should accept the modern conditions, cast off this *burqa* and become a modern girl.

**Mr. Muhammad Nauman** (Patna and Chota Nagpur cum Orissa: Muhammadan): On a point of order, Sir, I think we object to the words "*burqa*" and "*harem*" being used in the sense in which the Honourable Member is using them . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There is no force in the objection.

**Sardar Sant Singh**: I do not think I intended to hurt the susceptibilities of my Muslim friends by the use of these words. It is really a wonder to find an Honourable Member of Mr. Nauman's position objecting to the very innocent allusion . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has given its ruling, and the Honourable Member need not dilate on that.

**Sardar Sant Singh**: I was submitting that, coming out of the seclusion, the Defence Department will find itself in a healthier atmosphere, suitable

[Sardar Sant Singh.]

to the better development of their Department and, coming in contact with the popular opinion, they will gain both in wisdom and in experience. I claim, Sir, that in the past the Defence Department's attitude that they hold a monopoly of wisdom in matters of defence has proved to be incorrect: a conclusive demonstration has been given that the policy of the Defence Department, so far, for the defence of India has proved to be entirely misplaced, with the result that today, in the midst of war, we find that India has very inadequate defence provided by these people who claim all wisdom to themselves. It was the Chadwick report that opened the eyes of the Defence Department and it was brought to their notice that the modern army did not mean mere numbers being maintained in the country for the purpose of maintaining the peace and order in the country itself or for being used merely as an army of occupation to put down Indian liberties. The present European war has shown that the army is intended for the protection of even civilization—not to take away the liberty and freedom of the subject. If it is so, the Defence Department's activities go far beyond the limits of mere strategy or organization of military forces or even the disposition of the troops to various fronts. Their task at this time embraces other activities as well. Therefore, the Defence Department is not going to lose anything either in prestige or power if they associate the representatives of the people with their work.

Sir, the difficulty that confronts this country is that, while the budget of the Defence Department is rising by leaps and bounds, the people of this country are ignored absolutely and have absolutely no voice in the disposal of those finances which are given to the Defence Department by this House or, I should say, which are forcibly taken by a constitutional power, without consent, from this country. Sir, today we find that India is taking very little interest in the matters of defence. Though we are in the midst of a terrible war, the country is sullen and looks upon the Defence Department with eyes of distrust and suspicion. The country is justified in feeling, the people feel it, that the Defence Department has done nothing to take the country into its confidence, with the result that we know not whether India's defence has been strengthened or still stands in need of readjustment or reorganization. They were told that the Indian Army has been increased to about half a million of people; they were told that the mechanical equipment is being hurried; yet these are such meagre points of information that we cannot place our trust entirely on what the Defence Department is doing in the matter. If it is the intention of the Government—and there can be no doubt that it is the intention of the Government—to stimulate war effort, I am afraid the Government of India will have to change their policy sooner than later and will have to take the people of India into their confidence in matters of defence. If, like other countries, like Great Britain, Government want that people should take more interest in the matters of defence in this war, in providing better means for the encouragement of military operations both nearer home as well as at the great distances where battles are actually being fought, then the Government of India must give up this policy of seclusion and must come out and must associate the people of India with their war effort.

Sir, during the last year and a half that the war is going on, practically no information has been vouchsafed to us. I was simply surprised, I should say rather amused, to find that in answer to a question tabled in

this House for the Defence Secretary to make a statement about the war, the reply was given that the statement was being prepared, and after about a month or so when the House had risen, we had a statement on the war sent to us at our places. Is this the war confidence which is being shared by the representatives of the people with the Defence Department?

**Mr. N. M. Joshi** (Nominated Non-Official): Who says they do it?

**Sardar Sant Singh**: That is my complaint that they do not do it, my persuasion is that they should do it.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi**: Why?

**Sardar Sant Singh**: That brings us to a larger question—"why we should share it?" The logical reason, the moral reason that has any force at all is that we pay for it, that we are directly interested in the activities of the Defence Department, that we have to suffer, not the Britishers, if any attack is made on India. The Britishers are very few as compared with the Indians living here. If India is attacked and, God forbid, if any reverses follow, the sufferers will be the Indians to a much greater extent than the Britishers can be. Therefore, we have a right to demand that we shall decide the policy and the procedure in which the army is being expanded and maintained in India itself. Logically, they cannot deny us this right, it is our birthright, we have been demanding this right but we have been flouted always. Now at this time events are taking an active shape, it is but necessary that they should consent to the formation of a Committee to advise—I am merely asking for a committee to advise—not to overrule, not to compel them to accept the recommendations or the policy of that Committee. I am merely asking for an Advisory Committee. I am asking them to appoint this Advisory Committee immediately so that the people of India may know through their representatives where they stand and what the future has in store for them. This is a matter of great concern to us.

Sir, after the statement that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief made in the Upper House, I think the Government will come forward with a definite statement on this method of the appointment of a Committee of the Defence Department. I am not oblivious to the constitutional issue that might be raised by the Honourable the Defence Secretary, namely, that in the Declaration of August 8th, His Excellency the Viceroy offered us the enlargement of the Executive Council and the appointment of an Advisory Committee. No doubt, the question of granting more power in the Central Government is connected with the Defence Department as a whole. No doubt, the two questions shall have to go together, but at the same time it can safely be said that it is not necessary that the appointment of a Defence Committee should wait till the larger constitutional issue has been settled. If the constitutional issue is considered later, then in that case it will not be a merely Advisory Committee for the Defence Department but it will be something much bigger. The demand is connected with the appointment of an Indian in charge of the Defence portfolio in the Government of India. Much larger issues will be involved and will have to be conceded, but at present we are dealing with a period that is a sort of interregnum period between the settlement of that larger issue and the present conditions in India. I hope that the pretext of tagging it with the larger issue will not be put forward by the Honourable the Defence Secretary when dealing with this matter.

[Sardar Sant Singh.]

In this connection, it will not be out of place to remind the Honourable the Defence Secretary of a certain state of affairs that resulted after the last war. Members who were in the Fourth Assembly will remember that I raised the question of the forfeiture of the pensions that had been earned after the last war. I raised that question on the floor of the House on two points. Firstly, that certain regulations for the grant of pensions were changed after the war was over, resulting in depriving many soldiers of their hard-earned pensions during the war. It was even given out that this was done because the pensions were a charge on His Majesty's Government in Great Britain. At that time, the then Defence Secretary, Mr. (Now Sir) Tottenham, had to face a volley of questions and resolutions on this point till a Committee was appointed. That Committee came to the conclusion, which was accepted by the Government, that the regulations were really prejudicial to the soldiers. I am anxious that the same mistake should not be committed after this war. It should be made clear to those who are serving on the battlefields that the disability pensions and other pensions of which hope is given to them now will be strictly maintained and impartially given effect to after the war. This is due to the soldiers themselves and it is also due to the Department itself. The second point which I wish to urge in this connection is the forfeiture of these pensions on political grounds. Most of the soldiers of the last war were deprived of their pensions on the recommendation of the civil authorities on the ground that they had participated in the freedom movement of the country.

**Mr. C. M. G. Ogilvie** (Defence Secretary): Most of the soldiers of the last war!

**Sardar Sant Singh**: Many, I should say, amongst the Sikhs. I will modify my statement to that extent. I brought their cases to the notice of the Government by means of questions and the debates of the House will bear testimony to the fact that very lean pretexts were given as to why they were deprived of their pensions. I want the Defence Secretary on this occasion to give me an assurance that political activities will not be made ground for the forfeiture of pensions in future and after this war. I am asking these assurances in the hope that these assurances will go a long way in stimulating the war effort in which we are now engaged. They are not in any manner intended to diminish the war effort. As a matter of fact, they are intended to stimulate that effort if such assurances are held out on the floor of the House and which, I am sure, will be given effect to in actual practice after the war has been brought to a victorious conclusion.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

**Sir F. E. James** (Madras: European): Sir, I have listened to the speech of my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, with care and attention and I should like at the outset to associate the Members of my Party with the welcome which he has extended to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief. It is true that His Excellency is not with us and the Sardar Sahib will be the first to appreciate the tremendous demands that are made upon His Excellency's time. The Commander-in-Chief is a Member of the

other House and his views have been very widely broadcast in the press and as widely appreciated by Indian public opinion. We have, after all, in this House a permanent representative of the Defence Department in our colleague, Mr. Ogilvie, and may I here take an opportunity of paying him a tribute? He is the butt of very much criticism in this House. I am bound to say that he has a manner which is extremely disarming at times. I sometimes feel when he comes into this House that he has left his academic gown just outside in the lobby by mistake. Someone expressed to me the other day that he was a Don gone wrong. But no one who has had anything to do with Mr. Ogilvie can fail to appreciate his unvarying kindness and courtesy and the tremendous trouble which he is always willing to take to supply Honourable Members with information. I am very glad indeed to have the opportunity of paying this tribute certainly on my own behalf and on behalf of Members of my own Party.

**Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan** (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): On everybody's behalf.

**Sir F. E. James:** Yes, I am sure on everybody's behalf and even on behalf of some of the Members who are not here, for in spite of the somewhat frozen attitude that my Honourable friend has had to adopt on occasions towards this House, there are few Official Members who are more popular.

Now, let me come down to the real point of this motion. This is a perennial request that there should be attached to the Defence Department a Committee of this House. All legislators love committees, particularly if there is any chance of their being on them and, therefore, this demand is quite natural. In fact it was a demand that was made before the war with which we expressed considerable sympathy. After the war broke out, we realised, as Members in this House must realise that there would be real difficulty in supplying a vast amount of information to a Standing Committee of this House which it would not be in the public interest to supply. If there was a Standing Committee of this House and if its Members had important information withheld from them, they might possibly become dissatisfied with their position. I myself think there are real difficulties in the way of the appointment of a Standing Committee of the Legislature, particularly during war time and that those difficulties, I am sure, will be obvious to Members of this House.

**An Honourable Member:** Explain them.

**Sir F. E. James:** I have explained one difficulty, that is the difficulty which the Defence authorities are bound to be faced with in deciding to what extent and on what matters they can consult the Standing Committee. After all, if there is a Standing Committee of this House, it naturally is anxious to be supplied with as much information as possible.

Another point is this: I am not sure that the appointment of a Standing Committee of the House is the best means of achieving what my Honourable friend the Mover of this cut motion wanted to achieve. There is of course the constitutional difficulty which has been adverted to and which cannot be brushed aside. I notice that my Honourable friend was aware of that. He referred to the political deadlock at the moment and I may remind him that in the offer which His Majesty's Government made on the 8th August there was a provision not only for a provisional



[Sir F. E. James.]

national administration at the Centre but also for the establishment of a War Advisory Council, representative not only of British India, but of the Indian States. That still stands as part of the main offer and had the political parties in this country shown a different attitude in the matter that might have already been a *fait accompli* and who can say what valuable results would have been derived from its establishment? There it is, and if my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, is anxious that something along these lines should be adopted, then perhaps he would be kind enough to concentrate his attention upon those who are standing in the way of the solution of this constitutional difficulty at the moment.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** That is not the solution.

**Sir F. E. James:** My Honourable friend says that that is not the solution. To my mind that is the only way in which a solution could be arrived at. There are attempts made even now by well-intentioned and distinguished persons to find some way out of the political deadlock and I think they deserve a word of praise. It is not a pleasant business to try to solve deadlocks and those who are seeking to discuss ways and means of so doing deserve a certain amount of encouragement. But there it is and until the political deadlock is cleared up, the offer which His Majesty's Government made of a War Advisory Council cannot be put into effect because it is an integral part of the wider political issue which up-to-date has defied solution.

Now, Sir, we come back to the more specified and limited demand of a Defence Advisory Committee of this House. I understand that behind this demand is the desire that the activities and the policies of the Defence Department should be made more generally known to the people of this country. That is obviously a very natural desire and one which should as far as possible be met subject to the over-riding considerations of public policy. I would remind my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, that a considerable amount has already been done (of which he must be aware) in regard to publicity as to the activities and the policies of the Defence Department. My Honourable friend knows perfectly well that one of the subjects taken up by the late Commander-in-Chief was the appointment of a distinguished journalist as Public Relations Officer and that he has established extremely valuable links between the Defence Department and the Press and the public. One may say that since his appointment a great deal more information has been given to the public than was previously given. Not only has that been one step, but there are other steps. Members of the Press were taken to the Middle East and their contacts with soldiers on active service have been extraordinarily valuable in the information that they have been able to bring back. There has also been the visit by the Premier of the Punjab to the Middle East and I am told by those who have heard him since his return that he has made the most profound impression, through his information both of the activities and of the spirit of the fighting forces in the Middle East, upon all those whom he addressed.

The other day, Mr. Griffiths was speaking on the question of propaganda and the importance of the public platform. Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan

has realised that, and if things were sufficiently static—I hope they will be—I wish it were possible for distinguished Members of public life in this country to be taken to the Middle East so that they may see the soldiers in active service. It would be an eye-opener to them. In one speech, Sir Sikandar Hayat Khan said with understandable passion after having seen the troops on the battle field, "I feel that politics is a dirty thing and it was really a cleansing experience to see these men who are really fighting for India's future security and present security". If some of us had the opportunity of going there, we should not only welcome it, but we should benefit from, shall I say, the spiritual baptism which such an experience would give us.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** The Honourable the Finance Member takes it seriously, because I see him smiling.

**Sir F. E. James:** The Honourable the Finance Member knows, as do others, what effect contact with those who are really fighting has upon one.

Then, there are other ways in which the defence forces have been publicised. Honourable Members no doubt have seen some of the films which have been produced in this country showing the activities of the air forces and the army and the Royal Indian Navy; and these have been greatly appreciated in the cinemas throughout the country. In fact, I had a report not long ago of one country cinema where one of these films was shown and the audience refused to allow the drama of the evening to be shown until they had this particular film shown several times so that they could take it all in. That shows the advantage of the film as a means of propaganda. I believe Honourable Members of this House have already visited some of the training centres in India, Ordnance factories and other places, where preparations are being made to supply the defence forces of India and to train men both as officers and as other ranks.

**Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan:** Who visited them?

**Sir F. E. James:** I do not know but I understand some Members of this House,—or perhaps it may be of the other House,—have visited these places. I take it that the authorities would welcome visits on the part of public men to some of these training centres. Let Honourable Members go and see for themselves what is being done. That is the best form of publicity and I suggest that Honourable Members will get a very much better idea of the defence activities of this country than by sitting round a table with high officials from the Legislature as a Defence Advisory Committee. I am not for one moment suggesting that the possibility of a defence advisory committee should for ever be ruled out. All I am trying to do is to suggest that there are practical difficulties in the way of such an appointment at the present time. Another method might be easier and less rigid. Another method might be for Party Leaders to be consulted from time to time either by the Defence Secretary or by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, but we do feel that under present conditions the appointment of a defence advisory committee of this House would lead to very great difficulties.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** Sir, may I ask the Honourable Member one question? Does he consider publicity as a good substitute for the voice which the representatives of India should have in the control of the Defence Department's expenditure and other activities?

**Sir F. E. James:** My Honourable friend puts a question which, apart from being entirely irrelevant, is rather confused. He asks whether this publicity is any substitute for giving the people of this country control in defence matters and policy.

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

**Sir F. E. James:** My last word to him is, if I may be permitted to put it to him. If he really wants that wider participation in and control over defence policy, I would once more draw his attention to the offer of His Majesty's Government of August 8. It is there and if he cares to accept it he will have that control over both finance and policy that he desires.

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta** (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-  
12 oon. Muhammadan Rural). Sir, I have heard the speech of my Honourable friend, Sir Frederick James, with close attention. It is difficult to say that he did not oppose this cut motion; I have no quarrel with him; I understand him. He is quite consistent. Whenever there has been any controversy between Government on the one side and the people on the other his uniformly consistent attitude has been to support Government. I do not blame him; from his point of view he is quite right. I appreciate it and, therefore, I do not quarrel with him. But I have a little quarrel with my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, the Mover of this motion. He feels very happy at the pronouncement made in another place by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief. So far as that statement goes it is all right and I also feel grateful; but my complaint is that it does not go far enough. What, after all, has His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said? He said he had full sympathy with the idea of a Defence Committee. Now, my Honourable friend himself has referred to the very important pronouncement that was made on the 8th August. That was a pronouncement far more unequivocal, far more authoritative and far more unqualified. The pronouncement that was made was not merely one of sympathy with the idea. It went further and said that "His Majesty's Government were only too anxious for collaboration of Indian leaders with the Central Government in the prosecution of the war and in that behalf and for that purpose to set up a War Advisory Council composed of representatives of the people." My contention is that that was a far more pointed pronouncement than the assurance of which Sardar Sant Singh seems so much enamoured. But in order to wriggle out of that pronouncement an attempt has been made by my Honourable friend, Sir Frederick James, that that was a conditional offer and that it was an integral part of the scheme of an expanded Council and so on. His interpretation of that pronouncement is that the one thing was dependant upon the other thing; either take the whole of it or nothing of it. But my difficulty is this. With what justification can it be said that the

condition precedent to the War Defence Committee, or call it the War Advisory Council, is the acceptance of the offer that was made on the larger constitutional issue? Whether the larger question is solved or not the fact remains that the war is going on and war efforts have to be made. The fact remains that Government invite our co-operation and support in the war efforts. We are asked to make sacrifices in the shape of new taxation and so on. Remembering all this, merely because the larger constitutional offer is not solved and accepted, does it follow that all co-operation and co-ordination about the war efforts between Government on the one side and the people on the other must be withheld? That is a position which I fail to understand. Because the offer of expanded Council was not accepted, have you asked India not to go in for war aid and not to continue her war efforts? Have you said this: "Well, you have not accepted that offer and, therefore, we do not care to have your support at all?" In that case of course the two things might be joined together. Therefore that is not an excuse which ought to be put forward. In fact even His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief did not raise the sort of objection raised by my friend, Sir Frederick James. He says: "Oh, there is constitutional difficulty, this difficulty and that difficulty: the difficulty of publicity and all that." Now, as a matter of fact even His Excellency does not say this. His Excellency no doubt says that it was not an easy matter to arrange; that is all he said. He also said that it might be possible to arrive at a suitable compromise. All this bogey of constitutional difficulty and other insurmountable difficulty was not raised by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief. Therefore my contention is, looking at the matter from the point of view of the Government, and even not forgetting that the constitutional deadlock has not been solved, even then it is certainly desirable, as has been expressed in mild language by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, to have a Defence Committee and take the leaders of the country into confidence as regards the war. Psychologically, it is a simple position. If you care to have the support of the people in the war efforts, it is essential that you should take them into confidence to some extent. It will not do to say merely that publicity is not in the interests of the country and of the Government. The War problems are discussed even in the Houses of Parliament, and if anything is particularly confidential, it is discussed in a secret session of Parliament. My friend himself advocates propaganda and publicity. You are talking of propaganda before the whole country and you cannot think of a small committee. These are arguments which cannot stand examination for a single moment. The real fact is, as it has been put in very appropriate language by a most distinguished Indian in the other House the other day, that the Government have failed to create a war atmosphere in this country, and that distinguished Indian has given you a warning in this connection. He has put it in such language that I cannot improve on it and I shall only quote it. He says:

"The Government has failed to produce a war atmosphere in India. . . ."

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not think the Honourable Member can cite speeches, delivered in the other House, like that.

**Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta**: All right, Sir. I shall make it my own language. I say that although you are having the money, although you

[Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta.]

are having the men, the fact remains that there is no enthusiasm in the country and there is a feeling that the feeling of distrust by the Government is also producing a counter-feeling of distrust in the country; and, therefore, even from the Government's own point of view it is necessary that you must have willing co-operation and willing support, and to achieve that object it is necessary to have some sort of Defence Committee. We are glad that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief has given us that assurance; but what is being actually done? Instead of taking us into confidence we find that as a matter of fact not only in the Military Department but also in the Civil Departments connected with the war, what is going on is absolute Europeanisation in place of Indianisation. It has been put in one sentence by the President of the Indian Merchants Chamber and, therefore, I shall read just four or five lines. He says in his presidential speech:

"In the Departments of Defence Co-ordination and in the War Supply Board and the War Transportation Board, Indians have been rigidly excluded from all key posts. In the Department of Supply the post of Director General of Supply, the Deputy Director General, Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Director of Administration, Director of Development, Director of Indents and Priority and even technical officers are all held by non-Indians. Not only this, but two British Directors General have been recently appointed in the Department of Supply, one in charge of Munitions and the other in charge of Engineering and both of them are non-Indians."

So, that is what is going on. Now, Sir, I shall read a small paragraph from an editorial note of the *Nagpur Times* of the 18th February last:

"The rapidly dwindling number of Indians holding key positions in the Imperial Secretariat is an eloquent footnote to Mr. Amery's slogan of 'India First'. The Secretaries of all Departments except Communications of which Mr. S. N. Roy is the Secretary, are all Europeans. The newly-created Supply Department is European manned. Many of the Additional Secretaries are Europeans. The De-Indianisation policy was at work when Mr. M. S. A. Hydari who went on duty to the Eastern Group Conference was succeeded by Mr. Prior as Secretary to Industries and Labour Department. The *Gazette of India*, announcement that Major G. E. Wheeler has been appointed to officiate as Information Officer, Bureau of Public Information, naturally provokes the question why an Indian was not appointed to the post."

My grievance is that instead of taking the people of India into confidence with regard to the war, even with regard to the Civil Departments connected with the war, Indians are rigidly excluded. Sir, I support the motion.

**Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya** (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadar Rural): Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by my friend, Sardar Sant Singh. Sir, India has been dragged into the war without her consent, and that is the main ground for which the majority of this House have absented themselves from this Assembly. Every nation has a right to defend its own country against any foreign aggression, and as such, we Indians claim the same right, but, unfortunately, the whole question of defence is left in the hands of the Government which is not prepared to trust us. The question of the appointment of a Defence Committee has been debated here year after year; and the present is a most opportune moment to consider this question favourably and to give effect to the demand made by us for so long. The Honourable the Finance Member wants about 84 crores of rupees for defence, and it is, therefore, in the fitness of things that we the representatives of the people should have first hand knowledge as to the manner in which the money will be

spent, and that if there is any necessity for more funds, we may be prepared to give it. It is in the interest of Government that a Committee of this character should be appointed. It is the interest of India which is at stake, and, therefore, we Indians must have a say in this matter. The real position is this. All free nations have an effective voice in their defence matters, but as we are not free to act or to say anything about our own needs or demands, we have to accept whatever Government do, and as such we have been for long accustomed to trust Government because of our helplessness. But, Sir, today our soldiers are fighting in Africa. They are winning victories for England, of which the British Government in India and England feel proud; and yet if we here are not trusted by Government, it is a pity, it is a shame, and, therefore, this disgraceful aspect of the question should be set at rest here and now.

We have been told that H. E. the Commander-in-Chief has said some good words with regard to the future of our defence forces. So far so good, but his words have yet to be translated into action. What we want by this cut motion is that a Defence Committee should be immediately appointed, not in simple words, but it must be a controlling committee, which will repose adequate confidence in the members with regard to the war efforts that may be made here. If, Sir, India can trust Mr. Ogilvie, why should not the Government trust Indians themselves who are the owners of this country? If by the conquest of India, Government feel that we Indians have no right to know our own affairs, why should there be a war at all? Germany is conquering country after country, nation after nation, and yet we Indians are not trusted after a century and a half's contact. The war is not justified in that case at all. Therefore, it is but proper that the Government should appoint a Defence Committee without any further delay. We know that if this question is to be decided by votes, we shall not get them, but we would warn the Government not to take advantage of our position in this House, and they should be just, fair and equitable to our demands which are not at all unreasonable. Sir F. E. James has spoken of the deadlock. The deadlock is not of our creation. It is the creation of an indifferent Government, a Government that does not care for 350 millions of people who have been living like slaves for centuries. If the demand now repeated by us with a view to help the British Government so that they may come out successful in the war is not accepted, it will be the fault of the Government and not of Indians. Sir, the majority Party of this House has gone out and has taken to other methods without embarrassing the Government in any way, and it is to their credit, I should say, although we have not followed them because we have taken a more realistic point of view. The real thing is, the war is to be won, because we do not want any new masters to come in, and if we have to make our war efforts more successfully, we must have our say in the matter, and, therefore, there must be a Defence Committee without delay. Sir, I support this motion.

**Mr. C. M. G. Ogilvie:** Sir, in the first place, I am sure I will be voicing the opinions of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and Defence Member when I say that he will be most grateful for the words of welcome and the tributes paid to him by Sardar Sant Singh and Sir Frederick James. I shall acquaint him with what they said, and I know that he will appreciate the honour done to him.

[Mr. C. M. G. Ogilvie.]

Turning now to myself, I acknowledge with blushes the very kind tribute paid to my long drawn efforts here by Sir Frederick James. I could dilate on that subject for a very considerable time. However, I will content myself by saying that so far from considering myself to be in a *burqa* or in any way behind the veil, I have for the past four years rather regarded myself as a most exposed and unprotected aunt Sally.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** It is just like the few holes in the *burqa*.

**Mr. C. M. G. Ogilvie:** I should also like to say that although on many occasions the position, in which I find myself, necessitates my adopting, I will not say an attitude of non-co-operation, but I should say of passive and perhaps sometimes active defence, I do welcome any opportunity I may have for supplying Members of any Party in this House with information or for assisting them in any way I can. I regard that not only as a duty, but as a pleasure.

Now, turning to the subject of this motion, in the first place in accordance with established practice, I wish to say a few cautionary words. As Sir Frederick James pointed out, the subject generally speaking, and not having regard to the particular circumstances in which we find ourselves but generally speaking, the subject of establishing a Committee of the Legislature drawn from all Parties in a position in which it can exercise more or less direct influence and control over the executive Government is one which bristles with difficulties. There is no blinking that fact. I know from the trend of some of the speeches to which I have listened that what is at the back, I should hardly call it the back, but in the front of some of the Honourable Members' minds, is dislike of the present form of the constitution. With that that I cannot deal. It is here for the present and I am here as a part of it. Like them I look forward with hope to better days.

A certain confusion of thought also struck me particularly in the case of the speech of Mr. Chattopadhyaya. It was also apparent to some extent in the speeches of Sardar Sant Singh and the Deputy President of the House. That is the idea that Indians are mistrusted because of the position of the present constitution. That is not so at all. The Governor General in Council who is the authority at present responsible for defence is not a non-Indian entity. What the Honourable Members really are saying is almost as much as to say that the Prime Minister of England ought to be reproached by members of an opposition party because he had not included them in his Cabinet. But the fact that he had not done so does not argue the slightest degree of mistrust. There is no mistrust. That I affirm categorically. On the other hand there is always in matters of defence a need for great circumspection and many matters have necessarily to be a close preserve of the executive Government. They would be grievously erring if they mentioned these secrets to any one whatever outside that Government and when other Governments supervene, Honourable Members will find that they too will take exactly the same view of their responsibility. They can do nothing else. That does not mean that the Government of India or the Defence Department arrogate to themselves the monopoly of wisdom. That charge was levelled by my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh. He went on to say that it was a proof, that this monopoly of wisdom, which we do not arrogate to ourselves, does not exist, that

the defence of India had proved to be inadequate. Well, the Government of India, and, particularly, the Defence Department, were engaged for years in a long struggle for more resources and the policy of His Majesty's Government, which was bound up, with the League of Nations and the hope that good sense would ultimately prevail and that these vast armaments which destroy the prosperity of peoples would not be required was necessarily our policy also. Here, in India, it was reinforced by a continuous and general political outcry against the scale of defence expenditure which, it was said, was crippling the development of the country. I could, if I wished, quote, I think, from the Honourable Member's speech himself on a Resolution on that subject. However inadequate, owing to the causes I have mentioned, pre-war preparations were, I maintain on behalf of the Government of India that though they were condemned, as we are all aware, to make bricks without straw, they made very good ones, and that the Indian Armies in the field have shown themselves to be second to none in the world. They have administered a crushing and overwhelming defeat to an antagonist who had been training up for war without respite for 20 years and upon the armaments of whose country practically the whole of their revenues had been expended but they were not a match for our troops and I think, that, if to some extent at least the proof of the pudding is to be found in the eating, possibly an occasional kind word might well be given to the Government of India. In passing, before I leave this subject I may say, as a slight digression, that yesterday I heard from an officer who had returned from the Middle East,—a British service officer,—that the memory which he carried most clearly out of the battle of Sidi Barrani was the spectacle of the Indian troops' iron discipline under heavy fire

Well, the Honourable Member complained of lack of information. He said that the information they received was meagre. That, I do not think is correct. I think myself that all information possible at the time is given to Honourable Members and the public generally. I do not say that that 'possible' is an immutable thing. As our facilities improve and our resources improve, so are we able to give more information and I think that on the whole one can say that the public of this country receive as much information about all matters connected with the defence of the country as the public of Great Britain does and, of course, a thousand times more than the public of most other countries.

As I said before on several occasions, the only disability under which Honourable Members labour in the present form of the constitution appears to me to be that they do not actually vote the defence budget. Otherwise defence is far from being behind doors or screens. Resolutions can be tabled and are freely debated on any subject connected with defence. Questions are constantly asked. I must myself have answered some thousands during the past four years on every matter connected with the administration of defence and answers are never withheld unless it is clearly contrary to public policy to give them. Out of the thousands of questions I have answered, I do not suppose that I have fallen back upon the 'public interest' answer more than a dozen or twenty times. Government welcome the growth of public interest in defence. Some years ago, I do not think that that interest was very great. It has undoubtedly grown and that growth is not deplored by Government but welcomed by them; and everything which Government can possibly do to meet the legitimate



[Mr. C. M. G. Ogilvie.]

desire of the Indian people and of the representatives of the Indian people for information they will do.

My Honourable friend, Sir F. E. James, said that he thought that it would be a good thing if some Honourable Members of this House could see our troops under their conditions of active service. I entirely agree with him; I think it would be an excellent thing, and if some Honourable Members would like to go,—I cannot make a promise for everybody because a great deal of arrangement has to be made—but if some would like to go, I will try to make arrangements for them. As regards trips to our training and other establishments—our Ordnance Factories, workshops, training centres—we shall welcome visits from Members of this House, more, particularly, now that we have something to show them; and I should be most happy to arrange, as far as our own country is concerned, for any number of Members to visit these establishments; if they are not shown one or two of our holy of holies, they must not think it is because they are not trusted; it is merely because some things are not shown to anybody. Now, when this matter was last debated in this House, I said that though at the time there were not very many matters which could be referred to the House or a Committee of the House for advice, Government would always welcome advice either tendered from the floor of the House, which it does often receive,—or sent by groups of Members or Members in their individual capacity. Some Members, I may say, have acted accordingly and have made suggestions and have asked for information and I should be glad to see an extension of that practice. His Excellency the Defence Member is firmly of the opinion that the possibilities of his receiving views and advice from the representative public men, on the one hand, and of his giving them, on the other, information which will assist them in the exercise of their public duties, require regularization, and he hopes that arrangements will be shortly worked out whereby this can be given effect to,—in what precise manner I cannot at present explain because it has not been worked out and as it has been made, I think, abundantly clear, there are many difficulties not only constitutional but also practical in the way. But so far as rendering it possible for the Defence Member to receive the advice of Indian public men in matters which are connected with his sphere of responsibility and of his giving them all the information which he can safely and properly give is concerned, those difficulties will somehow be surmounted. In view of that assurance, I hope that the Honourable Member will see his way to withdraw his cut motion.

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

“That the demand under the head ‘Executive Council’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

The motion was negatived.

*Policy of Recruitment to the Army, Navy and Air Forces in India.*

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh** (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Executive Council’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

Sir, this is an important subject. The importance of the Army is and can very well be put in these words: "what the vitality is to an individual, so the army is to a nation". If a person has got vitality, he is likely to live long and his activities can extend over a long period and in various directions; similarly, if a nation has got a good army, it can protect itself from aggression and maintain peace in the land. Now, the imperious necessity of having a good army is not only recognized by us but by the representatives of the Party which is today absent and to which references have been made all throughout this Session up till now. Sir, speaking about the imperious necessity of the army, *ex*-Premier, C. Rajagopalachariar said on July 18, 1940—that was shortly before the Poona offer:

"But since the whole country has been looking up to us not only for giving ideas for a new international order but actually for taking up the Government and administration of the country, we cannot suddenly transform our character and say that we shall be the torch bearers of a new culture and cease to bother about police, the military, the army, etc. The extension of non-violence, for the first time and immediately, to the field of national defence whether for internal peace or external aggression was not a responsibility to which the Working Committee of the Congress felt themselves equal."

Those are clear words. The necessity of an army is freely recognized and he has repeated the importance of this army again in his speech which he delivered at Poona in September, 1940, when the Poona offer was withdrawn because there was no response from this Government. Explaining the Congress demand under the Poona offer, he said:

"The British who held India in trusteeship for the last hundred and fifty years had bestowed on her a number of good things, except the important one of making her capable of her own defence. This was a thing of prime importance and the Congress by making its Poona offer volunteered to assist Britain in making India capable of defending herself."

So let it not be said that this majority Party, which is absent today, does not recognize the importance of the army or their responsibility with regard to it, when, as a matter of fact, it goes to the extent of blaming this Government for not preparing the country for proper defence. Now, Sir, we have seen the importance, as I say, of this defence and a good deal of the strength of the Defence forces will certainly depend on the policy of recruitment apart from the efficiency that is to be derived from the ammunition that is turned out of the Ordnance Factories or the aeroplanes that will come over from abroad that is America and the battleships that will come to the shores of India from Britain.

The policy of recruitment is based on what is now called the class basis. Recognised leaders of this country and other speakers outside this House have always emphasised this discrimination as a racial discrimination between martial and non-martial classes. For the last two or three years we have got the explanation that the distinction is not of martial and non-martial classes, but of listed and non-listed classes because they saw that in India people had awakened to the sense of their self-respect and that no particular community liked to be called that it was a non-martial race. When they saw that this distinction of martial and non-martial races was unpalatable to the people, they adopted a different phraseology, the listed and non-listed classes. Anybody who looks at this thing carefully will at once find out that these are synonyms for martial and non-martial classes. If you go through the list you will find that such classes are listed as were called martial

[Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh.]

classes and those who were formerly called as non-martial classes are now designated as non-listed classes.

Now, Sir, it has been said that this particular policy was adopted 80 years ago or a little after that. In other words, this policy was adopted after the wars of 1857. His Excellency, the Commander-in-Chief, did not wish to talk about the rights and wrongs of war in India, neither do I wish to say anything about them. Shortly after 1857, this method of recruitment was adopted. Well, we have begun to suspect it. The explanation given is that the martial spirit that existed then had rusted. Well, Sir, whatever may be said about the wars of 1857, it must be taken as a fact and as clear as broad day light that at that time there was the martial spirit all over India. It was particularly noticeable in Bengal, the United Provinces, Bihar and the Maharashtra. How did it rust and why was it allowed to be rusted? Why did the Government which had been established at that time allow this martial spirit to rust? The responsibility is theirs. What some persons have begun to think is this. By creating a class called the martial class and always praising them as such, the Government wanted to create a sort of prejudice against the non-martial classes. Then, we have heard it being said that the Punjab is the sword arm of India as if other provinces do not count and they are not at all martial. My submission, therefore, is that it was done decidedly to create a prejudice against a class which was called a non-martial class. I have also a suspicion that they derived a lesson from the wars of 1857 and they gathered together the martial races from several provinces and recruited them in such a fashion as to balance the communal strength in the army. To achieve that object, it was necessary to get recruitment from different provinces. Apart from the question whether the martial spirit is rusted or not, what really led to the rusting or inactivity of these races was the propaganda which was started after the Government had been established soundly in India that pen is mightier than the sword. They carried on that propaganda and began to put it into action. In other words, persons were educated and got better jobs. They had a better status than persons who were to handle the sword. But the time has now come when tables have been turned and when the pen is not so much needed as the sword.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** The pen has become weaker.

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh:** And it is the sword which has become stronger and which is very much in need now.

Then, there was another thing which reduced the activities or discouraged the martial spirit of the people of this country. This was the Arms Act. The Arms Act is an Act against which agitation has been made since the inception of the Congress and they had been asking for its repeal. This Act has emasculated Indians. Year after year resolutions were passed to this effect but there was no response.

**Mr. M. Ghiasuddin (Punjab: Landholders):** Is there no Arms Act in England?

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh:** Never mind that, I am speaking about the demand made by the Congress. Men who cannot be blamed for fiery views such as the late Mr. Gokhale, Surendra Nath Banerjea and other revered leaders protested against this Arms Act. Thus, it went a long way in putting cold water on persons who had sportive habits or who were fond of Shikar and who wanted to keep their martial spirits alive.

**Maulana Zafar Ali Khan** (East Central Punjab: Muhammadan): Martial spirit had been killed by Mahatma Gandhi.

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh:** I am not concerned at the moment with the personalities. I have given the views of the majority Party's representative who was the Prime Minister in the Madras Presidency. In his latest pronouncement, Mahatma Gandhi has said in so many words that he is responsible only for conducting the Satyagraha movement and if today the All-India Congress Committee were to decide to change this attitude, it is open to them to do so, although he may not believe in it. I have already read out two pronouncements of Mr. Rajagopalachariar and he has not said anything since then to contradict them. He has never said that he has taken to Satyagraha because of this movement. He put forward the constitutional issue as the ground for his Satyagraha.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): All that is irrelevant to the motion before the House.

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh:** I have said this because of an interruption.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member should not be diverted by interruptions.

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh:** As I was saying, the thing that was responsible for killing the martial spirit of Indians was to a very considerable extent the Arms Act. Well, after that we had this war of 1914-18. They got a good response. They cannot complain that they did not get a good response, it was not merely from what I will now call the listed class but from other classes which were not so known, and as has been stated in another place, from other classes which were not so well known but which were obscure and which were not known for their bravery. Even from this class there was a good response. If that was so, then do not those classes deserve encouragement now? No. That army was disbanded. These new classes which had shown bravery during the last war and which had sanctified the battlefields with their blood were given the go-bye. Their services were not retained in spite of the services they rendered. Let me again say this that the non-listed classes were not given opportunities as they were given in the Punjab to the listed classes. In the Punjab, they give jagirs and rewards to soldiers and thus encourage recruitment. This is how meritorious military service is rewarded. In other provinces, if people are anxious to enlist, what happens? I will tell you. The Maharattas are considered a martial race. I belong to the Central Provinces and Berar. So far as the Muslims and the Hindus were concerned there was no distinction so far as military service was concerned. The ancestors of my friend, Nawab Siddiq Ali Khan, as well as my forefathers served in the army under the Bhonsle Rajas of Nagpur. In those days there were no differences observed between Hindus and Muslims as prevail now. Now, if I wanted to get myself recruited what

[Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh.]

happened before this war. There are no recruiting centres in the Central Provinces and Berar. A man who wanted to get himself recruited to the army had to come all the way to Delhi, sit here for a number of days on the off chance of being selected. He had to spend a lot of money for staying here. I had put a question regarding the meeting of these expenses by the Government and the answer was the man had to bear the expense. I asked a supplementary question as to whether the Government were prepared to multiply these recruiting centres, and the answer was 'No'. With such great handicaps, how can any province be represented. It is very easy to give a dog a bad name and hang it. First of all you do not give men of any province opportunities for getting themselves recruited and then say to them, 'you have not availed yourself of opportunities, you show no response to the demands we make, you belong to the non-listed class.' This kind of argument does not really sound fair in the mouths of the Government representatives.

The Government again say, "True, we are very anxious to have a unit on a new basis, but we have got no officers. There is a paucity of officers". Whose fault is it? The Congress Party since 1935 has been dinning into the ears of this Government about this, but the Government seem to have put cotton plugs into their ears. Our voice has never reached them. We want recruitment from all the provinces. We want that you should convert this University Training Corps into an Officers Training Corps. We asked questions about this. What was the reply? It can not be done. The Universities were very keen to instil a martial spirit into the students and when at the last Quinquennial conference held at Bombay, they passed a Resolution and approached the Government with a request that military officers should be lent to them so that the U. T. C. might be made more efficient and also that the formation of U. T. C. should be extended to all the Colleges and Universities, what was the reply of the Government? The answer was this cannot be done. Every time we want to do something for the army, the question of money is put forward to deny our demand.

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

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh**: If you will kindly extend to me about ten minutes or even five minutes, I shall finish.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must stick to his time limit.

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh**: Then, I will finish in two minutes. I now come to this point that all the provinces should be given equal opportunities, the reason being that the tactics of warfare have changed now. All provinces are in danger. In those early days, the strategy was wholly confined to land army.....

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member need not go into all that. He must finish now.

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh**: I shall finish in one minute, Sir. On account of the modern strategy of war and use of aeroplanes and bombers,

as the means of attack from Air no province is safe now. Every province is really in danger and, therefore, it is necessary that all the provinces should be given this facility for recruitment and for training and thus enabled to share the responsibility for its defence. With these words, I commend my motion for the acceptance of the House.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved: "That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee** (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Sir, I rise to support this motion. This motion has two aspects, firstly, the aspect of Indianisation and, secondly, the aspect of recruitment from the different provinces. So far as Indianisation is concerned, we, from this side of the House, have urged time and again that not only should the rank and file of the Army in India be Indianised, but also the officers' ranks. But the progress towards this goal has been extremely slow. What is the position today? We find that although the rank and file of the Army has been greatly increased during the war, the proportion of Indians in the ranks of commissioned officers is extremely small. This is absolutely unjustifiable. I hope and trust that adequate steps will soon be taken to remove this injustice.

As regards the second aspect, the Honourable the Premier of the Punjab said the other day that the Punjab was "the sword arm of India". I greatly appreciate the bravery and heroism displayed by the soldiers from the Punjab in the recent war in Africa, and I congratulate them,—Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims,—who won brilliant victories there. But I do not see any cogent reason for holding the view that the Punjab should always remain the sword arm of India. The Punjab came into the possession of the British Government comparatively recently. It was only in the forties of the last century that the Punjab became a British possession. Before that the other provinces raised their armies in order to enable the British to conquer the rest of India including the Punjab. In those days there were no Punjabees in the Indian Army, but how did those armies which existed then fight their battles? They must have been well-trained, they must have been brave soldiers, and they must have possessed the strength to fight.

The Defence Secretary said the other day that there was no distinction between martial and non-martial races, that distinction was the creation of politicians. If there is no distinction between martial and non-martial races, what is the basis of the discrimination which has been sought to be placed on recruitment from the different provinces? Is it physical strength? If that be so, I may say that there are men possessing adequate physical strength in all parts of the country; this is not the monopoly of the Punjab. Then, again, we should remember that physical strength is not the only thing needed in modern warfare; the brain is as important today as the body. Therefore, too much emphasis should not be laid on physical strength. But there is an important question of principle involved in this. The defence of the country is not only a right but also a duty, and it is not proper that the people of other provinces should be deprived of the exercise of this right and the performance of this duty. A grave injustice has been done to the inhabitants of the other provinces by depriving them of this right in the past, and now the time has come when this right must be restored,—they should be allowed to perform their duty in the proper manner

[Dr. P. N. Banerjea.]

Sir, His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in moving a substitute Resolution the other day in the other House gave some assurances in this regard. I hope and trust that those assurances will be fully carried out in the spirit in which they were given, and that at no distant date. The matter brooks no delay. We should now see to it that the Army in India becomes an Indian Army in the fullest sense of the term and that facilities are afforded to the inhabitants of all parts of India to serve in this Army.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney** (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I take part in this debate with a view not to decry but support the principle underlying this cut motion. It will interest Members of this House when I say I can take my memory back nearly 50 years to my early active Army service days and later to my 22 years of public life. I, therefore, feel I am in a position more or less to weigh matters more from the practical standpoint than from linguistic ability. Sir, I yield to no one in my desire that the Army in India should be increasingly the concern of India, as was the dictum laid down by the Cabinet Member who presided over the Defence Committee of the first Round Table Conference of which I was a member and which policy I supported at that time. Today we are environed with a different position. The world has moved, the Army has changed, ideas have changed and India has changed; but this House seems to be very keen in its efforts, not so much with the policy underlying recruitment into India's new Army but a discrimination between martial and non-martial classes. We have Members of this House who desire to run; some of them before they can walk, others before they can even crawl and think they can make a paper or sentimental Army. To all I would gladly give a tonic to walk faster; and so, in principle, I am not against this cut motion if it indicates India's desire to take a larger part in the new Army than it has done. Nor am I at all against the desire of Members of this House to be taken into closer co-operation and confidence in the policy underlying the defence of this country. For, after all, if England is sincere in its desire to give India Dominion Status, a start must be made now. It is no use being told after the war is over and the incendiary bombs and the roar of the cannon have given place to the trumpet call of peace that we are not prepared or are found wanting. It is better to prepare us now and so dove-tail us into the change which is bound to come sooner or later. But when I hear Members of this House blame Government for not rapidly Indianising the Army and for not recruiting it from all classes from different parts of India I feel they lose sight of a very obvious and important fact; it is this: Though efficiency and economy are strange bed-fellows, yet, if we are to have both efficiency and economy it is in the country's interests to locate your troops in areas where we are more exposed to attack and by communities who are acclimatised to these parts of India. Those parts are not in the South of India, not in the middle of India, not in Calcutta where my friend, Dr. Banerjea, comes from,—a part where they make bombs for the rest of India to fire. No, Sir; it is in the North-West Frontier of India. And who are the inhabitants there, who are acclimatised to that place but the Sikhs and the Punjabees? It is true that their entrance into the Indian Army is much later than many other Indian communities who, unfortunately, today, are dubbed non-martial—or not selected classes and if the Army must be located in these parts where there is the greatest danger, can any unprejudiced Member in this House conceive of an army of Madrassis or Brahmins or Bengalees coming up North and being able to

stand the extreme winter of the North in spite of their being good soldiers down in the plains of India? Nor would it be wise permanently to locate Gurkha Battalions in the hot plains of India. Government are blamed for dividing India into martial and non-martial classes. Indeed my small community—Anglo-Indian, has also been dubbed “non-martial” despite the undeniable fact that Government have every reason to be grateful to the Anglo-Indian community. Indeed I make bold to say that if at the time of the Mutiny the Anglo-Indian Community had not been loyal I feel sure that the map of India would today be a different one. But let me come nearer home.

Sir, I have recently sat as a Member of the Central Selection Committee for Emergency Commissions when I spent a month of interesting work which has been a great lesson to me. I have sat on many of these Committees and I desire to tell this House that I was struck with the cosmopolitan character of the candidates who came up for selection. They came up from every Indian community—Depressed Classes, Indian Christians, Parsis, Jains, Buddhists, Nepalis, Sikhs, Punjabees, Muslims, Anglo-Indians, etc. And, Sir, charitable as I want to be I was struck with one point, *i.e.*, India was not sending her best youth as officers for the new Army and I often asked myself why? In my public life I have travelled all over India and I have mixed with all kinds of Indians—indeed, I believe in the whole of this House I can look on every Indian as a friend of mine. I know India can supply as fine soldiers and officers as any country in the world; but I was struck with the absence of its best youth at these selection committees. They were not the type who would make the best soldiers and the best officers. Most of them were graduates who thought that because they were B.As or LL.Bs, therefore, they ought to be officers. I repeat with regret we were not getting the proper type; and it is on these occasions when a cut motion like this is moved that we should instead of blaming Government make ourselves into publicity agencies and try to get a better class of our boys to join us. As one who has sat on such committees, I can assure you, Sir, that they would welcome them and no one would be prouder or gladder than the Defence Secretary. I speak as one who is absolutely non-communal in a matter like this, and from my own personal knowledge. I hold no brief for the Defence Secretary, but I believe he has India's interests close at heart and he cannot be charged, even by his worst enemy, of being in any way differential in his treatment as regards class recruitment. There are I know higher policies which he has to follow as a servant, but it is up to us to get our best men to come forward and when Government are crying out for men and officers, let us ask ourselves whether India is supplying the best and what part are we playing apart from critics? With all respect to my friends here, I say, let each one of us be a recruiting centre. Let us not misunderstand Government. We have made Government realise that their vested interests, their ideas of monopolies are of the past, we want more recruits and more efficient officers. Are we to get them or not? Surely, you do not want an Army officered by what I might call physical degenerates? I can assure you that many of the specimens who came before us at the last Selection Committee were really not up to standard. It is, therefore, no use decrying the Army Department. Its answer is clear: it is doing its best to help India but we are doing very little to help it, except to criticise it on the platform of this House, more as idealists than as practical men.



[Mr. M. Ghiasuddin.]

**Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** Sir, I have listened with great attention and respect to the speech of my Honourable friend, Mr. Deshmukh, the Mover of this out motion; and much as I tried to understand his point of view, as far as I could see, it was full of self-contradictions. The first point he tried to lay stress on was that the necessity of an army is recognised by the Congress. My way of looking at it is that only either super-idealists or fools would say that an army is not a necessity for any country. One has to be charitable and say that persons who think that we can defend our country by the methods of non-violence are super-idealists and do not fall into the other category. The Honourable Member has tried to trace the history of the so-called martial and non-martial classes to the year 1857. The Honourable the Defence Secretary has time and again repudiated that there is such a thing as martial and non-martial classes . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member may continue his speech after Lunch.

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

---

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

---

**Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** Sir, when the House rose for Lunch, I was trying to meet a point raised by my friend, who, I am sorry to find, is not in his seat now. He said that the so-called differentiation dates back to the year 1857 since that unfortunate incident. He did not fully develop his point, but I guess he meant that the armies at that time did not prove satisfactory and so the avenues of recruitment had to be altered. Well, Sir, I will not refer to that unfortunate incident, because the incident is such that neither side came out with credit then and I think that both sides have definite reason to be ashamed of it for the part they played then, and we should not mention it here. But if the armies at that time did not give a satisfactory account of themselves, I do not suppose the reasons which led the Government to take that view then would hold good today. Government may have held that view then, and perhaps they were justified in changing the field of recruitment. But these are all arguments, and not facts, and so let us come to facts and figures.

Today the Army career is open to everybody. The Government require more men in all branches of the Army than one province, or one single community or one part of the country can supply. It is an opportunity afforded to everybody to come forward and help the cause. The figures that were given the other day by the Secretary of State for India in the House of Commons show that whereas the Punjab supplied more than 48,000 recruits last year, other provinces did not come up to much, and the second best province, as far as I know, was the United Provinces which supplied 12,000 recruits. Now, Sir, there is a marked difference in the figure of 48,000 men supplied by the Punjab and the figure of 12,000 men supplied by the United Provinces, and we all know that the population of the United Provinces is much greater than that of the Punjab. There is something in the traditions of a province,—and this fact Honourable Members of this House generally forget or ignore. There is such

a thing as tradition and it does play a large part in such matters. The families who have made army as their career, son succeeding a father, and grandson succeeding a grandfather,—this process goes on for generations. You cannot build up traditions in a day, nor can you change traditions by a Resolution of this House.

Now, Sir, let us take the attitude of the Party which has absented itself today from this House. On the one hand, its sympathisers say—open the doors of the army to all the provinces,—while on the other hand, the very leaders of that Party go out to the country and tell the people not to help in the prosecution of the war efforts. Today you find a great many *ex*-Ministers and *ex*-Premiers of several provinces in jail, because they have been openly preaching that nobody should enlist in the army. On the one hand, they carry on a propaganda against recruitment to the army, while on the other hand the Premier of the Punjab—an *ex*-soldier himself, has given his full support to the recruiting campaign. That great gentleman has not only asked every able bodied youngman to enlist in the army, but many members of his own family have joined the army;—in fact two of his sons who are of military age are serving in the army. One of them, unfortunately, has been taken away by the enemy after he had given a very good account of himself and after he had been wounded, but the younger son is still serving. Therefore, the attitude of the leaders in a province does count in all these matters. On the other hand, what do we see today in the other provinces? How does the leader of that organization regard the soldiers? Some months back all right-minded people were shocked to know his views when he said something about the soldiers from the Punjab. He said the Punjabi soldiers were mercenary. Now, Sir, we all know that the term mercenary is hardly a fit language to be employed in respect of such honourable men who have shed lustre on India by the way in which they have fought and are still fighting abroad, and the world has come to know of their bravery, and such brave men have been characterised by this man as mercenary soldiers. How would the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution like if I say he is mercenary because he attends this House not to do any service to the country or to his constituency, but to draw his daily allowance? All I can say is that any man who uses the word 'mercenary' in regard to those brave men is a petty-minded person, only such petty-minded people can use such language, —and it is not even worth replying . . . . .

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh:** Whom are you referring to? I have not said that.

**Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** The leader of your organization did say that.

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh:** Who is it?

**Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** I think every Honourable Member of this House who reads newspapers knows who the leader is.

**An Honourable Member:** Mr. Aney?

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** He is not responsible for anybody's statement outside.

**Mr. M. Ghasuddin:** I do not say that, but according to that great leader of Wardha he would like to create more mercenaries, that is what this Resolution comes to.

Another point raised by my friend was that the Arms Act is responsible for these people not coming forward in sufficient numbers to join the army, it has made cowards of persons here. Let me tell my friend that Acts similar to the Arms Act here are in existence in all civilized countries, and so it is not the Arms Act which is to blame. The one thing which makes a man coward, is this doctrine of non-violence, and not the Arms Act. So unless a man is an utter fool or a hypocrite, he would see the harm that is being done to our young men by this doctrine.

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh:** Some can honestly believe in it.

**Mr. M. Ghasuddin:** You have to be very very honest, in fact ultra-honest, to believe in such a thing.

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh:** You must attain that amount of detachment from the world and then you can do it.

**Mr. M. Ghasuddin:** Sir, a great cry has been raised against my province. They say we want the monopoly of the army and they remind us that at one time the Punjab was conquered by the armies from Bihar and Bengal. But there may have been other contributory factors to that. There was a certain amount of disaffection among the Sikh armies; probably those soldiers were better officered, and that would have contributed to the defeat of the Punjab then. But in the Punjab we gave them a much better fight, and any historian will bear testimony to it . . . .

**An Honourable Member:** When was it?

**Mr. M. Ghasuddin:** We gave the British much better fight than the other people.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta):** The Honourable Member should address the Chair.

**Mr. M. Ghasuddin:** I am sorry, Sir.

Sir, a demand has been made to the Honourable the Defence Secretary and a promise made by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief in another place has been cited. Well, let me give a warning to the Honourable the Defence Secretary and through him a warning to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief that the people of my province of the Punjab earned their share not by talking in this House or by making speeches. They have earned this proud place by their blood.

**An Honourable Member:** So have others.

**Mr. M. Ghasuddin:** If any attempt is made to tamper with our rightful share we will not tolerate it and we will resist it.

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** By force?

**Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** Now, I want to say one more thing. That is my advice to the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution. Today our Indian Army needs as much men as any province can bring forward and there is room for many more. Instead of moving such Resolutions in this House and instead of making speeches here, let him go out in the country and help the recruiting authorities and persuade his young men to come forward for service. That would be doing real service and Resolutions like this, to use an American expression, cut no ice.

**Mr. Govind V. Deshmukh:** In your case it might.

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

**Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** I have finished, Sir.

**Mr. C. M. G. Ogilvie:** Sir, the old vexed question of martial and non-martial has again been raised. I have tried on several occasions to exercise this ghost but I have failed. However, I am not deterred and I am going to try and do so again. Government, as I have often said before, do not recognise any distinctions of martial and non-martial and the distinction which is observed, which is enlisted and non-enlisted, is not an immutable distinction and has no relation to martial and non-martial.

**An Honourable Member** What is it based on?

**Mr. C. M. G. Ogilvie:** I will explain. I can well understand people not likely to be called non-martial. It does sound derogatory. It sounds as if they were cowards or would not fight for their hearths and homes and no man likes that imputed to him. I shall, therefore, be the last person to use the phrase non-martial intentionally about any of the peoples of India, none of whom to the best of my knowledge and belief are lacking in those qualities. On the other hand, I think, everybody will admit that a large and even supply of excellent military material is not readily obtainable from all sources. It is not merely a question of courage or physique or brains but of that particular type of character which combines boldness and caution, swift decision, capacity to see the weak point of an enemy and to look after one's own skin, which makes the formidable fighting man. Well, you get people like that in all parts of this country, undoubtedly, but in some parts of it you get more than in others and in the past we have been very much restricted in numbers and consequently in choice. History also enters into it as certain Members have seen but it is not only history. When you are restricted to a comparatively small Army, it is obviously impossible to mingle the ordinary folk, not the upper classes, but ordinary peasants from all parts of the country in a single unit, you cannot really do that. So your enlisted classes must be comparatively speaking few. As the Army expands, so those classes expand and His Excellency the Defence Member said recently in another place a beginning has already been made in the breaking of new ground. He also said, and this also I wish to make quite clear, that the breaking of new ground does not mean that we throw overboard those who have served India so valiantly and successfully. I notice that Dr. Banerjee—or it may have been the Mover—said that during the last war it was discovered that many

[Mr. C. M. G. Ogilvie.]

of the additional classes then enlisted made very good soldiers. Quite true. So it was, but he also said that they were thrown out at the end of the war and the old ones kept. Should we have thrown out the old and kept the new ones, or what should we have done? As a matter of fact, we kept, I think, those who generally speaking had proved in the last war to be in practice the best, but we were much restricted by the size of the Army, and if we could have we should have liked to have kept very many more. His Excellency said in the Upper House that though for the early expansion of an Army it is necessary to rely mainly upon what is already there, as you cannot build up quickly new units from nothing,—they have got to be raised from a nucleus of trained men which can only be supplied from existing units, still in the new expansion that is going on now, no province or people will be excluded from consideration. I think that is all that can be said and that is all that any one can ask for. He also made it quite clear that those classes who were already serving in the Army would not lose the opportunities for service which they at present enjoy and of which they have made such magnificent use.

I was very glad to hear from Dr. Banerjea that he complimented the soldiers of the Punjab on their recent victories. Well, I too, speaking as a Punjabi, feel very proud of them, but though I rejoice in their successes, I must point out that it was not only the Punjabees who gained glory for themselves in the recent victories. There were many soldiers from the United Provinces, Garhwalis, Rajputs, Mussalmans from the United Provinces, Mahrattas from Bombay and also the Madras Sappers and Miners who displayed their customary courage in the most dangerous task of removing concealed mines in order to let our troops get through. In fact, all the classes of Indian soldiers at present on active service have very greatly distinguished themselves, and I have no doubt that the newer material, when its time comes to be tested, will do its utmost to live up to the magnificent traditions bequeathed to it by our old army. I hope that, on receipt of the assurance which I have just given to him, the Honourable Member will see fit to withdraw his cut motion.

**Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad** (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, only this morning, my friend, Sir F. E. James, complimented the Honourable the Defence Secretary first on behalf of himself, then on behalf of the European Group, then on behalf of all the Groups in the Assembly, and, then, on behalf of everybody; now I would add one thing more, *viz.*, not only on behalf of the living, but on behalf of the dead, and the reason for adding this remark is that I know he has done a very great service in finding a suitable place for the resting place of the late Maulana Shaukat Ali. Sir, we know, when we were in great difficulties, he came forward and helped us on that particular occasion.

I heard with great satisfaction the remarks made by my friend over there when he communicated to us the desire of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief. Of course, it is a standing grievance for the Muslims at least in my Province, the United Provinces, that there are certain towns—I know of one place which was part of a constituency which I represented in the U. P. Council—there are certain towns and the people there had

two professions and nothing else, viz., either service in the army or gardening. They knew nothing else. Now, unfortunately, recruitment to the army stopped and consequently they did not know what to do; they were accustomed for generations to nothing but doing army work—whether you call them martial races or by whatever name—it is a fact that from their very childhood they were accustomed to all kinds of military training, military technical terms and a military atmosphere.

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** So also in Mainpuri.

**Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad:** I did not like to include Mainpuri, because Bhagaon is in the Mainpuri district.

Now, I would like to know whether the assurance given to us applies only to the Army, or it extends also to the Air Force and the Navy, because the Muslims have got a standing complaint just at present that for the recruitment for certain categories, which I need not mention at present, in certain regions, I do not say that they are excluded, but they are not getting their proper share of the recruitment in the Air Force, and not even in the Navy, especially amongst the officers; therefore, I think this announcement which we have received with great satisfaction in different Provinces and which has also been so received by people belonging to the different communities and in different atmospheres—call it by martial or by any other name you like—is very welcome and they will also visualize that this privilege will be extended to all the arms, and not restricted to the recruitment to the army. In this connection, I may say that I have heard some definite complaints about the manner of double selection in the army. They have no doubt a Recruiting Committee—which is a very representative one, it represents all shades of opinion which a military selection committee should have, but we have some complaints about the primary selections. In the first place, I believe that it is unnecessary to have double selection,—first, selection by some local committee, and a second time, selections by a central committee. Now, provincial committees have got different ideas; their standards differ so widely from province to province. With one particular class of persons a certain qualification is supposed to be a suitable qualification for selection by one provincial committee, and just the reverse when you come to a second province. Now, we have got in the United Provinces Selection Committee a body which is always a touring body; it chooses its places of selection the Circuit House, and we thus call it a Circuit House Committee, though officially it is known as the U. P. Selection Committee. If the idea is that the people should be saved from the trouble of coming to Delhi, and in order to avoid expenses there, I may assure him that the expenses are actually doubled if a candidate has to bear expenses twice—once for the local selection committee, and then for the selection committee which has been established by the central organization: so it is most desirable that in order to have a uniformity of standard, there should be only one selection committee which can tour about; they may visit different places, they may visit the centres of the universities and get suitable candidates. But as regards the other method which is adopted at present, I do not know whether it is convenient from the point of view of the military authorities, but it is certainly not convenient from the point of view of the candidates. The second difficulty which I felt was that I come across a number of young men very suitable for a military career, but they do not know where to go; some of them are in the railway

[Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad.]

service or some other service, but they say that they want to serve in the military department during the war and they want to get some commission if they are competent, and the officers under whom they serve are willing to send them, but wherever they send applications they never hear of them; I do not know what happens. I may mention one definite case; the General Manager of the B. & N. W. Railway sent an application from a young man who had two years' military training in the cavalry and had one hundred hours' flying experience. He wanted to enlist himself as an ordinary commissioned officer, he sent his application, the General Manager sent his application to our Selection Committee in the United Provinces, but he got no reply. I forwarded a duplicate, but I got no reply. I do not know whether the selection committees ever paid any attention to it. So I think it is very desirable that the method of selection should be such as may be simple and easily intelligible to all the persons who want to serve in the army. At present they do not know where to go, how to apply, etc. Therefore, I think some kind of propaganda work should be done in this direction, and this method of recruitment should be widely advertised, so that everybody may know what is the method of the application if they want to serve in any of these three arms,—viz., the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. I do not want to take up the question of propaganda work which we discussed at great length here, and unfortunately, whenever we get cut motions, they are really restricted to the speech of the Honourable the Mover and the reply from the Government.

**An Honourable Member:** Why?

**Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad:** . . . for want of time; and we do not get sufficient experience in getting on with this propaganda. I have got a good deal to say. . . .

**An Honourable Member:** The question may now be put.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Chair should remind the Honourable Member that it is almost the time for the question to be put.

**Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad:** Very well, Sir, I shall wait for the Finance Bill, when I will not be restricted as regards the time.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The question is: "That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100." The motion was negatived.

*Grievances of Government Employees.*

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Now, it is the turn 3 P.M. of the unattached Members.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

This time I do not want to go into all the grievances of the Government employees but deal with only one grievance which comes uppermost in the minds of all Government employees and from which they suffer the most.

That grievance is that the Government employees are not compensated for the loss which they suffer on account of the rise in prices and the cost of living. It is more than 18 months since the war started, and since the war started the prices of articles in our country have gone up. In his Budget speech the Honourable the Finance Member admitted that the prices of articles of export had gone up by 40 per cent. and he also admitted that the prices of articles of internal consumption also tended to keep pace with the rising prices of articles of export. This year he has brought down the figure, but I do not know how he could do it. At least he has not explained it. Still, he admits that the prices of articles of export have gone up and he does not say that the prices of articles of internal consumption have not kept pace with the rise in prices of articles of export. On account of this rise in prices the poor people of this country, who do not get sufficient for the maintenance of themselves and of their families, have suffered and their standard of life is tending to go down and has already gone down considerably. Now, Sir, if this is to be prevented, then those people who do not get sufficient for their maintenance and for the maintenance of their families must be compensated by the rise in wages and in salaries. In this matter, the Government of India have done nothing. If you take the industrial workers, at least some of them have got some increases in their wages; but in the case of Government employees, the Government of India did not do anything up to this time. Recently, I read of certain statements made by the Honourable the Finance Member and this morning I read in the newspapers that the Standing Finance Committee has considered this question. Now, Sir, after having waited for 18 months it seems that the Government of India propose to do in this matter what the Provincial Governments have done. We do not yet know what the Provincial Governments have done. I have read in the papers that some of them propose to give some grain compensation allowance for the lowest paid employees.

Now, as to the Government's policy of doing what the Provincial Governments have done, I would suggest to the Government of India to follow one policy and stick to that policy. If they want to follow the Provincial Governments in the matter of treatment of their low paid employees, let them decide that way, but it is my experience that when the Provincial Governments do something in favour of their inferior servants, the Government of India are not willing to follow their good example. You will remember, Sir, that in the matter of pensions of the inferior servants I brought to the notice of the Legislative Assembly that the Bombay Government have done some justice to their inferior servants and I suggested that the Government of India should follow their example. Then, the Government of India said that they cannot follow the Bombay Government. The Government of India considered themselves to be wiser than the Bombay Government on that occasion. Now, when it is a question of taking away from the employees of the Government of India, they would bring forward the argument of following the Provincial Governments.

**An Honourable Member:** Taking away how?

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Taking away in this sense that recently some inquiries have been made regarding the conditions under which some of the Government employees are living. The Rau Committee has recently reported and it has recommended that there should be a rise of Rs. 3 a month in the salaries of the lowest paid Government employees in the railways. The



[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

Government of India could have easily said that as that Committee has gone into the question of the lowest paid railway employees, they are prepared to accept their recommendation for the inferior servants of the Government of India. The Government of India could have done that but they are not willing to do it because they know that what the Provincial Governments are doing or will do is much less than what has been recommended by the Rau Committee.

Then, Sir, as regards the question of the Government of India following the Provincial Governments, I would like to ask the Honourable Member what he proposes to do where there are no independent Governments, such as, the Centrally Administered Areas like Delhi and Ajmer. In these Central areas there are no independent Governments. There is no doubt that they have some kind of Governments but they are not independent provinces. Their Governments have no power of levying taxation. They have to come to the Government of India for money and I would like to know what the Government of India propose to do with regard to them. Let them, at least, follow the Rau Committee's recommendation in the Central Areas where they are in control. I would, therefore, suggest to the Government of India, in the first place, that they should set a good example by themselves accepting the recommendation of the Rau Committee in the Central territories and then apply that recommendation to the other provinces.

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** How can the Government of India apply it?

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** The Government of India can apply that recommendation only to their employees. I am not asking them to raise the salaries or give war allowances to the employees of the Provincial Governments. In this matter I would like the Government of India to be just and fair and even generous. Then, Sir, I would like the Government of India also to consider the question not only of those people who are called inferior servants or the lowest paid but they should also take up the question of those people who may be getting a little more than what the inferior servants get but who do not get really sufficient for the maintenance of their families and themselves. that is, people who are getting, say, Rs. 100. Sir, I do not wish to take up any more time of the House and I would commend my cut motion to the favourable consideration of the Assembly and of the Government of India.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to support this cut motion. It relates to the grievances of Government employees, and I think the House should have sympathy for them. They are the back-bone of the Government, and they should be kept always contented and not dissatisfied. It is in the interest of Government to look to their welfare, and to see that they get enough to live on. Everyone has a right to live, and if the Government employees do not get sufficient for maintaining themselves and their families, they will be discouraged and the efficiency of the Government work will suffer.

Now, Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, has, as usual, taken up this cut, and he wants that there should be some increase in the salaries

or allowances of these low paid Government servants. So far as Provincial Governments are concerned, he says that the Government of India should merely give a lead by doing something on their own account. In these days of war, it is very necessary that there should be dearness allowance to these low paid servants. What is the percentage in the rise of prices is a question to be found out and settled by Government. It may be 30 per cent. or 40 per cent. It cannot possibly be denied that there is rise in prices. But to what extent it is, it is for the Government to find out. The other question is, to which classes of Government servants the dearness allowance should be given. So far as the Central Government is concerned, a low paid subordinate here gets about Rs. 60 to Rs. 80. At any rate, that class of subordinates should get the allowance. So far as the Provincial Governments are concerned, the lowest paid employee starts on Rs. 30 or so. In the provinces also, the dearness allowance should be given to those who draw Rs. 60 and less.

There is another grievance of the employees of the Government of India. It is well known that some of these people used to be taken to Simla where they were provided with rent-free houses, and so they were not required to pay any rent. Now, some of them are not taken up to Simla. I do not know how many. So far as the exodus is concerned, it is yet to be seen whether the Government have complied with all that was intended. At any rate, it is quite clear that the Government have not complied with the idea that was contemplated, namely, that there should be less and less exodus to Simla. These subordinates who remain in Delhi throughout the year get no house rent at all. In lieu of rent-free houses, which they used to get when they were taken to Simla, these people should be given some allowances. Of course, their wants are the same both here in Delhi and in Simla. This particular grievance should be considered by the Government sympathetically. You must keep the subordinates contented wherever they require some help in the direction of allowances.

**The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman** (Finance Member): Sir, my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, is quite right in saying that this matter of dearness allowance was placed before the Standing Finance Committee at its last meeting. I may say that there was remarkable unanimity of opinion on the proposals which the Government of India had formulated. Mr. Joshi says he has not heard what the provincial schemes are. A number of Provincial Governments have already published their schemes and they are quite well-known to the Government servants affected. It is true that several of those schemes have not yet come into operation for the simple reason that they are based on a criterion which has not yet materialised. In other words, the cost of living as measured in the reports of the cost of staple food grains has not yet risen in several of these provinces to the point at which the Provincial Governments consider that any compensation whatever is called for. I must express my strong agreement with that point of view. The fact is that whatever fluctuations have occurred in the last two years in the cost of living the levels which existed when the present rates of pay were fixed have certainly not been violently exceeded and in fact it is possible to prove that in many areas they have not even yet been reached. I am familiar with the argument that Government servants of this class should not be deprived of any improvement in their standard of living which has accrued

[Sir Jeremy Raisman.]

to them over a long period when prices have been somewhat lower than those prevailing when their rates of pay were fixed. I admit that argument is deserving of some weight. At the same time the position which prevails over large areas of India is that the cost of living has increased, if at all, only to the extent of barely ten per cent and I maintain that it is quite impossible to preserve any kind of structure of salaries or wages if fluctuations of that kind in the cost of living are to be continuously adjusted.

Well, now, I take my main stand on this principle that the cost of living in any locality is very peculiarly a local matter regarding which the Provincial Government is obviously in the best position to form an opinion and the Provincial Government is able to keep itself in touch. Moreover, the number of inferior servants employed in the provinces is far larger than those employed by the Central Government in those provinces. It would, therefore, be in my opinion quite improper for the Central Government to take the lead and not only to tell the Provincial Governments what it thought was required in the circumstances of the case, but to proceed to apply to its own comparatively small minority of servants a scale of compensation regardless entirely of the ideas of the Provincial Government. Surely, the path of common sense is to await the Provincial Government's formulation of its own scheme and to apply to the comparatively small number of Central Government servants the scheme which the Provincial Government has applied to its own comparable grades.

Mr. Joshi throws up at me that in some other matter,—I think he said in the matter of pensions,—we did not follow the Bombay Government when they improved the pensions. That is an entirely different matter. The question of a substantive condition of service is entirely different from a question of compensation or adjustment due to local and temporary conditions. With regard to the latter it cannot be denied that the authorities on the spot are in a much better position to judge what is appropriate than the Central Government. But it is entirely a different matter to formulate new substantive conditions of service for your employees. Mr. Joshi asks what we intend to do in the Central Areas. We have not yet decided what we shall do in the Central Areas and it seems to me that on the same argument as I have employed hitherto, that is, that Central Areas are mostly contiguous to provinces in which very similar conditions prevail, unless we see any strong reason to the contrary I imagine that we shall formulate something on the lines which are applicable in the neighbouring districts of contiguous provinces. Mr. Joshi was not content with asking us to give a lead by handing out large compensatory allowances to inferior servants, but with a fine courage he went on to say that we should apply this to higher grades and go right up to Rs. 100. I would remind him that a man on Rs. 170 a month is already being asked to make some additional contribution by way of income-tax and I think it will be somewhat anomalous if an employee on Rs. 170 a month in effect is asked to suffer a reduction in his net income whilst the employee on Rs. 100 a month is given an increase. In other words, who is to pay for all these generous compensations? What about a little compensation or consideration for the taxpayer from whose money these compensations have to come?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai supported Mr. Joshi, but he went on to another point which certainly comes within the grievances of Government servants, though it is not connected with the dearness allowance. His soft heart has been obviously entirely melted by the dreadful hardships of those who once used to go to Simla and when they went to Simla were given a compensation, because it was so expensive to have to move to Simla, and now that they are kept in Delhi they have lost that compensation and they are not given a compensation because of the loss of the compensation which they once got, because they had to go to Simla. That may seem humorous, but it is a literal statement of the case which these Government servants have. It is not an overdrawn statement; it is a serious claim that having once enjoyed compensation on account of certain increases in cost to which they were subjected, they ought now to be compensated for the loss.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** They have the same cost in Delhi.

**The Honourable Sir Jeremy Raisman:** I should be very glad if Mr. Lalchand Navalrai would organise all these Government servants and get them together and give me that simple answer. I should be glad to accept that simple position, namely, that there is no extra cost involved in going to Simla or there is no extra cost in Delhi, because the immediate effect of that would be that I should save the Simla compensatory allowances. The existing rates of pay and rents and so on in Delhi were fixed on the basis of Delhi. The only change that took place was that the people who went to Simla got something more. If it is the considered opinion of the Government servants concerned that there is no such difference, then the taxpayer here also is due for a little relief and the compensatory allowances given to the ministerial staff who move to Simla should be withdrawn at once.

I submit, Sir, that in fact in dealing with the case of these inferior Government servants we have to maintain a certain standard of logic and common sense and also a certain standard of fairness to the general taxpayer. In my opinion Government servants are dealt with not only with justice and equity but even with generosity as Mr. Joshi suggests. But we cannot put them in the position of being spoilt darlings of the community and extend to them concessions which are not justifiable. Sir, I oppose the motion.

**Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad:** Sir, this question of dearness allowance was discussed twice in the Standing Finance Committee, and I think also in the Railway Finance Committee, and I think there are one or two important points in this connection. I may point out at the outset that the Honourable Member for Labour was certainly wrong in the manner of the appointment of this Committee. The Committee should not have been there under the auspices of the G. I. P. Railway, and this question ought not to be decided on the issue of one railway line. It is a broad issue which affects the entire employees of the Central Government. In fact, the other day when some person came in, and this question was being discussed in the committee, I thought I was discussing with the representative of the Labour Department, but I subsequently discovered that my arguments were all wasted, because he was representing the Finance Department, and not the Labour Department. I think the

[Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad.]

conclusion that the Finance Department and the Finance Committee arrived at is very just and equitable, and they decided that wherever they find that the circumstances are such that additional relief is necessary, this relief should be given to all the servants in the Central Government, to whichever Department they may belong. We went thoroughly into the price index of the various provinces, and discussed these matters in great detail and came to some conclusion. We laid down principles, and then we discussed the details, and I think even my friend, Mr. Joshi, who is so difficult to satisfy when any question of labour comes in, because he wants something more, will be satisfied with this principle that whenever the Provincial Government on account of local conditions and on inquiry finds that dearness allowance is necessary, we should accept their decision and give dearness allowance to the servants of the Government of India, whether they be railway employees or employees of any other Department. And if the Government of India accept this principle, I do not think any class of persons can have any reason to complain. It is said that the railways are a commercial concern, and when they are making enormous profits, a share of those profits should go to the low-paid staff in the shape of bonus. This argument was offered by some persons during the debate, but it is not a right argument. In the first place, this profit is really due to the increase in rates and fares last year, and also partially to the increase in traffic. But if we accept this principle of giving bonus to the employees, then the bonus should be given to everybody—not only to the low-paid staff, but also to the highly paid staff. The moment you accept the principle of bonus on account of profit, you must accept the principle that it will apply to all, and not only to the low-paid staff. Therefore, that kind of argument advanced by some persons that it should be given to railways, because there is a profit, and that it should be given only to the low-paid staff, is, I think, not sound. If a bonus is given, because profit has accrued, it should be given to everybody. If it is a dearness allowance, then it should be given to all servants of the Government of India whether in the Post office or the Railways or in any other Department. I ask the Honourable the Communications Member whether he will agree that if it is to be given to one class of his employees, it should not also be extended to another class of his employees, not only in the railways, but also to the post office. Therefore, I think, the principle adopted by the Finance Committee is a sound principle and the method of their calculation is also a sound one, and if we go on that principle, no class of persons will have reason to complain; and though we started in a wrong manner, I think we decided the correct policy—a policy which cannot be objected to by any class of servants.

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

“That the demand under the head ‘Executive Council’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The next motion is No. 13 on the list.

**Mr N. M. Joshi:** Sir, what has happened to my motion No. 9?

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): No. 9 is not on this list. There was an agreement that No. 13 should be moved after Mr. Joshi's No. 8.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Why No. 13?

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): It was the result of a certain agreement, the Chair understands.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** I never heard of that agreement.

**An Honourable Member:** Because you were not here.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** May I say, Sir, that there has been some misunderstanding? If I had known that I could move only one cut motion, I would have moved some other motion and discussed all the things I wanted to discuss. I will not take a long time, Sir.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Chair cannot go behind this agreement.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** There was no agreement.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): It can be done with the consent of all the unattached Members.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** All right, Sir. I will not move any more motion.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): No. 13, Mr. Kazmi.

*Repressive Policy of the Government.*

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi** (Meerut Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I move:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The *New Statesman*, one of the most influential papers of England, has summed up the situation in India in one sentence:

"India is in moral revolt."

The position of Government may be summed up in a similar sentence:

"Government are using immoral means to crush the moral revolt."

The significance of this would be seen from the fact that in South Africa the party that is against South Africa's participation in the war is not only carrying on a verbal campaign against it, but is preaching violence, raising of an armed rebellion, organising of storm troopers and is even conjuring up the vision of a Nazi victory . . . .

**An Honourable Member:** What are you reading?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** The *New Statesman* and my own comments. This armed revolt is tolerated in South Africa. But a moral revolt, which the Honourable Member even described as a symbolic revolt

[Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi.]

and which, as Mr. Amery has said, has had no effect on the Government's war effort, is being sought to be crushed by means of a policy of indiscriminate imprisonments, detentions, and so on. Six *ex-Premiers* and nearly three score Ministers are in prison; and what is their crime? The demand for the freedom of conscience. In most cases the imprisonments are effected even before the demand is made or the speech in protest against the war policy and the war effort is actually made. In the vast majority of cases, heavy sentences have been given just for the offence of repeating an innocent slogan which is nothing more than the expression of an opinion—"It is wrong to help the British war effort with men and money. The only worthy effort is to resist all war by non-violent resistance."

**Sir. Syed Raza Ali** (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): What does that mean?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** It means what it says, namely, that it is wrong to help the British Government with men and money; the only worthy effort is to resist all war by non-violent means.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan** (Leader of the House): You call that innocent?

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell** (Home Member): On a point of information; may I know whether this is the Honourable Member's own speech, or he is still reading from a quotation?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** Quotation.

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell:** From whom?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** It is the slogan for all members whom you have arrested.

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell:** Is the Honourable Member giving his own opinion, or is it a quotation?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** A quotation from persons who repeat this formally, and some are arrested before the formula is uttered, and others are arrested after the formula is uttered, and this is a very convenient way of going to jail these days . . . .

**The Honourable Sir Jeremy Baisman:** The cat is out of the bag!

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** I have been told that a lawyer of renown has said that if Mahatmaji were to allow him to defend the Satyagrahis, he would see that every one of these sentences was wrong in law and was set aside; and the matter is so simple that every one can see it. In the case of Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, if he had cared to defend himself, no Court would have dared imposing the savage sentence of four years. He would have been acquitted, for he had committed no offence . . . .

**Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** Even in a Nazi Court?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** I have no experience of that. My learned friend might have. For what are called symbolic offences, or I should call technical offences, they are being given varying sentences of four months to four years, and fined Rs. 200 to Rs. 6,000. The earnestness of the people of India may be judged from the fact that an Advocate of the Central Provinces, Mr. Jakatdar, and an M. L. A., aged 65 years, has offered satyagraha six times in spite of having been sentenced to a fine aggregating over five thousand rupees and has again been sentenced to six months' rigorous imprisonment . . . .

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** The sentence was not severe enough; that is the grievance, I suppose?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** In their zeal to suppress the movement, the Government have not even hesitated to interfere in the election to this Honourable House. Mr. Khedan Lal, the Congress candidate, was arrested before his election, and just two days before the date of election, his worker, Mr. S. K. D. Paliwal, was also arrested, and the Government ought to have realised from the thumping majority of votes that Mr. Khedan Lal secured that this policy of torment and terror cannot succeed for long.

Now, as regards the prisoners, there is no uniformity of punishment, and certainly no uniformity of treatment, though the "technical" offence in all cases is the same, whereas there is uniformity of treatment for the German and Italian prisoners who are now in India. The arbitrary classification of prisoners adds insult to injury. There is no classification for war prisoners. The general demand for better and uniform treatment for politicals has been unceremoniously ignored, and in some cases, as in the United Provinces, policies laid down by previous Governments have been reversed. One would have thought that the Government would have issued instructions that no satyagrahi should be awarded less than "B" Class", but today even women Satyagrahis are being given "C" Class". You can find any number of such cases, and they for that reason are compelled to undergo various hardships, humiliation and mental torture for having to stay with the ordinary convicts of low character. No Government, having an iota of civilization in it, could allow this treatment.

In some provinces, many of those who repeat these anti-war slogans and have made anti-war speeches have not been arrested at all, while, in a large number of provinces, people have been imprisoned without having done any overt act. In some provinces, including Delhi itself, prisoners are marched to railway stations through public streets in handcuffs and bar fetters. In the Punjab, a man of the position of Mian Sahib Iftikharuddin, who pays several thousands of rupees as income-tax was transferred from one prison to another in handcuffs.

Then, Sir, food in jails, and in the Delhi jail, in particular, is unclean, full of grit and of inferior quality. In spite of protests and publicity, no improvement in the matter has been made. The prescribed diet of an ordinary prisoner is none too nourishing or substantial, and it is notorious that even that is undercooked and unclean. In the Vellore Jail, satyagrahi prisoners and detenus were harassed by being denied the normal rice diet and they were being given, instead, an inferior grain *ragi*, which even beggars regard as starvation diet . . . .



**The Honourable Diwan Bahadur Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar** (Member for Commerce and Labour): What is *ragi*?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi**: My friend knows it better than myself. I had to ask the meaning of it, but I now find that they are asking me what it is.

**Mr. Umar Aly Shah** (North Madras: Muhammadan): *Ragi* means *Ghody*?

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi**: Now, prisoners are allowed to supplement their diet, but may not have cooked food from outside. In the Madras Presidency, even Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar, the *ex*-Premier of the Province, is no exception to the rule, and even pickles and edibles of that kind come under the description of cooked food. In the Ajmer province,—and I had occasion to refer to it this morning.—Mr. Krishna Gopal Garg, a respectable and well-known citizen of Ajmer, who is in frail health, was given *chakki* grinding mill-task for some days during which he had a fainting fit. The trying Magistrate gave him “‘A’ Class,” but the administration have persisted in giving him “‘C’ Class” treatment, and the *Hindustan Times* has fitly characterised it as a scandal.

Then, Mr. Abdulla Farooqui, editor of two journals, *Mahshar Khyal* and *Khatoon*, who is incarcerated in Delhi Jail, is given old bamboos for cutting and making splinters,—and this is a kind of work considered fit enough to be given to a distinguished writer and editor of two journals,—and those who saw his condition say that his hands had become swollen and it became difficult for him even to take his food. Then, there are prisoners who have been served with restriction orders, and those who are detenus and security prisoners. The one is undergoing the rigours of jail life outside, while the other is inside without the semblance of a trial. On a previous occasion, I read out before this House that these restriction orders have been served on many persons in Delhi itself. In some cases these orders require these people to attend the police station after every four hours, that is, at 8 A.M., 12 NOON, 4 P.M. and 8 P.M. Probably they are not called at night, because they might disturb the sleep of the police officers. Not only that, Sir, but they are also restricted to a ward or two of the Municipality of Delhi. Even if they cross the borders of the ward, they are held to have contravened the terms of the notice and are given various terms of imprisonment. They are asked to keep themselves not only within the bounds of the Municipal ward, which would hardly be 1/20th part of the area of the city and if they step out of it they are considered to have infringed or violated the terms of the order and are given imprisonment. Even if they cross the road which bounds a particular ward, they are liable to be convicted. In one case—that was cited previously before this House,—a gentleman was charged by the police for having joined the *Fateha* ceremony of his sister. His defence was that he only crossed the road to get hold of the child, but anyway he was challanned by the police and convicted. And, Sir, taking advantage of the present position in Delhi, a number of persons have taken up the role of C. I. D. men. They approach peaceful citizens and tell them—look here, we have noted your activities and we will report you, and you will get restriction orders served on you,—and they are making money out of it.

Now, Sir, the lot of detenus who are in jail even without the semblance of a trial, and behind whose back the Honourable Member made the most irresponsible and unworthy attack on their character and labelled them as

traitors, etc., is very pitiable indeed. The Members of the Government are never tired of praising the life in prison. Honourable Members know very well the place where most of these people are kept,—they are kept in places far away from all railway communications, and their relatives and friends have no opportunity of meeting them. I may here mention the instance of Maulvi Habibur Rahman of Ludhiana who was at one time the President of the Majlis-i-Ahrar. He had a talk with Mr. Rafi Ahmad Kidwai at Allahabad. Mr. Rafi Ahmad Kidwai is an *ex*-Minister of the United Provinces. After he returned from Allahabad and reached Lahore, he was taken into custody without any charge or without any allegation that he had done anything which could be construed as prejudicial to the war activity, and now he has been transferred to Montgomery Jail. Now, Sir, it will be news to Members of this Honourable House that no friend or relative of his can see him without the permission in writing of the C. I. D. D. I. G. of Police, C. I. D., at Lahore. Unless one gets the permission of this officer who is in Lahore, no person can see him in Montgomery Jail, and no person is allowed permission by the C. I. D. His own son had much difficulty in seeing him. His doctor, Dr. Abdul Qavi, who has got a good practice. He had been attending him while he was outside the jail. He wanted to get the permission of the D. I. G., C. I. D., at Lahore to see him, because Maulvi Habibur Rahman being of advanced age suffered from piles and wanted medical consultation. The result was that permission was not granted. Even those persons who have got the good fortune of getting permission from that high official have got to get their permission renewed by the Superintendent of the Jail. That is only proper. I do not blame the Government. The interview can only be had in the presence of a jail officer as well as a policeman, and they must be in hearing distance, that is, only a few steps from the place where the conversation is going on. It was suggested by Mr. Amery in the House of Commons that leaders of political parties in India, if they wanted to correspond or consult or do anything of the kind, will be given all the facilities.

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

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi**: I am just finishing. These are the hardships of the people who are suffering. The Honourable the Home Member inspected the Deoli Jail in the guise of a P. W. D. Official. If he wanted to know the real condition of the people there, it would have been better if he had got convicted and resided there for some time. Then he would have also got well deserved rest from his arduous duties, and if he had told his experiences after he had been sometime in jail, we would have had no hesitation in giving full credit to his statement about the life of the prisoners there. I would only submit in the end that the characterisation by the Honourable the Home Member of the detenus that are now kept in Deoli jail has evoked a strong protest in the whole of India, and I must add that in my view the statement regarding them was most disgraceful and not fitting to this House. With these words, I move the motion.

**Mr. Deputy President** (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** It is extremely difficult for a man returned to this august Assembly by the vote of his constituency to speak freely on a motion of this character.

**An Honourable Member:** Why?

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** After all the position is that among the remarks that my Honourable friend made in his speech he has referred to a large number of Members of this House and Congress Ministers serving in the Provincial Governments till the year 1939 being sent to jail. I really feel considerable diffidence in saying anything which would create an impression that I have no objection to Government riding the high horse and acting recklessly in the discharge of their duties. As I said, I would be the last man to produce the impression that if the Government are acting recklessly they can have the sympathy from any action of this House. But, Sir, let us see what is the real issue raised by the motion of my Honourable friend. My Honourable friend has divided the main question into two parts. His contention is that in the first instance those who are courting arrest and going to jail are doing so in the exercise of a right which has not been conceded to them by a wicked Government, according to him. That is the first part. The second part consists of a number of instances in which according to his information unduly severe treatment has been meted out by Government officials, magistrates and jail authorities to people either belonging to the Congress or to associations affiliated to the Congress, such for instance, I take it, as the Ahrars. Let me make it clear that so far as the second point is concerned, it is not for me to say anything. My Honourable friend just referred to an old man of 65 being sentenced 6 times in the exercise of his right, I suppose, of shouting out anti-war slogans. Now, as regards the age and the number of times on which this individual has been sentenced, I do not think there is much for me to say. If the magistrate had inflicted one year's sentence of simple imprisonment, the complaint so far as this man is concerned would not have arisen.

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** What about the hand cuffs?

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** I am coming to that. The complaint is that instead of "A" and "B" classes being given to these Congress prisoners they are given "C" class. Another complaint is that Congress prisoners have been marched to railway stations and other places in handcuffs.

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** And hand fetters.

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** I mentioned the first word used by my friend—I may be fetters too. Another complaint is that the kind of work to which they are put in jail is unduly severe and it is not in keeping with the degree of the offence committed by them as according to my friend these prisoners have committed a non-violent offence. I may have to say later a word about the meaning of "non-violent offences". Any way, so far as these things are concerned, it is not for me to offer any remarks; it is a matter for the Government to inquire into and find out whether any of these complaints are correct; I will confine myself entirely to the attitude taken up by the law-breakers on the question of shouting out anti-war slogans. Sir, complaint was made by my Honourable friend that interviews are not allowed with some of these prisoners without the authority of the Inspector General of Prisons.

**Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** D. I. G., C. I. D.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** I would add, of the place where the man was arrested.

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** Again, this is a question with which we as a party are not concerned. This again is a matter which should be determined by Government,—whether all the rules should be suspended so far as the Congress prisoners are concerned. Let me, however, recite an incident which happened to me. Sir, it is open to my friend to lay all sorts of charges at the door of the Government, and it may be that the Government are hard put to it to find a defence on some of the questions; that is Government's look-out. But let me tell this House as to how the Congress ministries themselves behaved when they were in power in 1939. . . .

**Sardar Sant Singh:** On a point of order, how is that relevant?

**An Honourable Member:** That is not a point of order.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta):** Let us wait and see.

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** You are complaining of this treatment meted out to Congress prisoners by this bureaucratic Government of India. Let me remind you that they themselves behaved no better than the Government of India towards certain important Muslim prisoners. Now the point is this. We know that the Khaksars went to Lucknow when that unfortunate internal trouble among Muslims took place in 1939. We also know that Allama Mashriqi was awarded a sentence. Sir, I thought it my duty as a Member of this House to visit the unfortunate Allama Mashriqi and to find out from him as to what the real cause of his quarrel with the Congress Government was. Sir, let me tell this House that the first thing I was told was this, that I could not possibly be allowed to see Allama Mashriqi unless I obtained permission from the officiating Prime Minister himself—not the D. I. G. but the officiating Prime Minister himself was to give me permission. That happened to be Mr. Rafi Ahmad Kidwai—who unfortunately is behind the bars of jail today. Sir, I did apply, he gave me permission but the permission was hedged round with so many conditions that I found it impossible to have that interview. One of the conditions was that Mashriqi was to go to the Superintendent's room to be interviewed by me. Mashriqi had already declared to Government half a dozen times before that he refused to leave his room as a prisoner; if anybody wanted to have any interview with him, it was for him to come to Mashriqi's room and I requested Government to waive this condition and allow me to see Mashriqi in his room. But the reply was, "rules are rules, whether it is a case of Raza Ali or somebody else; rules cannot be relaxed for the sake of Raza Ali". May I ask whether the rules can now be relaxed for the sake of this Congress person or that Congress person? I am not really exhibiting a want of sympathy. But this is the message I got a friend to give to Mr. Rafi Ahmad Kidwai on the phone; I said, "well, you will not always remain in power; you do not know (Interruptions) what turn the events will take"; now, the events have unfortunately

[Sir Syed Raza Ali.]

taken a turn very disadvantageous to Mr. Rafi Ahmad Kidwai and his friends. All I can say is that the present Government—I am not here to defend the Government as they are capable of defending themselves—are not more wicked than the Congress Government of 1939, who did not grant me the interview.

Now I come to the main point. My main point is this. Are Congressmen and the friends of Congressmen, and I believe my Honourable friend is a friend of the Congress, are they right in complaining and in raising this cry, "grant us the right to preach to the people that they should not participate either in the war or in the war effort"? Sir, this is a point that concerns everybody who lives in India, whether Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Christian, Parsi, Jew or anybody else. Sir, may I ask my Honourable friend—is there any country in the world which is involved in war the people of which have been conceded the right by their Government to preach anti-war slogans?

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** What about South Africa?

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** I am very glad my Honourable friend has raised that point; well, I happen to know South Africa a little.

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** South Africa of the present day.

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** If my Honourable friend, Dr. Banerjee, reads his paper carefully, he must have noticed that only nine days ago a Reuter's message came out from South Africa to the effect that Government had put a ban on a nationalist association that was engaged in conducting anti-war propaganda,—only nine days ago.

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** After how many months?

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** However, I do not want to give too much time to South Africa, but I know this much that what is being done by the Congress people in India today South Africans will not dream of doing and then agitating the question of ill-treatment of prisoners.

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

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** On the first question I just want to say this much indeed seriously,—that in Germany, Italy or England or any Dominion or Colony within the British Commonwealth of Nations, it is impossible for any Government, unless it is prepared to abdicate its functions as a Government, to allow its people the free right of conducting an anti-war agitation when that country and that Government are engaged in a life and death struggle. In fact, it is childish. If the Government really want to concede that right to the Congressmen, then, before they do so, they should make up their mind to abdicate their functions as a decent Government. On this question, it is impossible for anybody to agree with the Congress. No doubt, the Congressmen think that it is such an innocent thing. After all, the word "innocent" was used by my Honourable friend. Now, what is called innocent? The right to say: "Do not go to fight; do not help the Britishers". It means "do not defend your

own country" for ultimately, it comes to that. My friend knows that very well. Therefore, I say that this is really a childish campaign. I am sorry my friend has brought this motion. We have been keeping studiously silent on this question, but a time comes when it is your duty to speak up. I am sure my Honourable and Learned friend has rendered a positive disservice to the Congress and the unfortunate victims of the Congress by raising the question in the form of this cut motion.

Sir, I oppose the motion.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Mr. Deputy President, I rise to support the cut proposed by my Honourable friend, Mr. Kazmi. I am glad my Honourable friend is present in this House, at least on this occasion. In my judgment, if he had cared very much for the maintenance of civil liberties even in war times, he should not have absented himself from the House when the Defence of India Bill was passed into an Act. Though late, he has learnt wisdom now. I am not interested in defending the Congress. I am interested in defending the civil liberties of the citizens of this country. Whenever even the Congress had attacked civil liberties, I had not failed to lodge my protest against the Congress Government. The point is not whether the Congress is right or wrong. The point is whether the civil liberties of the people of this country should be attacked even in war times. Sir, it is said that during war times there is no country in the world where people are allowed to say if they are against the war that they are against the war.

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** They cannot be allowed to preach.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** They cannot preach, but if they are against the war, they must say that they are against the war and I take it that they will be allowed to argue why they are against the war.

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** No.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** My Honourable friend says 'No'. There is clearly a difference of opinion. He asked: Is there any country in the world where such a liberty is given? May I ask him another question? Is there a democracy in the world where a country is involved in the war without consulting its Legislature or Parliament? I do not know of any democracy where a country is involved in a war without consulting its Parliament. Therefore, it is not quite fair to compare India, which has been involved in the war without the consent of the people, with those countries where people have joined the war with their own consent. I know that during war times, ordinarily, in all countries people are not allowed the same freedom of speech and the same civil liberties in other respects. I can understand a Government restricting the civil liberties of the people and preventing the people giving information by their speeches and by their writings which is likely to be helpful to the enemy. I can even understand a Government restricting the civil liberties of the people to the extent that during the time of war when passions could be easily roused, people should not be permitted to make provocative speeches. But to make use of the existence of war, to prevent people to argue calmly and coolly their opposition to the war if they are against it, and to prevent people to persuade their countrymen to accept the view which they themselves hold, namely, opposition to the war, is going beyond the reasonable limits.

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** Is that allowed in England?

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** I shall come to what is being allowed in England. I remember the Government of India stating, through the mouth of their Leader, that the Government are prepared to give to the people of this country the same right which is given to the conscientious objectors in Great Britain. Well, Sir, I know that during the last war man like Ramsay MacDonald, when he was opposed to the war, did make his speeches against the war and he was permitted to do so.

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** Not if he preaches.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** I am not talking about preaching. I am not a preacher, but I believe in persuading people to accept my view. A citizen has every right to put forward his point of view before the other citizens and persuade them to accept his view. That may be allowed here: that has been allowed in Great Britain.

**An Honourable Member:** What about Sir Oswald Mosley?

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** I feel that it is in the interests of Government themselves if they feel that they have involved this country in the war rightly to give this freedom to the citizens to discuss this question, whether it was in the interests of the country that our country should have been involved in the war? If people are to be persuaded and not to be coerced to join the war, then the right thing to do is to allow them freedom for the proper discussion of this subject.

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** Publicly?

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** If you do not allow public discussion, you simply coerce people to accept your point of view and you do not persuade them . . . . .

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** No country is allowing that.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta):** There should be no interruptions.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** If it suits the convenience of my Honourable friend, Sir Syed Raza Ali, let him do so. But the point which I am making is this, that every citizen must be allowed to present his point of view before the other citizens. He has an equal right to persuade the other citizens to accept his point of view, and that must be allowed even during the war. In India, we go much beyond this and with much less excuse than in Great Britain. After all, Great Britain is the actual seat of war. India is not. Whatever you may say, even today there is greater freedom allowed in Great Britain than in India.

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** No.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** I am going to prove that.

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** Quote cases.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** I am going to quote cases if the Honourable Member will only have a little patience which will suit his age and experience.

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

Sir, in India people are penalised not only for what they say or what they do but what political opinions they hold. The Government of India is putting in jail communists on the ground that they are communists. In Great Britain, a man is not put in jail on the ground that he is a communist. There is at least one Communist Member of the British Parliament, who is still allowed to make his speeches in that Parliament and who is still allowed to make his speeches to his constituents. There are thousands of communists in Great Britain who are still doing their work as usual and who are still using their freedom to preach their point of view. There is at least one point in favour of Great Britain so far as civil liberty is concerned and there is nothing in favour of India. I feel that it is wrong to penalise any people on the ground of their political principles or views. If communists do something wrong, if they go against the law, then certainly put them before a Magistrate or before a Judge and let them have at least a fair trial. But that is not done in India.

The Government of India have announced their policy that people who hold communistic views will be put in jail. I do not wish at present to go into the question of treatment of prisoners. I have spoken about that point before. I would like the Government of India to consider the question of people who are detained without trial and then who are refused even the ordinary treatment which is necessary to be given to them as human beings. I have placed several points regarding this treatment of prisoners before the House. I had also made a suggestion to the Government of India that they should appoint a Committee to consider the question of treatment given to the detenus in the various jails of India. Sir, last time I put before the House one of the difficulties of those people who are put in jail as regards the maintenance of their family outside of the jail. I have also placed before the House the difficulty of their family members especially ladies, in finding the requisite money to go and visit the jails. The Government of India have removed some of the detenus from Bombay to Deoli camp. I know several families of these detenus who cannot afford to go to Deoli on account of want of money to see their relatives lodged in the detention camps. I would have liked the Government of India to at least make the rule that if a detenu, say from Madras or from Bombay, is taken to Deoli, his wife or his near relatives will be at least given railway fare to go to Deoli.

**Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad:** First class fare.

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** Why not run a special train?

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Well, Sir, if the Government of India have sufficient number of detenus from Bombay or Madras and other provinces lodged in Deoli jail, it may be necessary for them to have a special train. Every detenu is a human being and he has his own rights. He has been put in jail without trial and it is wrong to make his family suffer on account of the Government's action. I, therefore, hope, Sir, that the House will not treat this subject lightly, will not treat this subject merely out of a partisan spirit, but let them consider this question from a humanitarian point of



[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

view, let them consider this question from the point of view of fairness and justice, and I am quite sure that even the Honourable Members of the Muslim League Party of this House will support this cut motion moved by my Honourable friend, Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kasmi.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** Sir, I had no intention of intervening in this debate (Interruption), and the very fact that I stand on my legs to exercise my right of speech troubles my Honourable friends of the Muslim League, which means that realisation of their error of ways has dawned upon them at last and I hope that the process will continue for some time more to bring light to their benighted brains. It is strange to find a man of the position and status of Sir Syed Raza Ali making a speech by which he is encouraging restrictions of liberty of speech, liberty of action and sorts of disappearance of civil liberties from this unfortunate land. It was a shock to me to find that a man who claims to be an experienced politician of India . . . . .

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** May I know when I made that claim?

**Sardar Sant Singh:** I am very happy that he does not claim to be one. So, I will try to leave him in oblivion which he deserves rightly after the speech which he made just now. Sir, the question before the House, the subject matter of the cut motion was the repressive policy of the Government of India in the matter of the administration of the Defence of India Act and the rules made thereunder. I do not understand how the question of the administration of the Congress Governments in the various provinces came into the discussion at all, unless my Honourable friends of the Muslim League have gone into utter lack of imagination that they are out to defame Congress Governments in season and out of season.

**Sir Syed Raza Ali:** I have quoted my own case.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** Quoting your own case, does not justify the action of this Government. Suppose for the sake of argument the Congress Governments have been doing wrong in the matter of maintaining law and order, does it justify that the Honourable the Home Member of the Government of India should be doing the same thing with the people living in the Centrally Administered areas. According to him one wrong justifies the other and two wrongs make one right. If that is the logic of my Honourable friend, Sir Syed Raza Ali, I have nothing to say about it. My Honourable friends of the Muslim League forget that we, in the Punjab, are suffering at the hands of the Unionist Government. You forget that it is the Unionist Government that placed a ban upon religious processions which no Congress Government would do. The Unionist Government in the Punjab banned the religious procession on the occasion of the birthday of Guru Gobind Singh at Sargodha under the Defence of India Act.

**Dr. Sir Ziauddin Ahmad:** How is all this relevant?

**Sardar Sant Singh:** My Honourable friend, Sir Syed Raza Ali, referred to what the Provincial Governments were doing.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim):** Will the Honourable Member come to the Central Government. The Central Government is not responsible for what happens outside.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** It was because Sir Syed Raza Ali referred to the Provincial Governments . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better confine himself to the Central Government.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** I am only giving a reply to what Sir Syed Raza Ali said.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It does not justify the Honourable Member to go outside into the provinces.

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** It is only by the way.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** I am not one of those who objects to the policy of the Government of India on that account. If the Congress Governments have done anything wrong, they are as much condemnable as the Central Government if they do anything wrong or as the Provincial Governments which are not Congress Governments if they do anything wrong. It is the repressive policy which is to be condemned whether it comes from the Government of India or from any of the Provincial Governments. There is no sense in making this objection from that point of view, namely, that because Sir Syed Raza Ali was not allowed to interview a prisoner by a Congress Government, that is no reason, that is no justification. What I want to say is this: is it or is it not a fact that the Defence of India Act and the Rules made thereunder are being worked in a spirit which represses the legitimate activities of the people of India. That is the question to which we must direct our attention.

Here, on the floor of the House, I have complained from the very day that the Defence of India Bill was brought before this House that I want an assurance from the Honourable Member who was piloting this Bill that this will be worked in a spirit which will not crush the legitimate activities of several people outside the prosecution of the war or the maintenance of law and order. I can understand that in time of war, order must be maintained, the successful prosecution of the war must not be hampered. So far I am willing to go with the Government. But when the Central Government abdicate their power entirely, refuse to watch the working of the rules, throw the responsibility upon the Provincial Governments and say that they have nothing to do with them, I take exception to it. I say the Central Government are not keeping within those assurances given on the floor of this House. The Honourable the Home Member told us the other day that he had visited the Deoli camp and those persons who are detained there are traitors. This was strong language and it was taken exception to on that very day and every sensible man will take exception to it. After all whoever is detained is detained on police reports alone. No regular charge is made and they were never brought to trial. They were given no opportunity to cross-examine witnesses who deposed against them; their antecedents were never tested in a court of law. Therefore, the description of such men as traitors to the country is open to serious doubt and serious challenge. Therefore, I will say that if the Government of India want that the people should reconcile themselves to the Defence of India Rules they will have to exercise greater caution and greater control over the working of the Act. I know a case which I intend to cite during the discussions on the Finance Bill of a very respectable chemist in Lahore

[Sardar Sant Singh.]

belonging to a well-known firm who was visited by a police officer of the rank of D. S. P., who wanted to arrest him for selling a drug for Rs. 2 against the notification. He protested that this drug was not one of those the sale of which was controlled or prohibited under the Defence of India Rules. But his protest was not heard and he was taken into custody. Two days he was kept in lock-up. He wrote to the Inspector General of Police and to the Prime Minister that the sale which had taken place did not contravene any of the provisions of the Defence of India Rules. Nobody listened. After two days he was let off on a bail of Rs. 10,000, and, ultimately, when the case came up the police found that the sale of the drug was not prohibited under the Defence of India Rules. The case was converted then into an attempt to cheat under the ordinary Penal Code. The Defence of India Rules disappeared and the case was brought under cheating.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is dealing with a provincial case. He cannot be allowed to do that.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** I am referring to it as an illustrative case to show that the Defence of India Rules . . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member may be right in saying that the Government of India ought to supervise the administration but he cannot deal with the merits of these cases.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** I am not discussing the case. I am only saying what the Magistrate said. He said that there was no case under the Defence of India Rules. There was no case under the Penal Code either and he was discharged.

**Sir H. P. Mody** (Bombay Millowners' Association: Indian Commerce): The Honourable Member makes the Government of India look almost virtuous by comparison!

**Sardar Sant Singh:** I agree they are virtuous in comparison with Provincial administration but at the same time I would be failing in my duty if I do not bring to the notice of the Government of India that they should amend these Defence of India Rules, and if they have handed over the whole control to the Provincial Governments they should get it back by legislation and keep the control to themselves. That is the point that I have been urging for a year and a half during which the Defence of India Rules have been working. I really cannot appreciate the position that the Government of India have no hand in the matter or that they cannot watch the working of the Defence of India Rules by the Provincial Governments. The present position is this that the Defence of India Act is admittedly a very drastic legislation; it puts very drastic powers in the hands of individuals who are not capable of exercising them. Therefore, the time has come when some sort of committee should be appointed to examine the working of the Defence of India Rules throughout India whether action is taken by the Provincial Governments or the Central Government. That is the point that I have been

pressing during the last one year and a half and I want again to bring to the notice of Government the mischief that is being done under the Defence of India Rules. They are certainly entitled to use them for legitimate purposes where the prosecution of the war is hampered in one way or the other. But they are not entitled to abdicate in favour of other individuals whom they have given power to use this Act in any way they like. Therefore, I support this motion.

**Several Honourable Members:** The question may now be put.

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

The motion was adopted.

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell:** Sir, I confess I have found this rather a confusing discussion and I do not know exactly what case I am called upon to meet. But so far as I could disentangle the remarks which were made by various Honourable Members, there seem to be two main objects underlying this motion. One which was stated more prominently by Mr. Joshi than by the Mover is the assertion that civil liberties ought to be allowed to the extent of permitting any conscientious objector to say what he likes, regardless of its effects. On that I would remind the House of the objects for which the Defence of India Act was passed. The Preamble of the Act states its main object, *viz.*, "to provide for special measures to ensure the public safety and interest and the defence of British India". That is a very solemn purpose and we are interpreting it in the highest interests of the country. The rules which Government are authorised to frame under the Defence of India Act are rules "for securing the defence of British India, the public safety, the maintenance of public order or the efficient prosecution of war, or for maintaining supplies and services essential to the life of the community". In other words, the Defence of India Act is not primarily a penal enactment; but it recognises the fact that in time of war, in time of grave national emergency the liberties of the ordinary citizen have to be circumscribed in certain directions. That very point was stressed by the Honourable the Leader of the House in the Assembly debate on the Defence of India Bill where he quoted from a speech of Mr. Winston Churchill drawing attention to the fact that it might seem a paradox that a war undertaken in the name of liberty and right might require as a necessary part of its purpose the surrender for the time being of many valuable liberties and rights. The Honourable the Leader of the House at that time gave an assurance to the House that we should, as stated there by Mr. Winston Churchill, regard ourselves as the jealous guardians of those rights in so far as it is possible, and I can assure the House that in all matters connected with the Defence of India Act we have a full sense of our responsibility. . .

**Sardar Sant Singh:** May I ask the Honourable Member one question? It is this. . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is not giving way.

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell:** If I stop to answer interruptions, I will not have time to finish. While, then, I am able to assure the House

[Sir Reginald Maxwell.]

that in administering the Defence of India Act so far as it depends on the Central Government, we have a full sense of our responsibilities, I must repeat that no assurance has ever been given that the rules would not be used against any form of activity which was designed to impede the successful prosecution of the war.

Now, I had come here prepared to discuss the use of the Defence of India Rules, generally, because the motion did not make it clear on the face of it how restricted the intentions of the Honourable the Mover were: but I find that in reality the only thing in which he is at all interested is the treatment of satyagrahis; and in regard to those persons, as has already been recognised by my Honourable friend, Sir Syed Raza Ali, we have to take them at their word: they have come forward not merely as conscientious objectors, but as persons going about openly attempting to persuade the public to withhold all support from the war effort. In regard to conscientious objectors, neither this Government nor any Provincial Government in India has ever said that conscientious objectors would not be allowed all the liberty which similar persons are allowed in England. There, no restriction is placed on a person who holds conscientious objections to war as such, and he is even at liberty to profess his views openly; but there too a line is drawn against any attempt to interfere with others who are willingly giving their services to the war. Now, I deny that the person who utters an anti-war slogan can be given the credit of insincerity. If he means what he says, he wishes to persuade the public that they should withhold their support from the war. Even in its simplest form, the stereotyped slogan must be taken in that sense, but I have come across a number of instances in which persons supporting the movement which my Honourable friend wishes to defend have said quite other things. Let me quote from a speech by a gentleman named Mr. Ghulam Ghaus who holds the high title of dictator of the All-India Ahrar Party. He in addressing meetings in Peshawar stated among other things: that three-fourths of the British Navy had been sunk, and on one occasion he prayed that Hitler should be given strength to kill the British people. On the subject of the Army, in all his speeches he invariably exhorted his listeners to persuade any military sepoy they met not to die a *haram* death. Another gentleman of the Punjab, I think I will not mention his name, exhorted the audience to inculcate the spirit of those brave German pilots who at great personal risk and in face of thundering anti-aircraft guns and strong searchlights shelled London and did not even miss the Royal Palace. Another gentleman, this time a gentleman in Madras, said:

"Britain will never defeat Germany. The Nazi mode of government is given for us to welcome in our midst. Britain has robbed France of many of her possessions and slaughtered many of her innocent men and women, all the while posing as an ally of the French. The Indian army is a host of stone-starved men. This army is deplorably short-lived and is not likely to exist for more than 28 days."

As that speech was delivered on the 26th January, I am glad that the speaker's prophecy has not come true. Therefore, it is not entirely open to the Honourable Member to talk as though this anti-war slogan campaign was an entirely innocuous thing or that we were not right in invoking our powers under the Defence of India Rules against such persons.

They are of a different character from the conscientious objectors. I have no objection to any one deploring the necessity of war as such—in that sense I am a conscientious objector myself. But I am not going to allow any one to persuade other people not to take part in the actions which are necessary for the safety of British India. That is all I need say on this particular point, except this, that in so far as we have used powers under the Defence of India Rules against movements of this kind or against any other movements commonly described as political, we have attacked only the war aspect of the activities of these agitators. The Defence of India Rules have not been used from the beginning and I defy any Honourable Member to give me an instance to the contrary: these rules have not been used to suppress any legitimate form of political agitation. . . .

**Sardar Sant Singh:** I am telling you in Sargodha the Guru Govind birthday procession was stopped.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The Honourable Member has had his opportunity to speak.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** Religious processions are being stopped.

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

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell:** The other line of attack which I am asked to meet and which, I confess, surprises me, is this: that persons convicted for civil disobedience are not allowed privileges other than those of ordinary convicts. So far as I can make out the very special object of the Honourable the Mover of this motion was that satyagrahis should be declared entitled to some kind of special treatment in jail and that the treatment which is an ordinary incident of the life of a person convicted of any other offence suddenly becomes (in the words of his daily adjournment motion) "inhuman" when it is applied to a satyagrahi. Incidentally I may correct him on the point of whether *ragi* is a suitable diet or not: it is the staple food of a large number of the people in my province, Bombay, and is universally recognised as having a very good nutritive value. However, that is a minor point; but when an Honourable Member who appears, if I may say so, to be supporting a movement which claims to penetrate to all strata of society and takes particular interest in Harijans and people of that kind, when he complains that those persons, those satyagrahis who are imprisoned are compelled to associate with persons of low character, I am surprised at the lengths of, I might almost say, snobbery to which certain classes of our professing nationalist population are inclined to go. . . .

**Sir F. E. James:** There is a lot of snobbery in jail!

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell:** So it seems. As regards the use of handcuffs and fetters, I might mention that in a few days I am answering a question which is being asked by the Honourable Member himself on that subject in this House, and, therefore, I will not detain the House with details on that point; but I have a perfectly satisfactory answer to give so far as Delhi is concerned, and I think that was the province to which he alluded.

[Sir Reginald Maxwell.]

But in regard to these satyagrahis it may interest the House to know that the total number of persons actually undergoing imprisonment under all sections of the Defence of India Rules on the 1st of February amounted only to 3,094 in the whole of India. So many prisoners were in jail for all offences under the Defence of India Rules. On the face of it then to describe the action taken under the defence rules as anything in the nature of repression is a total misuse of language. But of these 3,094 prisoners who were then in jail, I find that about 2,642 are prisoners convicted in connection with the civil disobedience movement; that is to say, these were prisoners who had actually invited their arrest. Now, when a person comes to me and asks to be arrested and I arrest him under some section of the law, am I to be accused of repression? I cannot understand what sort of repression it is. Actually I have plenty of instances, which I could quote if there is time, to show that if we do not arrest a satyagrahi, we are regarded as unsympathetic. There is a very good case on record, and it was published in the *Madras Mail*, of a satyagrahi who was provided with a bullock cart and garlands to go to his place of satyagraha, in fact the people of the village wondered why they had not got on to his good points before. It all went well, but when the man appeared on the platform the police did not turn up. This entirely upset the programme of the meeting, and they sent anxious messengers to the police Sub-Inspector to come along. The Sub-Inspector said he had other work to do. Then their demands for a Sub-Inspector changed to pleading, and they begged him to come along if only not to spoil the ceremony. He came and sat on the platform with the satyagrahi, and the satyagrahi stammered his slogan. But the Sub-Inspector was engaged in conversation with his next door neighbour and finally went home. . . .

**Sir F. E. James:** Have they a photograph?

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell:** I expect so.

I have heard of another case of a gentleman in Bihar offering himself as a satyagrahi. This gentleman is a *bidi* maker,—I am not sure if he has a sufficiently good status to associate himself with other satyagrahis,—he is a *bidi* maker, and he is now *en route* to Delhi walking three and half miles a day. He is imploring the rural police alongside his route to arrest him.

**Sir F. E. James:** He will get here next Session.

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell:** If the police do not listen to his entreaties and arrest him.

Then, there is another case of a man in Bareilly who had given notice of satyagraha in a certain village. He went to the District Magistrate and told him that he wished to change that village for another one as he had met with such hostility that he had to run away from the village originally chosen. The District Magistrate asked him if he would prefer to go straight to jail. He thanked the District Magistrate and went round to the Police Office to be arrested.

**Sir F. E. James:** Tell us some more.

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell:** There is another instance at Dehra Dun. A Congress volunteer who had been detained for courting arrest dodged his duties on the ground that he was suffering from frost bite. This was interpreted to mean cold feet. I have many other instances which I might quote, but I might perhaps quote one to illustrate the types of satyagrahis we are getting hold of. There was one case again in Madras, an accused woman who was perfectly illiterate, a country girl who did not know what she was doing. She gave her age as 19 but looked considerably less. Immediately after the examination of the one prosecution witness, she was asked to cross-examine the witness. She did not know what cross-examination meant, but she merely repeated the slogan. Then she was questioned by the court, and she frankly admitted she did not understand what the slogan meant. She thought that the present war was between Britain and Poland. I have no time to give other anecdotes to the House about these persons.

**Some Honourable Members:** Give us some more.

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell:** I will tell the House at least one encouraging story, that is, in the Central Provinces a satyagrahi was sentenced to a fine of Rs. 60. His father sent a currency note of Rs. 100, of which Rs. 60 was on account of fine, and the balance was for a contribution to the war fund. (Laughter.) In these circumstances, I heard without surprise the story of the Honourable the Mover of the satyagrahi in the Central Provinces who had made six attempts before he could get himself arrested. This again is an instance of repression!

**Sir F. E. James:** May I know, Sir, if the Honourable the Home Member will take suitable steps to have these stories broadcast in the usual way?

**The Honourable Sir Reginald Maxwell:** As I said, these satyagrahis are persons who have asked us or invited us to arrest them, and who object in fact to not being arrested; yet when they come to jail they ask for special treatment. The treatment that is good enough for ordinary convicts is not good enough for them, and I would ask the House what sort of heroes or martyrs are these. I understood that it was one of the duties of a true satyagrahi not to ask for any special privileges for himself. One point has been made as regards classification, and on that I can assure the House categorically that no distinction at all is made between satyagrahis and ordinary convicted prisoners. As regards the principle of classification, all persons, whether satyagrahis or ordinary convicts, are classified according to their status and mode of life before their arrest, and no exception is made to that. In other respects the Government of India have informed Provincial Governments that satyagrahis are not ineligible for 'A' class treatment, that is to say, the offence does not come under those which debar a convict from 'A' class treatment, and I may inform the House that a great many of them get 'A' class. But I do not know why these complaints are brought forward and are generally supported by allegations of ill-health and so forth, or that the prisoner was not able to do the tasks assigned to him. From all these complaints one would rather suppose that the average satyagrahi was a confirmed valetudinarian. If so, I can only say to the Honourable Member that the persons who are supporting this



[Sir Reginald Maxwell.]

movement are not prize examples of India's manhood, and I would suggest that in order to get the movement taken more seriously, he should find a few satyagrahis who are able to take ordinary food and become ordinary convicts. Sir, I oppose this motion.

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

"That the demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

**The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan** (Leader of the House): May I make a statement? Sir, the Holi and Dulhandi were to have been observed on Wednesday and Thursday, respectively, in this week. Consequently, no meetings of the Assembly were fixed for those days. Intimation has now been received that while the Holi will be observed as arranged on Wednesday, the Dulhandi will be observed on Friday instead of on Thursday. In these circumstances, Sir, I would request you to cancel the meeting fixed for Friday and to direct a meeting to be held on Thursday in lieu of Friday. If you are pleased to make this direction, the list of business issued for Tuesday, Friday and Saturday will stand as the list for Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): As suggested by the Honourable the Leader of the House, the meeting for Friday is cancelled, and, instead, there will be a meeting on Thursday next.

(It being Five of the Clock.)

#### DEMAND NO. 1—CUSTOMS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 82,13,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Customs'."

The motion was adopted.

#### DEMAND NO. 2—CENTRAL EXCISE DUTIES.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 10,85,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Central Excise Duties'."

The motion was adopted.

#### DEMAND NO. 3—TAXES ON INCOME INCLUDING CORPORATION TAX.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 82,63,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 4—SALT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 50,73,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Salt'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 5—OPIUM.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 25,56,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Opium'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 6—PROVINCIAL EXCISE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,09,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Provincial Excise'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 7—STAMPS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 25,09,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Stamps'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 8—FOREST.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,86,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Forest'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 9—IRRIGATION (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES), NAVIGATION, EMBANKMENT AND DRAINAGE WORKS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,11,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 10—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT (INCLUDING WORKING EXPENSES).

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,25,48,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 11—INTEREST ON DEBT AND OTHER OBLIGATIONS AND REDUCTION OR AVOIDANCE OF DEBT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 84,24,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Interest on Debt and other Obligations and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 12—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,23,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Executive Council'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 13—COUNCIL OF STATE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,39,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Council of State'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 14—LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEPARTMENT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,11,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 15—HOME DEPARTMENT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,74,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Home Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 16—LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT.

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,78,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Legislative Department’.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 17—DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, HEALTH AND LANDS.

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,71,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Department of Education, Health and Lands’.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 18—FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,12,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Finance Department’.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 19—COMMERCE DEPARTMENT.

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,61,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Commerce Department’.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 20—DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR.

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,63,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Department of Labour’.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 21—DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS.

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,05,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Department of Communications’.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 22—CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,30,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Central Board of Revenue'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 23—INDIA OFFICE AND HIGH COMMISSIONER'S ESTABLISHMENT CHARGES.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 18,51,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'India Office and High Commissioner's Establishment Charges'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 24—PAYMENTS TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS, DEPARTMENTS, ETC., ON ACCOUNT OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF AGENCY SUBJECTS AND MANAGEMENT OF TREASURIES.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,11,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Payments to other Governments, Departments, etc., on account of the Administration of Agency Subjects and Management of Treasuries'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 25—AUDIT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 90,37,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Audit'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 26—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 55,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Administration of Justice'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 27—POLICE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 36,20,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Police'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 28—PORTS AND PILOTAGE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 14,25,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Ports and Pilotage'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 29—LIGHTHOUSES AND LIGHTSHIPS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,14,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Lighthouses and Lightships'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 30—SURVEY OF INDIA.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,83,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Survey of India'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 31—BOTANICAL SURVEY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 56,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Botanical Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 32—ZOOLOGICAL SURVEY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,20,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Zoological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 33—GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,06,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Geological Survey'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 34—MINES.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,50,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Mines'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 35—ARCHAEOLOGY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,67,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Archæology'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 36—METEOROLOGY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 22,27,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Meteorology'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 37—OTHER SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENTS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,77,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Other Scientific Departments'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 38—EDUCATION.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,11,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Education'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 39—MEDICAL SERVICES

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,02,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Medical Services'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 40—PUBLIC HEALTH.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,10,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Public Health'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 41—AGRICULTURE.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 29,30,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Agriculture'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 42—IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,29,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Imperial Council of Agricultural Research'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 43—AGRICULTURAL MARKETING.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,97,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Agricultural Marketing'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 44—IMPERIAL INSTITUTE OF SUGAR TECHNOLOGY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Imperial Institute of Sugar Technology'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 45—CIVIL VETERINARY SERVICES.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,61,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Civil Veterinary Services'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 46—INDUSTRIES.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,16,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Industries'."

The motion was adopted.



## DEMAND NO. 47—SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,29,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Scientific and Industrial Research'."

The motion was adopted

## DEMAND NO. 48—AVIATION.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,02,62,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Aviation'."

The motion was adopted

## DEMAND NO. 49—BROADCASTING.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 49,85,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Broadcasting'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 50—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON BROADCASTING (CHARGED TO REVENUE).

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Broadcasting (charged to revenue)'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 51—INDIAN STORES DEPARTMENT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 16,53,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Indian Stores Department'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 52—EMIGRATION—INTERNAL.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 25,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Emigration—Internal'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 53—EMIGRATION—EXTERNAL.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,34,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Emigration—External'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 54—COMMERCIAL INTELLIGENCE AND STATISTICS.

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,27,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Commercial Intelligence and Statistics’.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 55—CENSUS.

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,59,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Census’.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 56—JOINT-STOCK COMPANIES.

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,70,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Joint-Stock Companies’.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 57—MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENTS.

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,72,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Miscellaneous Departments’.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 58—CURRENCY

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 24,45,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Currency’.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 59—MINT.

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 69,81,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Mint’.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 60—CIVIL WORKS.

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,15,33,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Civil Works’.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 61—CENTRAL ROAD FUND.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,07,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Central Road Fund'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 62—SUPERANNUATION ALLOWANCES AND PENSIONS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,08,05,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Superannuation Allowances and Pensions'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 63—STATIONERY AND PRINTING.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 33,33,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Stationery and Printing'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 64—MISCELLANEOUS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 28,19,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Miscellaneous'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 65—MISCELLANEOUS ADJUSTMENTS BETWEEN THE CENTRAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,47,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Miscellaneous adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 66—DELHI.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 52,02,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Delhi'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND No. 67—AJMER-MERWARA.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,31,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Ajmer-Merwara'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 68—PANTH PIPLODA.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 13,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Panth Piploda'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 69—ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR ISLANDS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 42,80,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Andaman and Nicobar Islands'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 70—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 13,76,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 71—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—STORES SUSPENSE (NOT CHARGED TO REVENUE).

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 40,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs—Stores Suspense (not charged to Revenue)'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 72—INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON TELEPHONE PROJECTS (NOT CHARGED TO REVENUE).

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Indian Posts and Telegraphs—Capital Outlay on Telephone Projects (not charged to Revenue)'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 73—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON VIZAGAPATAM HARBOUR.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,50,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour'."

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND NO. 74—DELHI CAPITAL OUTLAY.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,50,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of 'Delhi Capital Outlay'."

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 75—COMMUTED VALUE OF PENSIONS.**

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Commuted Value of Pensions’.”

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 76—INTEREST-FREE ADVANCES.**

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,77,69,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Interest-free Advances’.”

The motion was adopted.

**DEMAND No. 77—LOANS AND ADVANCES BEARING INTEREST.**

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 93,03,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1942, in respect of ‘Loans and Advances bearing Interest’.”

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 11th March, 1941.