

7th March, 1934

THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

Volume II, 1934

(17th February to 10th March, 1934)

SEVENTH SESSION

OF THE

FOURTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
1934



NEW DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1934.

Legislative Assembly.

President:

THE HONOURABLE SIR SHANMUKHAM CHETTY, K.C.I.E.

Deputy President:

MR. ABDUL MATIN CHAUDHURY, M.L.A.

Panel of Chairmen:

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

MR. K. C. NEOGY, M.L.A.

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

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

Secretary:

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

Assistant of the Secretary:

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

Marshal:

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

Committee on Public Petitions:

MR. ABDUL MATIN CHAUDHURY, M.L.A., *Chairman.*

MR. K. C. NEOGY, M.L.A.

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

MR. T. R. PHOOKUN, M.L.A.

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

CONTENTS.

VOLUME II.—17th February to 10th March, 1934.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
SATURDAY, 17TH FEBRUARY, 1934—		FRIDAY, 23RD FEBRUARY, 1934—	
Messages from the Council of State	979	The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	1219—73
Presentation of the Railway Budget for 1934-35	979—86	Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>contd.</i>	1219—73
MONDAY, 19TH FEBRUARY, 1934—		Importance of Road-Rail Co-ordination and of the Organisation Boards throughout the country	1219—39
Member Sworn	987	Maladministration of the Railway Board	1239—53
Questions and Answers	987—96	Muslim Representation in Railway Services	1253—73
Unstarred Questions and Answers	996—1001	Statement of Business	1273—74
Statements laid on the Table	1001—05	Appendix	1275
The Railway Budget—General Discussion	1005—64	SATURDAY, 24TH FEBRUARY 1934—	
WEDNESDAY, 21ST FEBRUARY, 1934—		Questions and Answers	1277—97
Questions and Answers	1065—91	Unstarred Questions and Answers	1297—1302
Short Notice Question and Answer	1091—93	The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>conclud.</i>	1302—64
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1093—96	Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>conclud.</i>	1302—61
Message from the Council of State	1096	Unreasonable Rates	1302—40
The Railway Budget—List of Demands	1096—1156	System of Appeals	1340—59
Demand No. 1—Railway Board	1097—1156	Condition of State Railway Press Employees	1359—61
Passengers' Amenities	1097—1118	First Class Railway Station for Cuttack	1361
Statutory Railway Board	1118—56	Demand No. 2—Audit	1361
THURSDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 1934—		Demand No. 3—Miscellaneous Expenditure	1361
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	1157—1217	Demand No. 4—Refunds	1362
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>contd.</i>	1157—1217	Demand No. 5—Payments to Indian States and Companies	1362
Statutory Railway Board— <i>conclud.</i>	1157—96	Demand No. 6-A.—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works	1362
Indianisation of the Railway Services	1196—1217	Demand No. 6-B.—Working Expenses—Maintenance and Supply of Locomotive Power	1362

PAGES.	PAGES.
SATURDAY, 24TH FEBRUARY 1934—contd.	MONDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY 1934—contd.
Demand No. 6-C—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Carriage and Wagon Stock	The Wheat Import Duty (Extending) Bill—Passed.
1362	1400—2
Demand No. 6-D—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Ferry Steamers and Harbours	The Steel and Wire Industries Protection (Extending) Bill Passed
1363	1423—33
Demand No. 6-E—Working Expenses—Expenses of Traffic Department	The Indian Medical Council (Amendment) Bill—Passed
1363	1400
Demand No. 6-F—Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments	TUESDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1934—
1363	The Factories Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee
Demand No. 6-G—Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses	Election of the Standing Committee for the Department of Education, Health and Lands
1363	1435—36
Demand No. 6-H—Working Expenses—Electric Service Department	Demands for Supplementary Grants in respect of Railways
1363	1436—49
Demand No. 7—Working Expenses—Appropriation to Depreciation Fund	The Indian Navy (Discipline) Bill—Circulated
1364	1449—87
Demand No. 8—Interest Charges	Presentation of the Budget for 1934-35
1364	1488—1538
Demand No. 9—Temporary Withdrawals from Depreciation Fund	The Indian Finance Bill—Introduced
1364	1538
Demand No. 11—New Construction	FRIDAY, 2ND MARCH, 1934—
1364	Members Sworn
Demand No. 12—Open Line Works	Questions and Answers
1364	1539—56
MONDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY 1934	General Discussion of the General Budget
Member Sworn	1556—1612
Questions and Answers	SATURDAY, 3RD MARCH, 1934—
1365—86	Questions and Answers
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1613—16
1386—88	Unstarred Questions and Answers
Statements laid on the Table	1616—35
1388—96	General Discussion of the General Budget
The Negotiable Instruments (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1635—
1397	TUESDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1934—
The Salt Additional Import Duty (Extending) Bill—Introduced	Questions and Answers
1397	1691—1
The Trade Disputes (Extending) Bill—Introduced	Unstarred Questions and Answers
1397—98	1723—3
The Cotton Textile Industry Protection (Amendment) Bill—Introduced and Passed	Election of the Standing Committee for the Department of Education, Health and Lands
1398—99	1736
The Reserve Bank of India Bill—Amendments made by the Council of State agreed to	The General Budget—List of Demands
1399—1400	1736—85
	Demand No. 39—Army Department
	1736—97
	Retrenchment in Defence Expenditure and Military Policy
	1730
	Demand No. 28—Executive Council
	1767
	Federal Finance
	176

**WEDNESDAY, 7TH MARCH
1934—**

	PAGES.
Questions and Answers	1787—92
Message from the Council of State	1793
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl.</i>	1793—1845
Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>contd.</i>	1793—1845
Reorganisation of the Public Services under the proposed Federal Constitution	1793—1821
Necessity of Expediting the Constitutional Reforms	1821—45

**THURSDAY, 8TH MARCH,
1934—**

Message from the Council of State	1847
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl.</i>	1847—1903
Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>concl.</i>	1847—1903
Planned Economy	1847—1903
Statement of Business	1903—04

FRIDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1934—

Questions and Answers	1907—14
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl.</i>	1915—75
Demand No. 16—Customs	1915—49
Absence of Oriyas in the Customs Department	1917—19
Status and Salary of Assistant Preventive Officers at Madras	1919—23
Grievances of the Hindus of Sind in the Customs Department	1923—49
Demand No. 17—Taxes on Income	1949—54
Paucity of Oriyas in the Bihar and Orissa Income-tax Department	1950
Hearing of Appeals on Assessment by the same officers and not by Independent Judicial Officers	1951
Arbitrary Assessment by Income-tax Officers	1951—52
Policy of the Income-tax Department	1953
Demand No. 18—Salt	1954
Demand No. 19—Opium	1954

**FRIDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1934—
*concl.***

	PAGES.
Demand No. 19-A.—Excise	1954
Demand No. 20—Stamps	1954
Demand No. 21.—Forest	1954
Demand No. 22—Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage works	1954
Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)—Paucity of Muslims in the services.	1955—75
Paucity of Muslims in the Services	1955—75

**SATURDAY, 10TH MARCH,
1934—**

Questions and Answers	1977—83
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1983—93
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl.</i>	1993—2072
Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)— <i>concl.</i>	1993—2058
Compensatory Allowance for Lower Division Clerks and Sorters	1993—96
Retrenchment Policy adopted in the Posts and Telegraphs Department	1996—2035
Condition of the Extra Departmental Agents	2035—40
Selection Grade Posts	2040—46
Grievances of Railway Mail Service Employees.	2046—50
Protest against the Appointment of the Postal Committee	2050—55
Measures of Earthquake Relief for Postal and Railway Mail Service Staff in North Bihar	2055—57
Wynad Allowances	2057
Demand No. 25—Interest on debt and Reduction or avoidance of Debt	2058
Demand No. 26—Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations	2058

**SATURDAY, 10TH MARCH,
1934—contd.**

	PAGES.
Demand No. 27—Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor-General	2058
Demand No. 29—Council of State	2058
Demand No. 30—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department	2059
Demand No. 31—Foreign and Political Department	2059
Demand No. 32—Home Department	2059
Demand No. 33—Public Service Commission	2059
Demand No. 34—Legislative Department	2059
Demand No. 35—Department of Education, Health and Lands	2060
Demand No. 36—Finance Department	2060
Demand No. 38—Commerce Department	2060
Demand No. 40—Department of Industries and Labour	2060
Demand No. 41—Central Board of Revenue	2060
Demand No. 42—Payments to Provincial Governments on account of Administration of Agency Subjects	2061
Demand No. 43—Audit	2061
Demand No. 44—Administration of Justice	2061
Demand No. 45—Police	2061
Demand No. 46—Ports and Pilotage	2061
Demand No. 47—Light-houses and Lightships	2062
Demand No. 48—Survey of India	2062
Demand No. 49—Meteorology	2062
Demand No. 50—Geological Survey	2062
Demand No. 51—Botanical Survey	2062
Demand No. 52—Zoological Survey	2062
Demand No. 53—Archæology	2063
Demand No. 54—Mines	2063

**SATURDAY, 10TH MARCH,
1934—contd.**

	PAGES.
Demand No. 55—Other Scientific Departments	2063
Demand No. 56—Education	2063
Demand No. 57—Medical Services	2063
Demand No. 58—Public Health	2063
Demand No. 59—Agriculture	2064
Demand No. 60—Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department	2064
Demand No. 61—Civil Veterinary Services	2064
Demand No. 62—Industries	2064
Demand No. 63—Aviation	2064
Demand No. 64—Commercial Intelligence and Statistics	2064
Demand No. 65—Census	2065
Demand No. 66—Emigration—Internal	2065
Demand No. 67—Emigration—External	2065
Demand No. 68—Joint Stock Companies	2065
Demand No. 69—Miscellaneous Departments	2065
Demand No. 70—Indian Stores Department	2065
Demand No. 71—Currency	2066
Demand No. 72—Mint	2066
Demand No. 73—Civil Works	2066
Demand No. 74—Superannuation Allowances and Pensions	2066
Demand No. 75—Stationery and Printing	2066
Demand No. 76—Miscellaneous	2067
Demand No. 76-A.—Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel charged to Revenue	2067
Demand No. 76-B.—Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments	2067

SATURDAY, 10TH MARCH 1934—		PAGES.
<i>contd.</i>		
Demand No. 77—Refunds .		2067
Demand No. 79—Baluchistan		2067
Demand No. 80.—Delhi .		2068
Demand No. 81—Ajmer-Merwara		2068
Demand No. 82—Andamans and Nicobar Islands .		2068
Demand No. 83—Rajputana		2068
Demand No. 84—Central India		2068
Demand No. 85—Hyderabad		2069
Demand No. 85-A—Aden .		2069
Demand No. 86—Expenditure in England—Secretary of State for India .		2069
Demand No. 87—Expenditure in England—High Commissioner for India,		2069
Demand No. 88—Capital Outlay on Security Printing		2069
Demand No. 89—Forest Capital Outlay		2070

SATURDAY, 10TH MARCH 1934—		PAGES.
<i>contd.</i>		
Demand No. 90—Irrigation		2070
Demand No. 91—Indian Posts and Telegraphs .		2070
Demand No. 93—Capital Outlay on Currency Note Press		2070
Demand No. 94—Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour		2070
Demand No. 95—Capital Outlay on Lighthouses and Lightships . . .		2071
Demand No. 96—Commutated Value of Pensions .		2071
Demand No. 96-A—Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel charged to Capital		2071
Demand No. 97—Delhi Capital Outlay		2071
Demand No. 98—Interest-free Advances		2071
Demand No. 99—Loans and Advances bearing Interest		2072

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 7th March, 1934.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

POWERS OF THE MANAGER OF THE CENTRAL PUBLICATION BRANCH AS THE HEAD OF A DEPARTMENT.

398. *Sardar Sant Singh: Are Government aware that in the Departments of the Government of India, the heads of offices have full powers to deal with misbehaviour and misconduct of the staff serving under them? If so, do Government propose to declare the Manager of the Central Publication Branch as the head of a department for purposes of dealing with such cases?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Yes: the Manager of Publications has been given power to impose penalties on persons holding posts to which he is the appointing authority.

SIKHS AND MUSLIMS RECRUITED IN THE CENTRAL PUBLICATION BRANCH.

399. *Sardar Sant Singh: (a) Will Government please state the number of Sikhs and Muslims employed in the Central Publication Branch since its removal to Delhi?

(b) Is it a fact that no Sikh has so far been recruited in permanent, officiating or temporary vacancies in the lower divisions? If so, do Government propose to take special steps to give at least two future vacancies to Sikhs?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) I presume that the Honourable Member is referring to the ministerial establishment. If so, I would refer him to the reply which I gave on the 20th December, 1933, to parts (a) and (b) of his starred question No. 1457.

(b) The reply to the first part is in the negative. The second part does not arise.

RECRUITMENT OF BENGALIS IN THE CENTRAL PUBLICATION BRANCH.

400. *Sardar Sant Singh: Is it a fact that the Central Publication Branch is the monopoly of Bengalis? Do Government propose to issue orders to the Manager not to recruit in any future vacancies that may arise, whether permanent, temporary or officiating in the lower or upper divisions, men from Bengal unless and until the number from other provinces is equalised or at least brought to a decent strength?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the replies given by me on the 20th December, 1933, to parts (c) and (d) of his starred question No. 1457.

**EXEMPTION OF THE BIHAR EARTHQUAKE RELIEF DONATIONS FROM
INCOME-TAX.**

401. ***Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla:** Will Government kindly state whether they have considered the advisability of exempting the Bihar earthquake relief donations, both in cash and kind, from income-tax, and if not, do they propose to do so now and make a declaration to this effect immediately?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply which I gave to Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh's question No. 324 on the 2nd March, 1934.

WORKING OF STAFF IN THE CRACKED HEAD OFFICE BUILDING AT JAMALPUR.

402. ***Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla:** Is it a fact that the clerks had to and are still working in the cracked Head Office building at Jamalpur? If the answer be in the affirmative, are Government aware that it is risky, in view of tremors being repeatedly felt, to make people sit there?

Mr. P. R. Rau: With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 402 and 404 together.

Enquiries are being made from the Railway Administration, and a reply will be laid on the table in due course.

**LEAVE GIVEN TO RAILWAY STAFF AT JAMALPUR AFTER THE EARTHQUAKE
SHOCK.**

403. ***Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla:** Is it a fact that the next day after the earthquake shock the staff of the Workshop and the Head Office at Jamalpur were asked to go on leave, and passes available till the 31st January were given to them? Is it also a fact that the Workshop and the Head Office were opened on the 22nd, and those who could not turn up for want of information were given forced casual leave instead of special leave granted to them? If so, do Government propose to treat this as special leave?

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

**WATER CONNECTIONS AND LIGHTS GIVEN TO THE TEMPORARY COLONIES OF
WORKERS AT JAMALPUR.**

†404. ***Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla:** Will Government kindly state whether they have given water connections and some lights to the temporary newly raised colonies of Jamalpur workers, and if not, are they prepared to do it now? If not, why not?

† For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 402.

RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION FOR POSTAL OFFICIALS STATIONED AT OOTACAMUND.

405. ***Mr. K. P. Thampan:** (a) Is it not the policy of the Government to provide residential accommodation for their servants at places where they are not available at reasonable rates of rent?

(b) Are Government aware that Ootacamund is a hill station, commonly known as the "Queen of the Hill Stations", situated about 8,000 feet above sea level, is the seat of the Madras Government for seven months in a year and is the summer residence of a good many princes, ruling chiefs, gentry, officials and non-officials, European and Indian, and that the Local Government of Madras have provided residential accommodation for almost all the staff under their administrative control at Ootacamund (Nilgiris) at reasonable rent?

(c) Are Government aware that postal officials at Ootacamund (Nilgiris) experience great difficulty in securing residential accommodation and that most of them are housed in insanitary or unsuitable quarters and that they pay invariably exorbitant and unreasonable rates of rent?

(d) Were the grievances of the postal officials stationed at Ootacamund in regard to this subject brought to the notice of the Government at any time?

(e) Have Government any idea of providing suitable residential accommodation for the postal staff at Ootacamund as they have done at Delhi, Simla and other places? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Although the absence of suitable accommodation at a reasonable rent is one of the factors taken into consideration by Government when considering the provision of residential accommodation for their servants it is not a fact that it is the policy of Government to provide such accommodation in all such cases.

(b) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative. As regards the second part I understand that residential accommodation has been provided by the Local Government for a certain number of their servants only.

(c) Government are aware that the postal staff at Ootacamund experience a certain amount of difficulty in finding residential accommodation in the immediate neighbourhood of the Post Office and that rents are high, but have no information as to the suitability of the quarters actually occupied by the staff.

(d) Yes.

(e) The case of the Government staff at New Delhi and Simla is exceptional. Government do not consider that the position in regard to the housing of the Postal staff at Ootacamund is such as would justify the formulation of any scheme for the construction of quarters under present financial conditions. The postal staff at Ootacamund draw compensatory allowances at specified rates.

Mr. K. O. Neogy: Does the Honourable Member accept the statement that "Ootacamund is the Queen of Hill Stations" as correct?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Yes, Sir, as I come from the Madras Presidency myself.

COMPENSATORY ALLOWANCE TO THE POSTAL OFFICIALS EMPLOYED IN THE NILGIRIS.

406. ***Mr. K. P. Thampan:** (a) Are Government aware that the staff under the Local Government stationed at Ootacamund and other places in the Nilgiris are granted compensatory allowance far in excess of that granted to postal officials employed in such places?

(b) Is it not a fact that the question of granting compensatory allowance to the postal officials employed in the Nilgiris, at the same rates as the Local Government have prescribed for their servants stationed in the said locality, has been pending before Government for over half a dozen years?

(c) Have Government any idea of redressing the grievances of the postal employees on this subject in the immediate future?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Although the rate of compensatory allowance for Madras Government employees of the clerical class is slightly higher than that drawn by the Postal officials of corresponding status, the latter are on a better scale of pay.

(b) On account of the unsatisfactory state of the finances in the Posts and Telegraphs Department, proposals for increasing the existing rates or making new grants of compensatory allowances or special pay have had to be refused generally in all circles on the ground of the additional expenditure involved.

(c) Does not arise in view of reply to part (b) above.

PUBLICATION OF NEWSPAPERS IN QUETTA.

407. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** (a) With reference to the answers to my starred questions Nos. 1449 and 1450, dated the 20th December, 1933, laid on the table of the House on the 13th February, 1934, will Government please state if they have taken up with the local authorities the question of the application of less drastic conditions for permission to edit and publish newspapers in Quetta? If so, will they be pleased to lay a copy of the conditions now applied on the table of this House?

(b) If they have not yet taken up the question, do they propose to consider the desirability of doing it at an early date and to communicate the result to the House?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: (a) The question referred to in the answer to parts (d) and (e) of the Honourable Member's question No. 1449 of the 20th December, 1933, has been taken up already with the Local Administration whose recommendations are awaited.

(b) Does not arise.

DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

408. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state to what extent they intend to act up to their orders on Recommendation No. II of the War Pensions Committee, and is it a fact that claims are held back as per instances given in the brackets (Mountain Artillery Training Centre No. R./28/1/352, dated the 26th January, 1934, 1/9th Jat Regiment letter No. 1000/34/1, dated the 9th November, 1933; Sapper and Miner Records No. R./107/2776/12, dated

the 11th January, 1934), by their Officers Commanding, and other administrative officers? Is it not their *locus standi*, for the purposes of adjudication of pensionary claims, that of a claimant, *vide* paragraph 44 of the Financial Regulations, Part I, and A. I. I. B-20 of 1927?

(b) To what extent will their adjudication with regard to the question "no sufficient grounds to forward, or to re-open a particular claim" be allowed?

(c) Is there any remedy if the Officer Commanding refuses to forward a particular claim to the sanctioning authority? If so, what?

Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham: With your permission, Sir, I propose to answer questions Nos. 408 to 414 together.

The questions are being carefully examined and a reply will be laid on the table in due course.

DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

†409. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Will Government be pleased to state to what extent they are prepared to act up to their orders on Recommendation No. III of the War Pensions Committee, admitting a right of appeal against a finding of "not attributable to military service", and to what extent has this right of appeal been denied under the cover of "professional aspect of the case" against which no appeal is admissible as per instances in bracket (D. C. M. P. letter No. G.-3/1978, dated the 15th February, 1934, and G.-3/5188, dated the 17th November, 1933)?

DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

†410. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Will Government be pleased to state to what extent they are prepared to act up to their orders on Recommendation No. V of the War Pensions Committee, accepting the presumption that all disabilities contracted on field or foreign service during the War were, in fact, "attributable to military service"? Is it a fact that as per instances in the bracket (D. C. M. P. letter No. G.-3/1978, dated the 15th February, 1933, and G.-3/2403, dated the 29th November, 1933), the decisions of original or fresh medical board convened in pre-committee period, adjudicating the term "attributable to military service", in accordance with pre-committee principles has been held as amounting to "sufficient evidence" clearly to rebut such a presumption?

DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

†411. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Will Government be pleased to state to what extent they intend to act up to their orders on Recommendation No. VII of the War Pensions Committee? Do Government admit full arrears in claims (i) which are not belated, or, (ii) wherein no explanation for delay is necessary, or (iii) the explanation for delay is satisfactory?

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 408.

If so, have Government allowed their Pension Controllers to go back on them as per instance in brackets (D. C. M. P. letter No. G.-3/3610, dated the 6th December, 1933, and No. G.-4/5414, dated the 18th January, 1934)? If so, in what way?

DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

†412. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state how far they are prepared to act up to their orders on Recommendation No. IX? Is it a fact that their Pension Controllers have taken the assessments, in percentages of disabilities, made by fresh medical boards, in 1923—1931 to be the percentage thereof, as existing during the War 1914—1922?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that a reference has been made to the Secretary of State for India with regard to the scope and applicability of this recommendation?

(c) Is it not a fact that pending the disposal of the reference made to the Secretary of State, all claims submitted with reference to this recommendation have been disposed of in a way adverse to the interests of the claimants and adverse to the spirit and letter of the recommendation?

DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

†413. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state how far they are prepared to act up to their orders on Recommendation No. XII of the War Pensions Committee, taking the onus on themselves to prove that an individual is not entitled to pension?

(b) Is it a fact that Government have shifted the "onus" to the claimants, in cases where claims are supported either by the production of a discharge certificate, or by the admission of an Officer Commanding to the effect that an individual was invalided from field service on account of some wound, injury, or illness, or was operated upon, or treated in some hospital during the War?

DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

†414. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state how far they are prepared to act up to their orders on Recommendation No. XIII admitting not to take adverse presumption for the "loss or failure to produce record, which, according to rule, should be permanently retained"?

(b) To what extent have their Pension Controllers, or Commanding officers, or other administrative officers taken adverse presumptions almost in every claim, of which the letters in brackets are a few instances (G3/3168, dated the 19th December, 1929, of the Deputy Controller of Military Pensions, Lahore, and letter No. 1069/34/A, dated the 9th November, 1933 of 1/9th Jat Regiment)?

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 408.

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

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

"I am directed to inform you that the Council of State has, at its meeting held on the 6th March, 1934, agreed, without any amendments, to the following Bills which were passed by the Legislative Assembly at its meeting held on the 26th February, 1934, namely :

1. A Bill further to extend the operation of the Wheat (Import Duty) Act, 1931;
2. A Bill to amend the Indian Medical Council Act, 1933, for a certain purpose;
3. A Bill further to amend the Cotton Textile Industry (Protection) Act, 1930; and
4. A Bill to continue for a further period the provisions made by certain Acts for the purpose of fostering and developing the Steel Industry and the Wire and Wire Nail Industry in British India."

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

Second Stage—contd.

DEMAND NO. 28—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL—*contd.*

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The first cut motion to be taken up for consideration is No. 179 under demand No. 28*. This discussion must close by Lunch time, and Honourable Members are requested to keep that in view.

Reorganisation of the Public Services under the proposed Federal Constitution.

Sir Hari Singh Gour (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I beg to move:

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

My intention is to call the attention of Government to the necessity for reorganising the public services in view of the proposals of His Majesty's Government. Honourable Members need not be told that in the Parliamentary Act it is now definitely stated that it is the considered policy of His Majesty's Government that there shall be progressive Indianisation of all branches of the administration. In accordance with that policy of the British Parliament, there has been a gradual development of Indianisation in some branches of public administration. In 1924, when the Royal Commission on Public Services was appointed, they went into the whole question of Indianisation and recorded their considered view to the effect that in the transferred field the services must be provincialised. I give to the Honourable Members two short passages from the report of the Royal Commission, and I shall read to the Honourable Members their formulated views in the shape of summary of recommendations. On page 8 of the report of the Lee Commission occur the following two passages:

"In the transferred field, the responsibility for administration rests on Ministers dependent on the confidence of Provincial Legislatures. It has been represented to us that although Ministers have been given full power to prescribe policy, they

*"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 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, 1935, in respect of 'Executive Council'."

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

might be hampered in carrying it out by the limitations to their control over the all-India Services inasmuch as the members of these services unlike those of Provincial Services are appointed by the Secretary of State and cannot be dismissed except by him while their salaries are not subject to the control of the local Legislatures. The Ministers themselves have told us that the all-India officers serving under them have, with negligible exceptions, given the most loyal support in carrying out their policies, but the constitutional anomaly remains that the control over the transferred field contemplated by the framers of the Government of India Act has remained incomplete. Our proposals are framed to remedy this particular anomaly."

Then, at page 62, they give a summary of their recommendations in the following words:

"For the purposes of Local Governments, no further recruitment should be made to the All-India Services as such operating in transferred fields. The personnel required for these branches of administration should in future be recruited by Local Governments."

—and then they add a note about the Medical Services—

"Local Governments should have power to make rules to regulate not only the public services which will take the place of the present All-India Services operating in transferred fields, but also the existing Provincial Services. The Secretary of State should make the necessary delegation of powers under section 96B of the Government of India Act accordingly."

Now, this was the recommendation of the Lee Commission. Acting upon that recommendation, the Secretary of State made rules under section 96B of the Government of India Act authorising the Local Governments to recruit and regulate their method of recruitment to the Provincial Services. That was the position when the Round Table Conference met in London. The Round Table Conference appointed a very strong Sub-Committee consisting of 34 members, of whom three members are at the present moment Members of this House, Mr. Mody, Sir Cowasji Jehangir and Mr. Ghuznavi, and they, by a majority, recommended that in future all recruitment to the All-India Services should be by the Government of India and not by the Secretary of State, and, secondly, they said that in their opinion recruitment for judicial offices should no longer be made in the Indian Civil Service. These are the recommendations of the Round Table Conference. But when the White Paper proposals were published, we found that the recommendations of the Round Table Conference on the question of the services were entirely ignored and in the White Paper proposals the present method of recruitment was to continue and for a period of five years after the commencement of the new Constitution Act. Honourable Members will find in the introduction to the White Paper, pages 35-36, paragraph 72, a summary of the proposals of the White Paper and that is repeated on a later page to which I have already referred. It is provided in the White Paper that the present method of recruitment will continue for a period of five years after the commencement of the Constitution Act, and that, at the expiry of five years from the commencement of the Constitution Act, a Statutory Enquiry will be held into the question of future recruitment for the All-India Civil Services and Indian Police, and the Government of India will be associated with the enquiry. But the decision on the result of the enquiry will rest with His Majesty's Government and will be subject to the approval of both Houses of Parliament. Pending the decision of this enquiry, the present ratio of British to Indian recruitment will remain unaltered. Then, it went on to say that the question of continued recruitment by the Secretary of State to the Superior Medical

and Railway Services was under examination, and His Majesty's Government hoped to submit their recommendation in this matter later on to the Joint Select Committee.

I may inform Honourable Members that while the Indian Delegation were sitting with the Joint Select Committee, the recommendations of His Majesty's Government were not submitted to the Joint Select Committee on the question of Superior Medical and Railways Services, so that the Joint Select Committee had not had the advantage of hearing the Indian delegates on these two services. But the Indian delegates made it abundantly clear that they could not see eye to eye with the White Paper proposals, and they questioned the Secretary of State as to how he reconciled his views with the policy of the Government of India Act and the recommendations of the Lee Commission. It was pointed out to him in the course of the examination that the Lee Commission had rightly pointed out that it would be a constitutional anomaly to continue an all-India Service amenable to the Secretary of State when there is a complete provincial autonomy, and the constitutional position which underlies the recommendations of the Lee Commission is this: that as soon as full provincial autonomy is established, the Provinces become directly responsible to the Crown and they become to that extent independent of the Secretary of State. If, therefore, in the Provinces you keep up an All-India Service recruited by the Secretary of State responsible to him and to him only, you are creating an anomaly in that while the Government are not responsible to the Secretary of State, the services operating in that Government are responsible to the Secretary of State.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar (Madras City: Non-Muhamadan Urban): Where does the Honourable Member get the idea that the Government are not responsible to the Secretary of State in the Provinces after provincial autonomy, but will be directly under the Crown?

Sir Hari Singh Gour: The very crux of the foundation of provincial autonomy is that the Provinces will become responsible only to the Crown and the Legislature, and, to that extent, the Legislature will control the action of the Provinces and the services will not be responsible to the Legislature, nor will they be responsible to any authority in India, but they will be responsible to an outside authority independent of the Provinces and of the Government of India.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): Where does my Honourable friend find that when provincial autonomy is introduced, the Provinces will be responsible only to the Crown?

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Honourable Members will find that if there was one point upon which the Indian delegates were emphatic and unanimous,—Hindus, Muslims, Christians and also Europeans, as the covering letter of Sir Hubert Carr as the representative of the European community in India shows,—they emphatically demanded that in order that the Provinces should have full scope for realising provincial autonomy, it was necessary that the services should be provincialised, and, in saying so, they used the following words to which I would draw the attention of this House. In paragraph 30 of the joint memorandum, they said:

"No part of the White Paper proposals has caused more dissatisfaction in India than the provisions relating to the public services."

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

And, then, in sub-clause (2) of paragraph 31, they say:

"Very strong objection has been taken in India to this part of the scheme which is, it may be noted, not in accordance with the recommendations of the Services Sub-Committee of the Round Table Conference. We consider that after the passing of the Constitution Act recruitment for the Central services should be by the Federal Government and for the provincial services including the Indian Civil Service and the Indian Police should be by the Provincial Governments who should have full power to determine the pay and other conditions of service for future recruits and also the proportion of Europeans that should be recruited."

There is a foot-note:

"Sir Henry Gidney dissents from this proposal."

I do not know from what he dissents, but, at the time when this proposal was under discussion, my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, did not express any dissent with the outline of the proposals that were discussed in a joint meeting of the Indian delegation. Then the Indian delegates go on to say:

"There would be a very substantial European element in the two key services for another generation even if European recruitment were completely stopped after the passing of the Act. The proposal that a Statutory Inquiry should be instituted after a period of five years is open to very strong objection. A problem of European recruitment cannot be considered in isolation; it is very closely connected with standards of administration, the state of communal feeling and other factors which are of a very controversial nature and raise political issues. Any such inquiry, even of an informal nature, would therefore, have a grave disturbing effect on the political atmosphere and would seriously affect the relations between the services and the legislature."

Now, Honourable Members will remember that all these points were brought to the notice of the Secretary of State in the course of his examination by the Indian delegation. One of us read to him a passage from the Lee Commission's report and asked him whether it was not a constitutional anomaly to continue the present method of recruitment under the new Constitution Act; and his answer was that it would be a constitutional anomaly. That was admitted. Then the next question that was put was, on what ground did he justify a departure from the considered views of the Lee Commission and of the Round Table Conference? And his reply is contained in question 11701 at page 1077. He says:

"What I should have thought most important to retain was a breathing space in which things would settle down."

All that he wanted to do was, he said, to continue the present method of recruitment for a period of five years. Now, Sir, as I have pointed out, Indian opinion is insistent upon one fact and that fact is that if the Provinces are to have any substantial measure of autonomy, the instrument by which that autonomy is to be worked must be within their own control, and that, if recruitment is to continue by the Secretary of State, it would impair from that degree of autonomy which it is the established policy of the White Paper to establish in the Provinces. That, I submit, was the view of the Ministers whom the Lee Commission examined in 1924. That was under a dyarchical system of Government. *A fortiori* it would be the case when under the proposals of the White Paper we have full provincial autonomy. I, therefore, submit that this House should concur in the decision of the Round Table Conference and in the representation contained in the joint memorandum of the Indian delegation and record its view that the reorganisation of the public services in India cannot be deferred for a period of five years after the commencement of the Constitution Act. I

wish to point out to the Honourable Members of this House that it is in the interest of the public services themselves that an inquiry should be immediately made and the services reorganised. I say it is in the interest of the services themselves for the very cogent reason recorded by the Simon Commission when dealing with the question of the reservation of law and order. The Simon Commission pointed out that if once in the Provinces all branches of administration are transferred and law and order is reserved, it will become a focus for organised attack and the police will be looked upon as an instrument of a foreign bureaucracy still lingering in the dark recesses of provincial autonomy. I should use the same argument and say that, in the interest of the public services in this country, it is necessary that the servant should feel that the responsibility is to the Provinces and the Provincial Legislatures and that they should not be buttressed and supported by an outside authority who would not know the local conditions prevailing in the Provinces. These high-souled gentlemen, who come to the Provinces to help in the fulfilment of the hope that was aroused by the enactment of the Act of 1919, would be the first to say that they should receive the popular support of the Provincial Legislatures in their day to day duties and that the Legislature should not look askance at them for all their acts and doings, however justifiable those acts and doings might be.

Then I cannot forget that with the reorganisation of the services there would be a substantial measure of economy. In answer to a question put to the Secretary of State, if the White Paper proposals went through, as to how many

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member can take five minutes more and conclude.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: as to how many members would be recruited between now and the initiation of the inquiry, he said, roughly speaking two hundred. I wish to ask Honourable Members of this House that if you were to have 200 more Members between now and five years hence, and it may take another five years for the inquiry to be completed and perhaps another five years for Parliament to agree with the report of the Commission—altogether you may have 400 or perhaps 600 Members with existing and accruing rights, and it would saddle a very heavy financial responsibility upon this country if this inquiry is not held forthwith as the Indian public opinion and the Indian delegation demand.

If I had time I would like to have mentioned one or two other facts, but let me very hurriedly refer to them. It is not merely a question of recruitment, but the question of control; and the weakest part of the White Paper scheme is contained in Appendix VII which deals with the existing and accruing rights of the All-India Services which are to be preserved under the new dispensation. What are those rights? I have not got the time to go through them, but I shall very cursorily mention two or three of them. One is that the reservation of those posts will be in the hands of the Secretary of State: whether the Provinces want them or not, the Secretary of State will say "So many members of the All-India Services are quartered upon your Province: employ them in the best way you can, but you will have to pay for them". Second, determination of the strength, that is, the number. Third, provision that posts borne on the cadre of All-India Services shall not be left unfilled for more than three months: You may find that it is not necessary to fill a post for six months or you

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

may want to economise, but you cannot keep that post vacant for more than three months. Then, the appointment of any one who is not a member of an All-India Service to posts borne on the cadre of such a service, however desirable that incumbent may be and however necessary his services may be for the working of provincial autonomy, these rules prohibit his employment in that Province in supersession of a member of the All-India Services. Not only that, but the Secretary of State is to control the posting of the members of the All-India Services, and the personal concurrence of the Governor shall be required to an order of posting of an officer of an All-India Service and the right of complaint to the Government against any order of an official superior in a Governor's Province and direction to the Governor to examine the complaint and to take such action as it may appear to him just and equitable; the Minister will be always in the criminal's dock if this provision goes through, because the moment he comes in conflict with a member of the All-India Services, the All-India Services will have recourse to the Governor and the Minister will have to justify his action as required by these Devolution Rules. Sir, I do not wish to elaborate this point. It was very exhaustively brought to the notice of the Secretary of State and the view of the Indian delegation was that the Secretary of State has not been able to justify these drastic provisions in favour of the All-India Services. I, therefore, move that the question of the reorganisation of the All-India Services should be taken up forthwith and the reorganised services should function under the reformed Government.

I have one more word to add and that is this: if the reforms adumbrated by the White Paper pass on to the Statute-book, members of the All-India Services will have to discharge entirely new functions to those which they have been accustomed to do under the present Government of India Act, and I, therefore, submit that it is all the more necessary that we should reorganise the Indian services in view of the altered conditions which would be ushered in by the new Constitution Act. Honourable Members will remember that, under section 96B of the Government of India Act, we have at the present moment the power, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State, to make rules—I will give the Honourable Members the exact words: section 96B (2) lays down:

"The Secretary of State in Council may make rules for regulating the classification of the civil services in India, the methods of their recruitment, their conditions of service, pay and allowances, and discipline and conduct. Such rules may, to such extent and in respect of such matters as may be prescribed, delegate the power of making rules to the Governor General in Council or to Local Governments, or authorise the Indian Legislature or Local Legislatures to make laws regulating the public services."

I submit, therefore, that under the present law the Indian Legislature has conceivably the power of making laws for the regulation of the public services, and I submit that that power should not be taken away by the new Constitution Act which is intended to make an advance upon the present Government of India Act. I beg, therefore, to submit—and this is my last word—that, under the new Constitution Act, the Secretary of State is to have what is called advisers, and some of them will be service men; and the Indian delegation strongly objected to the position that the Secretary of State with the service advisers should have complete control over the All-India Services. I, therefore, submit that the motion that I have the honour to move should receive the support of all sections of the House,

Hindus and Muslims, elected and nominated, because, to my great gratification, I read in the papers only the other day that the joint memorandum of the Indian delegation had been unanimously acclaimed by the joint meetings of the Muslim League and the All-India Muslim Conference. I, therefore, crave the support of all sections of this House to this very necessary reform in the public services, without which neither provincial autonomy nor central responsibility would be of that moment which we all desire that it should be.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Cut motion moved:

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

Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi (Tirhut Division: Muhammadan): Sir, it has given me very great pleasure to listen to the very able speech just now delivered by my esteemed friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour. He has pointed out to us all the details from the very beginning when the question was being analysed. He has also told us what view Indians hold in this matter. There is no doubt that there is the greatest unanimity on this question in all sections of the Indian population, and one need not support my friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, by quoting from other documents like the Reports of various Commissions and Conferences which have been held from time to time. It is enough for me if I say that his voice is the voice of India at present. (Applause.) I have attended the meetings of the All-India Muslim League and the All-India Muslim Conference, and I can personally testify to the fact that they have all supported with one voice the joint memorandum of the 12 Members of the British Indian Delegation which was submitted on this question to the Joint Select Committee.

Besides this, Sir, I would put forward one more argument. We have experience of the dyarchical form of Government. We have for the last 13 years now that sort of Government in the country. We know how it has fared in the different Provinces where self-respecting Ministers, holding independent views and having their own policies to carry out, had to contend with numerous difficulties. Where the Ministers only followed the dictates of some higher officials, I admit, matters have gone on smoothly. But the question is that we are now in different times. We are not in 1922; we are now in 1934, and Providence only can say how long it will take for the new Reforms to be inaugurated in India. By that time, I am sure, the country would have gone a long way towards something of a crisis I should say, and, therefore, it would be much better if the Government considered this question carefully at this opportune moment. If there is dyarchy in services, it will be a tremendously difficult task for the Governors of Provinces to carry on their administration. From the evidence tendered by the Right Honourable Sir Samuel Hoare before the Joint Select Committee, I find that he himself thinks that he wants only breathing time for things to settle down, and he is perfectly right in saying that it cannot be the lasting feature of the reformed Constitution. For those very reasons I contend that the reformed Constitution must be based on full control by the Ministers of all those Departments which will be placed in their charge. That feature is so obvious. I myself had discussions with some of my Minister-friends, and they confess that the restrictions and limitations put upon them in respect of the control of the services are the greatest handicaps in their way. They feel that no respectable Minister, no Minister holding independent views, having a policy of his

[Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi.]

own to carry out in the best interests of the people, would care to take up the reins of Government unless he felt that he had got the instrument under control to carry out his wishes in the administration of the country, unless he felt that his views were bound to be respected and brought into action by those who were in charge of the various Departments under him. If that feeling of security is not there, no respectable Minister would come forward to assume the reins of Government with pleasure. If dummy Ministers again come up to take charge of the Government, it would be very difficult for the Government to make the Constitution popular, because it is the popular men alone who can make the constitution also popular with the people. For all these reasons, I submit that the motion moved by my friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, has my full support.

Mr. Bhuput Sing (Bihar and Orissa: Landholders): Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting the motion just moved by my Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour. This motion deals only with one aspect of the White Paper proposals, namely, the services which are composed mainly of three parts, firstly, the Imperial Services recruited by the Secretary of State, secondly, the All-India Services recruited by the Government of India, and, thirdly, the subordinate services recruited by the Provincial Governments. As far as I am concerned, I would mainly deal with the Imperial Services which are better known in India by the Lloyd Georgian epithet of the steel frame of the Indian constitution. I think, Sir, even the present Round Tablers representing the United Kingdom accepted the same dictum of the steel frame in regard to the services, and, therefore, they laid more stress on the question of the reservation of the rights of the services than with provincial autonomy or with Central responsibility. They know in their heart of hearts that, let India have any reforms they like, but if she can be forced to accept the position of the services as propounded in the White Paper, then India's bondage hereafter will be a thousand times greater than with all the other safeguards combined.

Now, Sir, let us consider the position in more detail. In paragraph 71 of the proposals, all the present rights enjoyed by the Imperial Services recruited by the Secretary of State have been stated, and, after enumerating them, it is further added there as follows:

"It is intended to safeguard these rights and to extend them to all persons appointed by the Secretary of State after the commencement of the Constitution Act with the exception of the right to retire under the regulations for premature retirement; this right it is proposed to give only to officers appointed to the Indian Civil Service and Indian Police up to the time when a decision is taken on the result of the inquiry indicated in paragraph 72.

Certain members of the Provincial and Central Services, though they may not have been appointed by the Secretary of State in Council, have also rights for the preservation of which he responsible. These, too, will be secured."

It means that not only the present rights enjoyed by the steel frame services will be continued by them in the future, but even those privileges are being extended to all persons recruited by the Secretary of State even for technical appointments on a contract basis. In other words, the future Indian Ministers responsible to the Indian Legislature will have no control over their own subordinates belonging to these services manned by the Whites. This applies not only to the Centre, but this applies even to the Ministers of the Provinces which are going to be dubbed with the big, high sounding, name of the Autonomous Provinces. I wonder at the impudence of the British Cabinet and the Secretary of State who

think that Indians are all fools not to understand the real game of reserving the present rights of the services in the body of the Constitution Act itself.

Sir, even a man with no political education or acumen shudders when he goes through the 18 points mentioned in Appendix VII, Part I, to the White Paper proposals enumerating the present rights of the services. I could have excused the services and the British Cabinet if they would have only desired to have a *bond fide* safeguard about the security of their appointments. But, Sir, they do not want to have only safeguards in the form of security of appointments, but they want something more. They are not even satisfied with the present rights, but they want further rights to be ensured to them by which they would be able to ignore the Ministers under whom they would be required to serve. If I am to deal with all the eighteen points in Appendix VII, Part I, then it will be a volume by itself and the small space of time at my disposal is not sufficient to deal with them. I would only bring to the notice of the House a few of the rights which must be abrogated if the Constitutional Reforms are anything worth the name. Firstly, I take item No. 15 which reads as follows:

"Personal concurrence of the Governor required to an order of posting of an officer of an All-India Service."

It means, not to speak of any other punishment, even a Minister will not have the right of transferring an officer belonging to the tin gods without the concurrence of the Governor or the Governor General. Then, Sir, I come to item No. 3, dealing with the existing and accruing rights which reads as follows:

"Guarantee to persons appointed before the commencement of the Government of India Act, 1919, of existing and accruing rights or compensation in lieu thereof."

In this connection, I may state that the words "accruing rights" have already been defined by the Law Officers of the Crown. In spite of that fact, the public services demand these terms to be incorporated in the Constitution Act and the Secretary of State, as is evident from the White Paper proposal, is conniving with the services in retaining these ambiguous terms. With your permission, Sir, I would like to read questions by Sir Abdur Rahim and Sir Hari Singh Gour, when examining the witnesses representing the I. C. S. Associations, Sir Abdur Rahim put the following question: (Question No. 79).

"Q. As regards the accruing rights, are you aware that that has been the subject of interpretation by the Legal Officers of the Crown?"

A. Yes, I am quite aware of that, and I know that they hold the abolition of a Commissioner's post would not fall under the expression 'accruing rights', because it is a selection post, and not a post which an officer has a claim to get by seniority. I am quite aware of that, and that is one of the reasons why we ask that there should be a definition, to some extent. Of course, it is very difficult to have an exact definition, but a definition, to some extent, of 'accruing rights' giving the Secretary of State power in doubtful cases to say whether a particular loss of an appointment would fall under an officer's accruing rights, or not."

Then, Sir Hari Singh Gour put some questions, and, summarising the whole thing, he put the following question: (Question No. 186.)

"Q. It then comes to this: You want that a new provision should be inserted in the New Constitution Act which would enlarge your rights beyond what is interpreted to be your existing and accruing rights in the opinion of the law officers of the Crown?"

A. That is so. Lord Peel expressed his intention of doing so a good many years ago."

[Mr. Bhuput Sing.]

If we are to follow this sort of reforms, it is better that we do not have any Constitutional Reforms at all. India, after the 1919 Reforms, thought that she would get further advance, but in giving her further Reforms her bondage to the services is being increased. In the name of the Reforms, she is being mortgaged to the public services of the country. In this connection, Sir, I would remind the Secretary of State to remember how he would like the idea if the Minister gives these very privileges to the Provincial Services who would be recruited by the Provincial Government. How would an officer belonging to the autocratic Imperial Services like the idea if he is not allowed to have any controlling power over the subordinates working under him? Sir, to my mind, if, with this spirit of suspicion, the services are to work under the Ministers, then I am positive that the whole Constitution would come to a deadlock in no time, and whatever powers the Governor may be given, it would be beyond his powers to carry on the administration. I would not be surprised if, following the example of the Superior Services, the subordinate services would also ignore their own immediate superiors. The subordinate services would have sufficient justification to think that if the Superior Services can flout the Ministers who are their superiors, then there is no reason why they in their turn cannot ignore their own immediate superiors who would be none else but the personnel belonging to these heaven-born services. If the future Constitution is to be an advance on the present constitution, then out of the 18 items of existing rights, I for one would agree only to allow the services to retain the rights such as will give them only the security of their appointments and a right of appeal to the Secretary of State. Even this is too much of a liberty given, but I am prepared to allow these rights to the services who are recruited before the coming into force of the Constitution Act, and nothing further. If the White Paper proposals are really meant to be a further advance in constitutional progress of the country, the first and foremost thing required is the handing over of the control of the services to the Ministers either in the Centre or in the Provinces. To my mind this should be the pre-requisite before the question of the acceptability of the reforms can be considered. After the enforcement of the Constitution Act, the whole power of recruitment should automatically be transferred to the Government of India, i.e., the Governor General, or the Governor, as advised by his Ministers, and the only right thereafter that the services may be permitted to enjoy is the right of appeal to the Supreme Court when established in cases of dismissal only. So long as the public services are not reorganised on these lines and so long as they are not made to understand that they are really public servants and not public masters, any further advance will be useless. Unless and until the services are made to understand that they are no more the spoilt children of the Secretary of State, but that they in future will have to abide by the orders of their adoptive father, the Government of India, Indians of all sections would and must resist this state of things. Sir, India agitated for further reforms and hoped to get an eatable constitution, but, instead of that, she is being given stones and a cup of further misery. She wanted to be free, and instead she is being thrown into captivity at the hands of the public services. I emphatically protest against the proposals of the Secretary of State to retain under his control the public services of India.

Lastly, I have one more word to say. It is rather surprising to find that the Secretary of State is just like clay in the hands of the I. C. S.

Association and also the Retired I. C. S. Association. The memoranda submitted by these Associations demanded certain rights and we find all of them incorporated *verbatim* in the body of the White Paper proposals. For the information of the House and with your permission, Sir, I will read the following extract from the memoranda

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member must now conclude.

Mr. Bhuput Sing: How many minutes more have I got, Sir?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member may take two minutes more.

Mr. Bhuput Sing: In paragraph 5 they say:

"It is essential that the Governor should be in touch with the services, and in the case of the Indian Civil Service this result would be best ensured if proposals relating to postings, transfers, promotions and similar matters, were placed before the Governor by an officer of the rank of Chief Secretary."

It is surprising that, though hundreds of memoranda were submitted to the Secretary of State by different political bodies of India, yet none of them were given so serious a consideration and incorporated *verbatim* in the White Paper as was the case with the memoranda of these two particular Service Associations. It shows particularly how great is the concern of the Secretary of State for satisfying the Associations of the public services of India and the reasons for such concern are not far to seek. His main idea about the public services in India is that they must contain a sufficiently large number of British elements and, for bringing them into the field, he wants to put these bribes before them, so that they may be attracted in larger numbers.

In conclusion, Sir, I say that Mr. Lloyd George described the public services of India as a steel frame of the Indian Constitution, whereas I would like to describe the public services in India to be white ants which would eat up the very foundation of the proposed Constitution.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I must congratulate Sir Hari Singh Gour on having placed before this House, in a very lucid manner, the position as far as it relates to the claims of India and the Government of India to control, administer and recruit their own public services, and when my friend, Mr. Shafee Daoodi, said that Sir Hari Singh Gour's speech was the voice of India, I gladly join him. I also join in the demand that Sir Hari Singh Gour has made, but with a definite proviso. I can only explain this by referring to the note of dissent I made on this one point in the memorandum the British Indian Delegation submitted to the Joint Parliamentary Committee. I felt, rightly or wrongly, that at least during the transition period India did require and must have the services of the British element, and, for that reason, I entered my note of dissent in this Report on this point. I would have been more correct had I stated that my dissent existed only for the time being, *i.e.*, during the transitional period. The reasons given by Sir Hari Singh Gour, when he emphasised the anomalous resulting positions are irrefutable. I submit, if India is to be given self-government, if the Governments in this country, Central and Provincial, are to be given complete autonomy, they must have the right

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

of recruitment and control of their own services. Sir, in my opinion, two of the most lamentable omissions of the last Joint Parliamentary Committee were the absence of any evidence to show how the transferred subjects were operating in the Provinces, and the want of adequate opportunity, except in very general terms, to delegates who attended, either to hear or to give any evidence so far as the working of the All-India Services was concerned. I think it was on the last day of our sittings with the Joint Select Parliamentary Committee that I was asked to introduce the question of the Indian Medical Service. I think it was within 20 minutes to half an hour before the Committee dissolved and I had to rush through the matter for want of time. Indeed we had to go at such a pace with our agenda that many important subjects were denied our serious consideration. I think there was only one evidence given regarding the working of transferred subjects in the Provinces. It was when the Indian Medical Service deputation was examined and Colonel Baird and Colonel Dunn, retired members of the Indian Medical Service, were examined as to whether the transfer of medicine and public health was a success in the Provinces and even at this examination lack of time prevented members of the delegation from closely examining the witnesses, but, apart from this, there is no doubt that we did suffer from a want of time and opportunity to press our view points on service matters before the Joint Parliamentary Committee. But, Sir, behind and beyond all this, this House has to decide on one very important question, and it is this. Does India want the British element in her services or does she not? If she wants it, then she can do with only the best. She cannot do with second rate men in such services as the Indian Civil Service, the Indian Police Service and, need I add, the Indian Medical Service. There are certain essentials which the new Government needs during the transitional period, and that is efficiency in its Superior Services. Supposing the House passes this cut motion, does the House realise what it means? It means that we will get no further recruits from England, because one of the demands made by the youth of England before they would think of joining these services is that they must have a sense of security in case of appeal and this they demand must be with the Secretary of State for India. If the Central Government or the Provincial Governments have independent control of these services, who will safeguard the British officers' interests and appeal? Their appeal would lie either to the Public Services Commission or the Governor General in Council, and not the Secretary of State for India. It may be (as I suggested to the Secretary of State when I examined him on this matter) that it would be acceptable to this House and the Government if a compromise were arrived at. The compromise I suggest is this: that the Government of India recruit in India their Indian officers for the Indian Civil Service and the Indian Police Service and other such services on an All-India basis, and that the Secretary of State should continue to recruit in England the British element, all officers to be placed under the control of the Government of India (I am certainly opposed to these services being under the control of the Provincial Governments) with a right of appeal to the Viceroy and a final appeal to the Secretary of State. In making this compromise, I am fully conscious of the trouble and the difficulties referred to by Sir Hari Singh Gour. One has only to read the evidence given by Colonel Baird, the late Inspector General of Civil Hospitals, United Provinces, who stated that there were many occasions when he was at serious variance with the Minister in charge of Medicine, which often led to unpleasant and intolerable situations between them and at times to an impasse. I can also appreciate the fact that if the

Government of India or the Secretary of State controlled the recruitment of these Superior Services, it would in substance render the position of Ministers in the Provinces an absolute farce, but I can also readily conceive of means by which this can be remedied. Otherwise why give with one hand and take away with the other? Why introduce into the White Paper provisions and safeguards for these services, and, at the same time, say that India is to be given Provincial autonomy, self-Government and, in time, Dominion Status?

Sir Hari Singh Gour struck a true note when he said that if the Provinces were to be completely autonomous, the services working in the Provinces must be under their control and their recruitment cannot be controlled by the Secretary of State, but by the Governments concerned. That, I submit, Sir, is an ideal which I share with other Members in this House in the hope that it will materialise in the near future, but in my opinion it is necessary for this House to be a little bit slow in its pace and its demands. I think the time has not yet arrived when India can do without the valuable services and stabilising value of the British element in some of her services, and it is for this reason that I still uphold my note of dissent in the Memorandum. I consider it unwise and unsafe to shut the door to the recruitment of these services in England. It will deprive India of the best in her service. I am as keen on the autonomous development of India as any of my friends on the opposite side, but keener in seeing that we walk before we run and we learn to run before we leap, especially during the transitional period when we will be confronted with our present day communal conflicts and when this country will stand in sore need of the presence of the Britisher in the various services which they have undoubtedly helped to build up to their present state of efficiency.

There is another difficulty, and it is this. If each Province is to recruit and have control of its services, how will the Federal Government recruit their services? Will the Federal Government indent for their officers from the various provincial services or will they recruit their own cadre of officers? At the First Round Table Conference Services Sub-Committee in 1930, I led the discussion on the Indian Medical Service which recommended its closure to civil medical employment. Since then I understand that even if the Provinces were willing to create a purely civil medical branch, closed to recruitment from the Indian Medical Service, the supply of the British personnel for British employees would be so expensive as to render it impracticable. Sir, these are practical difficulties that must be faced by us. Apart from the fact that we must have the very best men, and I submit that the best men can only be obtained by an all-India recruitment by the Public Services Commission and under the control of the Federal Government, with the right of appeal to all officers to the Secretary of State when necessary. Sir, I think that the need for these changes was lurking in the mind of the Secretary of State, for you see in the White Paper the Secretary of State, himself, has asked that an inquiry should be instituted five years after the operation of the new Act. An inquiry will be necessary, as was pointed out by the last speaker, especially with regard to the vested interests and the accruing rights of the services. On the 3rd of November, I examined the Secretary of State very closely on the question of these vested interests and accruing rights which emanated from very insistent demands made by the Civil Services Association and the Police Association. These two Associations made, as their chief demand, the protection of their vested interests and of their accruing rights. Sir, if the Civil Service and the Police wanted this, I demanded, on behalf of the subordinate services and

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

the other gazetted services, a similar provision. The Secretary of State made the statement that some of the services would in a measure be similarly protected while others would not be. I am, however, happy to know today that the Government of India, I think it was on the 22nd of December last year, issued a communiqué in which the vested interests and some of the accruing rights of all servants, subordinate and gazetted, who were in Government employ on the 31st July, 1981, would be protected. I am happy to know that not only the accruing rights of the Civil Services will be protected, but also those of the subordinate services if only to a limited extent. This is as it should be. My Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, further said that his demand for this control of the services by the Provincial Governments was not only in connection with the question of recruitment, but in connection with the control: and I think I am voicing a great body of opinion—it may be a silent or unexpressed opinion,—that there is a fear in the minds of the British element in the services that, with such control, their interests are likely to be prejudiced. I know that this apprehension is serious and does exist, because, it has been expressed in the evidence tendered before the Joint Parliamentary Committee. One has to realise these practical facts when asking the Government of India to suddenly deprive their superior services of recruitment from England. Sir, with this important provision that, during the transitional period, we do nothing in this House that will deprive the services from getting the benefit of an adequate British element and that recruitment of the British element be adjusted in gradual decreasing numbers as the years go on. I support the motion that has been placed before this House.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran: Non-Muhamadan): Sir, I offer my hearty congratulations to my esteemed friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, for having brought out a very important point for discussion on the floor of this House. Sir, the White Paper proposals are riddled with innumerable drawbacks and the proposal connected with the recruitment and the reorganisation of the services is so reactionary as to derogate greatly from whatever little value the White Paper proposals may have for us. I associate myself with my friend, Mr. Bhuput Singh, to all that he said, when he subjected the proposals in the White Paper regarding the recruitment to the public services to criticism, and I do not want to refer to that again.

There is one important point which I would stress in this debate—a point which has already been referred to by my friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour—namely, this, that if the control of the services mentioned in the White Paper is to rest in the hands of the Secretary of State, all talk of provincial autonomy is mere moonshine. On the one hand, the White Paper proposals purport to give us provincial autonomy under which the Minister would be responsible for the conduct of the departments in the field of provincial administration, while on the other hand, the instrument with which he has to carry out the duties, assigned under the Constitution, will be an instrument over which he has no control! This introduces an element of anomaly into the whole constitutional position, and I would not be surprised if the result of this provincial autonomy, whatever may be the measure and extent of such autonomy, will not be worth the trouble of introducing it. The main divisions of the public services in India are the All-India Services, the Provincial Services and the Central Services. The All-India Services include the following: the Indian Civil Service,

the Indian Police Service, the Indian Forest Service and the Indian Service of Engineers. Provincial Services cover the whole field of the civil administration of the Provinces. The members of these services are appointed by the Provincial Governments. The Central Services have been classified as comprising the Railway Services, the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Traffic Services and the Imperial Customs Services. In the White Paper provision is made for the continued recruitment by the Secretary of State of the members of the Indian Civil Service, the Indian Police Service and the Ecclesiastical Department, etc. The I. C. S. is said to be a public service, but I should like to know what is the meaning of the "I. C. S." This service is hardly an "Indian" service, it is not a "civil" service, and it is not a "service" at all. (Laughter.)

An Honourable Member: Then what is it?

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Sir, the I. C. S. really controls the administrative policy of the Government of India and of the Provincial Governments. My friend, Colonel Sir Henry Gidney, has referred to the fact that he would prefer the recruitment of the British element during the transitional period. I say, I do not object to the recruitment of Britishers for any length of time, provided those Britishers are under our control, and provided India has the right of controlling the character and the composition of the administration. If we are given that power of controlling the policy of our own administration, we would certainly welcome the best men available, whether in India or elsewhere. But the position of the permanent service in India is not analogous to the sort of Civil Service which functions in England. In England, the Civil Service, if I understand aright, has no controlling voice in determining the policy of the administration. They have merely to carry out the policy as laid down by Parliament and the Cabinet, but here, the members of the I. C. S. constitute the very authority which lays down the policy according to which the administration of the country is to be carried on. Now that anomaly is sought to be perpetuated in the scheme propounded in the White Paper, and it is in this connection that we raise our voice to protest against it.

My gallant friend, Sir Henry Gidney, also referred to the transition period. I do not know what he refers to. The British Government has been existing in India for over a century and a half. I should like to know from what period to what period he would like to regard as the transition period, because the scheme adumbrated in the White Paper is not a complete scheme of self-Government in itself. It may at best be a progressive approximation to the scheme of Dominion Status. Under the scheme, as propounded in the White Paper, it will take a long time before the goal of Dominion Status is reached. Now, the period, commencing from now up to the time at which Dominion Status will be attained, might as well be called a period of transition. I would, therefore, submit that this talk about the transitional period has not much of practical value in it. I am quite willing to retain to the present administration the duty of carrying on the Government of the country till India receives Dominion Status, but the controlling power should be in the hands of the Federal Legislature or the Minister in charge of the different Departments, and the members of the Civil Services or of the other services, which I have mentioned, should be subordinate to the Federal Legislature or to the Minister in charge of those Departments as the case may be. This, Sir, is the point which I wished to submit to the House for its consideration. The point

[Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh.]

has also been referred to in the White Paper. At page 69 of the White Paper, there occurs the following paragraph:

"The Secretary of State will after the commencement of the Act make appointments to the Indian Civil Service, the Indian Police and the Ecclesiastical Department. The conditions of all persons who are appointed including conditions as to pay, allowances, pensions, discipline and conduct will be regulated by rules made by the Secretary of State. It is intended that these rules shall in substance be the same as those now applicable in the case of persons appointed by the Secretary of State in Council before the commencement of this Act."

I should like to say here emphatically that we do not want that the terms and conditions on which the present members of the Indian Civil Service or of any other service have been recruited in India should in any way be varied by any future Government. Those who have been already appointed must carry on their duties under the sacred covenant as it were, and their position ought to be made secure, but this should not be the case with the future recruitment. The control of these services and the conditions of service should in the future rest not with the Secretary of State for India, but with the Federal Minister and the Federal Government.

My Honourable friend, Mr. Bhuput Sing, has referred in some detail to some of the rights and privileges which are proposed to be secured to these members of the services which seem to be unreasonable and extravagant in many cases. I do not think there is any justification for laying down most of the rules as are given in Appendix VII of the White Paper proposals. I would not, however, labour that point, but I merely wish to emphasise once more the cardinal fact that, in the future Constitution of India, even in the scheme which has been laid down for the inauguration of Provincial Governments, the services working under that scheme in the Provinces should be absolutely under the control of the Legislature and the Minister in charge of the various Departments concerned.

The question which has been raised by my Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, is an important one, and I would ask my Honourable friend, the Home Member, to tell us what he has got to say in the matter of the proposals adumbrated in that part of the White Paper scheme. With these few words, I support the motion.

Sir Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the framing of a Constitution for India, as has been so many times pointed out, is really one of the most difficult tasks that has ever confronted any Constitution builders in the world. The conditions prevailing in India are no doubt quite different from the conditions prevailing in any other part of the world, and therefore, the Constitution which is to be prepared for India must be a Constitution for India and India alone. The proposals contained in the White Paper, theoretically speaking, may not be considered as perfect, but taking into consideration the conditions which are prevailing in India and the surroundings of this country, they are, I think, most practicable and such as could give satisfaction, at least, to a very large number of the population of the country. The recruitment of services and the control of the people so appointed are two different things.

My learned friend, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, has expressed a doubt that if recruitment is left to the Secretary of State, probably the Ministers will not be able to exercise their control in full over the officers so appointed. But our experience of the last decade in the Provinces has

shown that the officers who were recruited by the Secretary of State for India have loyally and to the utmost satisfaction of the Ministers carried out the policy which was laid down by the Ministers in different Provinces. Therefore, it is not right to say that recruitment by the Secretary of State would interfere with the control of the Ministers.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: I was merely referring to the constitutional position and not to the good sense of the members of the Indian Civil Service who have to work under Ministers.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: I do not understand what the Honourable Member means by the phrase "constitutional position". As I have said, Constitutions for different countries and for different conditions are quite different. The constitutional condition of every country depends upon the conditions prevailing in that country. My learned friend has also asked what the duration of the transition period meant. In reply to that, I would submit that as long as the conditions which are prevailing in India would continue to last, the period will remain always a period of transition. It rests with me, it rests with my friend from Bihar and it rests with all the people who live in this country to change the atmosphere of the country and with it the whole period of transition. We cannot shut our eyes to the suspicions which are lurking in the minds of the people in this country. We cannot shut our eyes to the experiences which certain classes of people in the country have experienced up to this time. Therefore, I would submit that the recruitment of the Indian Civil Service and of the Indian Police Service, at least for some time to come, will have to be left with the Secretary of State for India and that is my opinion on this point.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: Mr. President, I am very glad that this debate has been initiated by my Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, because it gives us an opportunity to state exactly what our position is with reference to the Superior Civil Services of the country. The speeches that have already been made show that there is no animosity in any section of this House towards those services. Let me at once divide the services into two sections—those who are now serving in this country under the existing covenants and those who may be recruited hereafter. As my friend, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, has already stated, we want that every covenant that has been entered into with reference to the existing services should be faithfully and scrupulously adhered to. None of us regrets the fact less than the Secretary of State or the Under-Secretary of State or any Member of Parliament that owing to conditions entirely beyond our control—the exigencies of the financial situation, the economic blizzard that has overtaken this country—it has been necessary to alter that covenant to the extent of reducing their salaries by a certain percentage at the present moment. I want definitely this fact to be understood so that all idea of antagonism to the services may be once for all removed, that we are here anxious to safeguard all those legitimate covenants which have been entered into with respect to the services and the Government servants when they entered the service.

Let me take the other question which is a far more vital question and which really was the question that was raised by my Honourable friend, the Leader of the Nationalist Party, what about recruitment to the future services? The White Paper has recognised that there are two services which are key services and which should be recruited on an all-India

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

basis, they are the Indian Civil Service and the Indian Police Service. I should like to express purely an individual opinion in this matter that I do not agree that these two services can be recruited by the different Provinces themselves. They should be recruited by a Central Authority on an all-India basis. You cannot have one grade of salary and one set of conditions of service for the Indian Civil Service officer in Madras and another for the Indian Civil Service officer in the Punjab or in Upper India. Similarly you cannot have one set of conditions of service for the Police officer recruited on an all-India basis in Madras and another set of conditions for the Police officer recruited in Bengal.

Let me make another position also perfectly clear. We have all agreed, at least most of us who were at any stage concerned with the Round Table Conference discussion, that with reference to these two services, in spite of the fact that there is already a European element sufficiently large for all practical purposes for the next generation, we have agreed, as a matter of practical policy, that a certain proportion of these services should continue to be Europeans. We have agreed that in the future recruitment also, a certain proportion of these two services shall be Europeans and the rest shall be Indians. What we have suggested is that the future Federal Government should be in a position to come to terms with the Secretary of State as to what exactly that percentage should be, that it should be an arrangement for a definite period of five years or ten years, that that arrangement should be revised from time to time taking all the factors then existing into consideration, taking also the necessity for any definite percentage of European element in these services.

Now, comes the question of conditions of service. The only point at issue really is whether the recruitment of Europeans or Indians for these two services should be made by the Government of India or by the Secretary of State. Let me again get rid of another idea; so far as the Indians are concerned, it is practically settled that that recruitment will be by the Government of India. The Superior Police Services are today being recruited by the Government of India through the Delhi Examination. So far as Indians in the Civil Service are concerned, they are practically recruited by the Government of India as a result of the Delhi Examination. I am aware that a certain number of Indians can enter through the open door of competition in England, that the Civil Service Commissioners in England can examine these people and declare them having passed and eligible to the Civil Service, but the reserve portion, that which is left, is now recruited by the Government of India on an examination conducted by the Public Service Commission in India and held in this country. Therefore, so far as the Indian element in these services are concerned, it is the Government of India that recruit them, and, on that analogy, there is not, there cannot be and there ought not to be any difficulty in recruiting the Indian portion of these two services purely by examination conducted in India. Now, comes the question of recruitment of the European element. I am not so vain as to suggest that a competitive examination should be held in this country for the recruitment of Europeans into the Indian Civil Service and the Indian Police Service. Our boys are able to go to England and compete with the English boys, all honour to their adventurous spirit, all honour to the risk that they run and to the risk which their parents run—and here I am speaking with knowledge on the subject—in sending their

boys of very young and immature age facing all the risks of a foreign atmosphere and all the risks which young men in any community do run when they are placed in such circumstances. But I recognise that it is not a practical proposition to ask young European boys to come over to this country and sit for competitive examination and take the chance of entering the Indian Civil Service.

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): Why a different rule of conduct for European boys?

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: I was making a practical suggestion. I am referring to practical politics and not to theoretical propositions. Theoretically, there is nothing to prevent these things. But as a practical proposition, I recognise, speaking for myself, that the European boys cannot be asked to come over here and sit for an examination.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Because they will not.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: My Honourable friend has given the answer, because they will not. By hypothesis, you have already agreed that a certain percentage of Europeans should be recruited into these services, and, therefore, it follows as a matter of logic that you must hold the examination where the boys will be available to sit for this examination. My Honourable friend, the Raja Bahadur, is perfectly right in thinking that they will not come to India to sit for the examination.

Then, comes the question, is it the Secretary of State that should fix the conditions of service and that should get the help of the Civil Service Examiners in England to conduct these examinations or is it the Government of India? What is the point in the Secretary of State fixing the conditions of service? Why do you not trust the Government of India to fix these conditions of service? Is it your answer that the Government of India may so fix the conditions of service that nobody will be eligible to enter the service? Surely not, because then the Government of India will be asked how they are fulfilling their promise of recruiting a certain percentage of Europeans. Surely they will be forced to revise the conditions of service to make them more attractive, so that the cardinal principle to which they are already committed, namely, recruitment of a certain percentage of Europeans into these services, can be carried out. Let me now visualise for myself how it will be worked out if the Government of India were in charge of recruitment. The Government of India lay down the conditions of service which means that they should recruit a certain number of Europeans, and, for this purpose, they will have to seek the help of the Civil Service Examiners in England. I imagine that so far as the Civil Service is concerned, the Government of India for the purpose of recruitment of Europeans—or rather the recruitment of men from Great Britain—into this service will rely exactly on the same machinery which the Secretary of State relies upon, and the Government of India will ask the Civil Service Commissioners to help them in conducting the examination and get them a certain number, through the open door of competition in London, of English boys who will come for serving in the future Indian Civil Service of this country, and the conditions of this service will be laid down by the Government of India and it is in accordance with that that the English boys will come in.

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

Now, I come to the Police Service. At present there is no competitive examination, or there was a very limited competitive examination in England at one stage, but there is no competitive examination now. I take it that the Government of India will ask the High Commissioner in England to recruit to the Police Service men who are required from England to serve in this country.

Then comes the question of control of the services. Now, let me say quite frankly, with some knowledge of the working of the dyarchic system of Government, that the whole idea of control by Ministers is very often misunderstood. If Honourable Members think that Ministers can be autocratic and can do what they like with the civil servants, promote them, depromote them, fine them and reduce them, they are entirely mistaken. Even the Honourable the Home Member, who is supposed to be the most powerful Member of the Government of India, holding a very important portfolio, even he has not got that power. None of the Members of the Executive Council are autocratic and even so none of the Ministers are autocratic. I suggest that there is a machinery by which any grievances which these services may have in the manner that individuals are treated can be looked into. There is the Public Service Commission, and wherever such a body is set up, they can look into the grievances of the services. The White Paper provides for a Public Service Commission both in the Centre and in the Provinces. The example of Madras has not yet been followed by other Provincial Governments, and Public Services Commissions have not come into existence in many Provinces. What happens in our Province is that no Minister can recruit a single person either for the ministerial appointment or for superior appointments. There is no question of patronage in any Ministry. We in Madras recognise the evils of it, we have recognised it from the very start of responsible Government in this country; we had not to go through all those dark years which the democratic Government in England had to go through before they realised the evils of patronage and the inconveniences to which Ministers were exposed on account of that patronage. We do not want that patronage, we want to keep far away from it, we want the Public Service Commission to be there to recruit to the All-India Services, both Indians and Europeans, whether it is working in India or whether it is working in London. We want the Public Service Commission to settle all disputes if they do arise. We want the appeal to go from the civil servant to the Public Service Commission if there are any grievances in the matter. Where comes in the Secretary of State? Why do you want the Secretary of State to lay down the rules and the conditions of service? Why do you want an appeal to lie to the Secretary of State? I ask my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, what these civil servants would lose if they are under the Government of India? I ask every Member of the Civil Service present here or outside the House, and I do hope that some civil servants present in this House will get up in this House and, if the Leader of the House will permit him, tell us exactly what their fears are. We are anxious to meet them more than half way, we are anxious to assure them that no position which they now occupy and no condition and no privilege that they now possess will be denied to them in future. We are anxious to tell the future servants and the future recruits that their position will be guaranteed from us and the Public Services Commission. Why do you want to interpose an authority whose methods may be open to question or

at any rate cannot have that searchlight of open criticism which the methods and the working of the Public Service Commission has, in whose decrees people will have less faith than in the decrees of the Public Service Commission? That is all that we want. We want the Government of India to lay down the conditions. We accept the percentage that is fixed as a matter of agreement between the future Government and the Secretary of State. We want the conditions of service to be laid down by the Government of India; and if those conditions are such that they do not attract the requisite number of Europeans according to that agreement, we are even willing to consider that those conditions of service can be revised by a third party so that men can come to the services in an adequate number. But, having done all that, let the power of recruitment be in the hands of the Government of India for these two services and let all their grievances and all their complaints be addressed to a quasi-judicial body like the Public Service Commission, the Central Public Service Commission and the Provincial Public Service Commission. If you read the recommendations of the White Paper, you will find that the appointment of Public Service Commissions is made by the Governor General. I think that for the Provincial Public Service Commission, the appointment is made by the Governor, but in any case it is not the Ministry that will appoint the members of the Public Service Commission. Therefore they are men in whom you have implicit confidence; the members of the Public Service Commission are chosen by your own Governors and by the Secretary of State so far as the Central Public Service Commission is concerned. Therefore, I ask, what is the apprehension? Let us not be at cross-purposes, you on the one hand trying all the time to think that we may not be fair to you, we on the other hand thinking that because you look to the Secretary of State for all your prerogatives and all your privileges, therefore there is some inherent antagonism between you and us. How can this provincial autonomy work? How can these Ministers get on with their Legislatures? For, remember, after all they are between the devil and the deep sea. It is not an easy matter for a Minister, owing his seat to a majority in the Legislature, to conduct his affairs in such a way that he can keep his seat and yet carry on those principles, if that Legislature is constantly under the impression that he has no real control over the Civil Services which are working with him. I join my friends in bearing testimony to the fact that, during the last 13 or 14 years, it has been the experience of every one of us either in the Provinces or in the Centre that, in the large majority of cases and in the overwhelming number of cases, the civil servants have so conducted themselves that there is nothing to complain of from the point of view of the Ministers. But the psychological effect is different. If the civil servant is given rules such as those in the appendix and says that he is to look elsewhere for the remedy of all his grievances, it is that that we are up against; it is that which we do not want, and not in any antagonism,—let me repeat again,—to the services, but fairness to ourselves and fairness to the services equally. If any other alternative suggestion is put forward as to how their position can be further assured, we are willing to consider it. But if it is the idea that the Secretary of State can alone intervene and protect them, that does not appeal to us and it ought not to appeal to Honourable Members opposite who are civil servants; for, I am sure, Mr. President, that there are innumerable cases where a civil servant has felt that the Secretary of State has let him down and has not considered his grievances appropriately or properly. If only the civil servants can speak,—I was about to say if they can have voices, but they have voices though they are not allowed to speak,—

[**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.**]

if only they can speak, I am sure they will state that on a number of occasions they had far more grievances against the Secretary of State than against the Minister who has recommended them, against the Local Government who has recommended them for certain preferments and against even the Government of India which have forwarded their appeals for approval. Therefore, let not either the civil servants or we on this side be under the impression that the Secretary of State like the *Deus ex machina* will do something wonderful for the services, protect them for all time and safeguard all their legitimate interests. Nothing of the sort. Let us work in harmony, for the future of the services and the future of the Government of this country depends on harmonious work.

Some of my Honourable friends spoke as if the civil servants in no country lay down the policy. Let me say this that it is all very well in theory to say that it is only the Ministers and the Cabinet that lay down the policy, but any one who knows the working of the system in Whitehall knows that the policy is really laid down by the civil servants, that the permanent Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, for instance, knows more of foreign policy than the evanescent Foreign Minister who flits in and flits out and hardly has the opportunity or the talents to know all the threads of foreign diplomacy or be in a position effectively to intervene in these matters. It is the same case with reference to other matters. The Board of Trade, for instance, the Board of Education and even the India Office,—we know, we have had opportunities of looking behind the screen, and we know that the civil servant plays a very important part indeed, not merely in the humdrum mechanical day to day routine administration, but in laying down policies, in developing policies and in showing his master what policies may be accepted. And I am sure that that will be the position in this country also. Every Minister will rely on his public Secretariat to help him in these matters; it is they that will have the opportunity of correlating all that knowledge which they have had through their years of service in the mufassil and in the Secretariat; and it is their policy that will ultimately be accepted. It is true that a Minister will have a choice of policies, he may accept or he may not accept it; that is a different matter. But to say that civil servants will have nothing to do with the laying down of policies is to express a very inadequate appreciation of the whole system of Civil Service which is associated with the British Government and British methods of administration.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member should conclude now.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: I, therefore, desire to state that it is from the point of view of trying to be as helpful as possible to the permanent services of this country that I support this motion; and I will only conclude by saying that it is essential that the recruiting authority, the authority that lays down the conditions of service, should be the Government of India for these two services, and that all adequate protection can be afforded to these future recruits through a Public Service Commission which will be fully authorised to examine their grievances and redress them. (Applause.)

The Honourable Sir Harry Haig (Home Member): Sir, I need hardly remind the House that the proposals of His Majesty's Government in regard to the new Constitution which have been embodied in the White

Paper are now before the Joint Select Committee of Parliament and the matter which is raised by my Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour's motion may to that extent be said to have passed out of the hands of the Government of India. I hope, therefore, that the House will not expect me to express definite opinions on policy and I trust that they will not press to a division any desire to censure the Government of India in connection with anything that I may say.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): Are they not responsible for the White Paper?

The Honourable Sir Harry Haig: I propose, Sir, if it will meet with the wishes of the House, that this debate should be forwarded for the information of the Secretary of State. It is perfectly true that the Secretary of State is aware of many of the points that have been raised this morning, because my Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, was himself present at the meetings of the Joint Select Committee at an earlier stage and was able to put his points very fully himself to the Secretary of State. I am glad that we have had this debate, for it has enabled the House, and, particularly, if I may say so, my Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar, to show that their attitude towards the services is a friendly and a fair attitude, and is not in any way inspired by feelings of hostility, and I think it is very important that that should go out to this country and to the people in England. I should like to make a few comments myself with reference to the various points that have been raised this morning.

In the first place, with regard to the function of the services, I would say that the function of the services strictly speaking is to carry out the policies laid down by the Government. To some extent that function is obscured under the present conditions, because certain individual members of these services happen to be in a position of some authority in regard to the formulation of policy. As the House is aware, it is one of the cardinal features in the proposals contained in the White Paper that those members of the services should no longer remain in those positions (Laughter), and if it should unfortunately happen that my Honourable friend to my right (Sir Frank Noyes) and I myself should disappear from our existing positions, possibly that might help to clarify the real functions of the service to which we belong. At the same time, there is a great deal of truth in what my Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar, said that though the services do not have the actual control of policy, they naturally, if they are efficient and know their work, have considerable influence in the shaping of policy; and in that connection I would ask the House to remember how immensely important it is to the effective running of the machinery of the country that you should have contented and efficient services. There is perhaps in some quarters an idea that the machine runs itself. It works very smoothly as a rule, and there is an idea that a machine that runs smoothly runs automatically. For instance in the case of, we will say, a motor car, a person like myself who knows very little about machinery gets into a car and knows that if he moves certain levers certain results follow, and is apt to assume that all that is required is that he should move the levers and that nothing then can go wrong. There is a certain danger that Honourable Members, who have not been intimately connected with the administration, should think that in the

[Sir Harry Haig.]

future all that the Ministers have to do will be to get into the car, to move certain levers and the machine will run on automatically by itself. But it is necessary to remember that, for the efficient working of a service, careful organisation, thought and hard and honest work are required, and that unless you have all the parts of the machine working effectively and wholeheartedly, when the Minister presses a lever, the machine will not work. Whatever form of Government there may be, we require really efficient services and I think we require them particularly at a time when the form of Government is being changed. For that reason I do feel it is most necessary to maintain relations of friendliness and good feeling between the services and the political classes into whose hands more and more the actual power will pass.

With regard to the particular criticisms that have been made on the proposals contained in the White Paper, I find a certain difference of opinion—I do not know whether I should say a confusion of thought—in relation to the various demands that have been put forward. Admittedly the normal constitutional position is that a Government should have full control over the services working under it. The question is whether in the position that is going to face the country when His Majesty's Government's proposals are completed, the time has come for making any large and fundamental and irrevocable change in the system of recruitment and control of a few of the most vital services in the country. My Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar, pressed the view that, while recruitment of Europeans for the Indian Civil Service and the Indian Police should continue and in fact all India recruitment should continue for those services, the recruitment should be carried out by the Government of India. On that point I do not think he appears to be in agreement with my Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, who, if he subscribes to the memorandum put forward by the British Indian delegation to the Joint Parliamentary Committee, appears to wish that recruitment on an all India basis should cease, that recruitment should be transferred to the Provinces and that the Provinces should be left entirely free to decide on the conditions that they would offer to their recruits and to decide whether or not they should recruit Europeans in future. That illustrates one of the difficulties and obscurities in the present situation. We have, for instance, the report of the Services Sub-Committee. That Sub-Committee recommended by a majority that the recruitment of Europeans should continue; they recommended by a majority that the recruiting authority should be the Government of India. In fact, the proposals put forward today by my Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar, are practically the proposals of the majority of the Services Sub-Committee; but I do not find that those are the proposals put forward in the Joint Memorandum for the Joint Parliamentary Committee, and I must say, if I were to express a personal view, that I do feel it a little difficult to contemplate under the Constitution pictured in the White Paper the Government of India or the Federal Government controlling the recruitment for what are in effect services working in the Provinces, because the relations of the Federal Government, as pictured in the White Paper, with the Provinces are very different to the relations of the present Government of India with the present Provincial Governments. We have now in the Government of India certain powers of superintendence and control over the

Provincial Governments. I do not find those powers expressed in the Constitution as stated in the White Paper. Therefore, Sir, it would appear to me that if any outside authority is required to control or to protect these services in the Provinces, it is constitutionally very difficult to put that power into the Federal Government, and that the natural course would be to give those powers to the Secretary of State. I should like the House to reflect on that point,—either no control, no protection at all, or if there is to be control and protection, then I would suggest that constitutionally the protection and control would naturally be exercised by the Secretary of State as representing the authority of Parliament.

While my friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, was speaking, I was not quite sure whether he had altogether reconciled himself to the
1 P.M. position that the existing members of the services should continue to possess their existing rights . . .

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Certainly.

The Honourable Sir Harry Haig: But some of his arguments suggested to my mind that he was overlooking the fact that there are a considerable number of members of the I. C. S. and the Indian Police in our services today and that they will, on his own proposals, continue to receive the protection of the Secretary of State. Now, Sir, if the picture which he drew or suggested of Ministers unable to carry through or formulate effectively their policy, because the servants who were to carry out the policy were not under their control, that, I am afraid, would be inherent in any proposals which did not contemplate the complete abolition of the existing members of the services and their dismissal from India tomorrow. I think, Sir, I noticed in several speeches a suspicion that Ministers will not be able to carry out their policy, because the members of the services have, in exceptional circumstances, an appeal to some outside authority. Well, Sir, I think the answer to that is contained in the passage which my friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, himself read out to the House at the beginning of the debate, a passage from the Report of the Lee Commission which went round the whole of India making very careful inquiries into the organization of the services and the relations between the services and the existing Governments. What they said was "Ministers themselves have told us that the all-India officers serving under them have, with negligible exceptions, given most loyal support in carrying out their policies". Well, Sir, if that was the experience of Ministers in 1924, I do not see why the Ministers of the future should expect any different result. I would, therefore, ask the House to dismiss from their minds any idea that, because the services are to have certain rights, which they at present have, personal rights, rights of appeal where they may think that they have been unreasonably treated, that because those rights are to continue, therefore the Ministers will not be able to carry out their own policy and will not receive from the services perfectly loyal support.

There is one other point which has been touched upon in the course of the debate, and that is the suggestion contained in the White Paper that while recruitment on an all-India basis should continue for five years after the introduction of the new Constitution, there should at the end of that period be an inquiry as to the future of recruitment. That, Sir,

[Sir Harry Haig.]

if I may express a personal opinion, seems to me to be a reasonable proposition. The fact is, there have been even this morning very varying opinions expressed as to whether, for instance, we want to continue European recruitment. I can see many Members in this House who would say "with the introduction of the reforms, cease to recruit Europeans", others would say "continue to recruit them". Questions like that and questions of control are very difficult to decide until we have the facts before us. Now, Sir, at present we have not before us all these facts. Until we have seen the actual operation of the new Constitution, whatever it may be, we are not really in a position to say which is the right solution for the future development and recruitment of the services, and it seems to me a wise provision that we should observe the facts and have the facts before us before a final and irrevocable decision is taken as to the future of the services which are after all the key services for the whole machinery of Government in India, whoever may be directing that Government.

Now, Sir, I hope I have made my own personal views on this matter plain to the House, and as I have said at the beginning, the Government will be very glad to forward a copy of this debate to the Secretary of State, but I would suggest to the House that they should not press this motion against us and censure us in a matter which is at the present moment under the consideration of the Joint Select Committee of Parliament.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Sir, my Honourable friend, the Home Member, has evaded the main issue. The question with which we are concerned is the attitude of the Government of India on this vital question, and when we tabled this cut motion, it was with a view to ascertaining the view of the Government of India on the future of the All-India Services. The Honourable the Home Member has given expression to what he called his personal views. It may be that those views are the echo of the views of the Government of India, but he did not commit the Government of India to his views. In that position we have no option but to censure the Government of India for not coming into line with the popular opinion in this country to the effect that the public opinion of all communities and classes

Sir Muhammad Yakub: Not all.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Hindus and Muslims in any case

Sir Muhammad Yakub: No, not all.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: unite in demanding that we should immediately go into the question of the future of the All-India Services. Sir, we are not at the present moment concerned with the next question that would arise as to whether the future services in India should be recruited by the Government of India or by the Provinces.

My Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar, inclines to the view that the future services in India should be recruited by the

Government of India, and the Joint Memorandum inclines to the view that the future services should be recruited by the Provinces. I may point out that that view of the Joint Memorandum was very largely influenced by the Despatch of the Government of India themselves. In their Despatch on the Simon Commission report, at page 184, paragraph 204, the Government of India said :

“We do not consider that any intermediate position between recruitment by the Secretary of State and provincialisation is likely to prove satisfactory.”

That was the view of the Government of India.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): They have agreed with the Honourable Member's view, then why does he want to censure them? (Laughter.)

Sir Hari Singh Gour: They do not agree with me at all. That was the view of the Government of India in 1929.

The Honourable Sir Harry Haig: I should explain that the Government of India have not changed their view on that point.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: The Government of India have not changed their view on that point and that is our grievance. Only two alternatives were before the Government of India—recruitment and control by the Secretary of State, or by the Provinces,—and they were in favour of recruitment and control by the Secretary of State, and it is upon that point that we are at issue with the Government of India. Sir, the Honourable the Home Member has alluded to two facts upon which I should like to make my own position perfectly clear. The first point that he raised was whether this side of the House had any intention of qualifying the rights which the existing members of All-India Services enjoy. I submit that we have made it abundantly clear on numerous occasions speaking from this side of the House that there is not one elected Member in the Legislative Assembly who would deny the existing members of All-India Services their existing and accruing rights to which they have become entitled, but the only question is, what are their existing and accruing rights.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member must now conclude.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: And on that point we are at issue with the White Paper. The second point which Sir Henry Gidney and others seem to have raised was, do we want an element of Europeans in the All-India Services? On that point I have said that the Provinces must be left free to decide for themselves as to the composition of their services, and we do not wish to burden the Provinces by any statement of our own whether they should or should not have Europeans in their services. Sir, in view of the fact that we have had no satisfactory reply from the Government of India, and they have not, as a matter of fact, either acceded to or

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

even acquiesced in the views we have expressed, I have no option but to divide the House on my motion.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Does the Honourable Member mean to say that the Government of India can express a view here against the Secretary of State whatever they may feel or think?

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Then we censure them.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The question is:

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

It is perhaps the duty of the Chair to explain to the House the significance of this vote. The object of Sir Hari Singh Gour is to censure the Government for not supporting the point of view urged by himself and his friends on the question of the reorganisation of the public services under the proposed Federal Constitution. If this motion is carried, it would mean that by a majority the House not merely censures the Government but supports the point of view of Sir Hari Singh Gour and his friends. If the motion is negatived, it means that the House does not support the contention of Sir Hari Singh Gour and his friends, and that is a point which Honourable Members must keep in view, and keeping that point in view the House will now decide whether it will go to a division or not. The question is:

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

The Assembly divided:

AYES—37.

Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.	Murtuza Saheb Bahadur, Maulvi
Abdur Rahim, Sir.	Sayyid.
Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.	Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Bhuput Sing, Mr.	Pandya, Mr. Vidya Sagar.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.	Parma Nand, Bhai.
Gour, Sir Hari Singh.	Patil Rao Bahadur B. L.
Harbans Singh Brar, Sirdar.	Puri, Mr. Goswami M. R.
Hari Raj Swarup, Lala.	Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Isra, Chaudhri.	Reddi, Mr. P. G.
Jadhav, Mr. B. V.	Reddi, Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna.
Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.	Roy, Rai Bahadur Sukhraj.
Jog, Mr. S. G.	Sant Singh, Sardar.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.	Sarda, Diwan Bahadur Harbilas.
Krishnamachariar, Raja Bahadur G.	Sen, Pandit Satyendra Nath.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.	Shafee Daoodi, Maulvi Muhammad.
Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.	Singh, Mr. Gava Prasad.
Mitra, Mr. S. C.	Sitaramaraju, Mr. B.
Mody, Mr. H. P.	Thampan, Mr. K. P.
Mudaliar, Diwan Bahadur A.	Uppi Saheb Bahadur, Mr.
Ramaswami.	

NOES—57.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
 Aliah Baksh Khan Tiwana, Khan Bahadur Malik.
 Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
 Bhoze The Honourable Sir Joseph.
 Chatarji, Mr. J. M.
 Clayton, Mr. H. B.
 Cox, Mr. A. R.
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.
 Darwin, Mr. J. H.
 Dillon, Mr. W.
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.
 Graham, Sir Lancelot.
 Grantham, Mr. S. G.
 Haig, The Honourable Sir Harry.
 Hardy, Mr. G. S.
 Hezlett, Mr. J.
 Hockenhill, Mr. F. W.
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.
 Irwin, Mr. C. J.
 Ishwarsingji, Nawab Nabarsingji.
 Ismail Ali Khan, Kunwar Hajee.
 Ismail Khan, Haji Chaudbury Muhammad.
 James, Mr. F. E.
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
 Mackenzie, Mr. R. T. H.
 Metcalfe, Mr. H. A. F.
 Mitter, The Honourable Sir Brojendra.

Morgan, Mr. G.
 Mujumdar, Sardar G. N.
 Mukharji, Mr. D. N.
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur S. C.
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
 O'Sullivan, Mr. D. N.
 Pandit, Rao Bahadur S. R.
 Rafuddin Ahmad, Khan Bahadur Maulvi.
 Rajah, Raja Sir Vasudeva.
 Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
 Ramakrishna, Mr. V.
 Rau, Mr. P. E.
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
 Ryan, Sir Thomas.
 Sarma, Mr. R. S.
 Schuster, The Honourable Sir George.
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
 Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar, Captain.

Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.
 Sloan, Mr. T.
 Sohan Singh, Sirdar.
 Studd, Mr. E.
 Suhrawardy, Sir Abdulla-al-Mámün.
 Talib Mehdi Khan, Nawab Major Malik.
 Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.
 Wilayatullah, Khan Bahadur H. M.
 Yakub, Sir Muhammad.
 Yamin Khan, Mr. Muhammad.

The motion was negatived.

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

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

Necessity of Expediting the Constitutional Reforms.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar: Sir, I beg to move:

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

My object in moving this motion is to discuss the necessity of expediting the Constitutional Reforms. At the outset, I desire to lay before you the scope of my cut motion, because I do not want that we should enter into a rambling and roving discussion of irrelevant matters; at least so far as my purpose is concerned, it is this. I do not intend to propose to go into the merits of the various proposals as desired to be modified, or as repudiated, or as accepted by the various parties and individuals in the country. I want that the Reforms whatever they may be, in view and in the light of what I am going to submit hereafter, should be brought into existence as early as possible and that we in India should not be left in any doubt as to the position of His Majesty's Government in connection with this. That is the scope of my motion, but in restraining myself and in discussing the Reforms it is not that I have no complaints against individual proposals in the White Paper, but what I submit very respectfully is this that, so far as the proposals are concerned, we have been at it for nearly

[Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar.]

five years. Three Round Table Conferences have sat as a preliminary to the formulation of the proposals in the White Paper and our representatives, who went from here, discussed the whole thing from all points of view so that, before the proposals in the White Paper were formulated, neither the Secretary of State nor His Majesty's Government can say that they had not got any particular or clear idea of what we wanted. Now, after the proposals in the White Paper were formulated, we in this Assembly have had an opportunity to discuss the whole thing, and although the time at our disposal was not very large and although we should have discussed it at greater length and with more definiteness, yet, in so far as this House is concerned, we have had the opportunity of formulating our opinions and of telling the British Government exactly what we consider to be necessary if these White Paper proposals are to be accepted. Then, the Joint Parliamentary Committee was constituted, and, again, our representatives have been called, some of them to sit along with the Joint Parliamentary Committee and others to be examined as witnesses. Sir, between these persons, *viz.*, the witnesses that were examined and our own representatives who sat on that Joint Parliamentary Committee, I think every phase of every objection that could possibly or impossibly be suggested has been discussed and discussed threadbare. If one looks at the voluminous evidence recorded of the cross-examination of the Secretary of State, especially the cross-examination by my Honourable and esteemed friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour—whose indefatigable and indomitable energy led him to probe into all the dark recesses of the proposals contained in the White Paper (Loud Applause),—I think it is impossible for any man claiming even a small measure of intelligence to say that he has not understood what our standpoint is in regard to the White Paper. Again, there is the memorandum submitted by the Right Honourable Dr. Sapru who had taken a leading part in these proposals and discussions prior to the White Paper,—to whose labours the Chairman, Lord Sankey, gave a just tribute the other day; and, lastly, there is the joint memorandum of the British Indian Delegation.

Now, if these papers have not given any idea of what exactly the Indian people want with regard to the proposals for general Constitutional Reforms, then I am afraid that any amount of discussion here within the time-limit you have prescribed is not going to clarify the issue any further. That is my reason why I did not enter into the details of the merits of the question, and not because I had not anything to say about it. Now, having said that, one or two matters that have got to be remembered is that, in so far as the proposals are concerned, excepting for these modifications that they wanted, so far no party which has been called into consultation has decidedly stated that they were not going to work these Reforms at all. They simply stated some conditions and directions in which improvement was sought. Sir, apart from what we demanded in asking that the Reforms should be expedited, I want His Majesty's Government to remember two very important pronouncements made. The first is His Majesty's Message at the time when this Assembly was first constituted, in which His Majesty said:

"For years, it may be for generations, patriotic and loyal Indians have dreamt of Swaraj for their Motherland. Today you have the beginnings of Swaraj within my Empire and widest scope and ample opportunity for progress to the liberty which my other Dominions enjoy."

That, Sir, is the condition upon which we began to work this Assembly and that is the condition upon which further proposals have been enunciated. Then, in winding up the proceedings of the Round Table Conference, the Prime Minister at that time—it was the Labour Government then—stated :

“The view of His Majesty’s Government is that the responsibility for the Government of India should be laid upon Legislatures, Central and Provincial, with such provisions as may be necessary to guarantee, during a period of transition, the observance of certain obligations and to meet other special circumstances and also with such guarantees as are required by the minorities to protect their political liberties and rights.”

Then, he proceeded to say :

“As regards finance, the transfer of financial responsibility must necessarily be subject to such conditions as will ensure the fulfilment of the obligations incurred under the authority of the Secretary of State for India and the maintenance unimpaired of the financial stability and credit of India.”

Then he hoped that all these things would come to pass, and, again, at the end of the Second Round Table Conference, I think the same statement was made, and the later pronouncements of the British Government also were in effect exactly the same as what the Prime Minister made on the first occasion. What I submit is this that, in asking you to expedite the Reforms, I want you to remember every bit of representation that has been made by our representative and you should also remember what you yourself have told us. Take all these things into consideration, come to a reasonable conclusion and expedite the Reforms so as not to keep us in any uncertain mood, that is my request. You said that you wanted safeguards. All right, keep the safeguards for the transitional period and work upon the conditions that you wish to impose with two objectives. Firstly, that those conditions do not militate against the development of India’s position on the road to Dominion Status. I suppose that is what is really meant, but I am afraid to say that because there might be a censure motion against this House in the House of Commons. The next condition is that these safeguards should be in the interests of India. These two conditions we have accepted and we are quite prepared to meet you. The White Paper proposal also stated that as a preliminary to the insuring of responsibility at the Centre you should pass the Reserve Bank Bill and we have done it. Of course, we did put up a fight, but the result is that the Reserve Bank Bill has been passed in accordance mainly with the proposals and suggestions made by you, so that on our side we have performed all the obligations that were laid upon us in order to insure the coming of the Reforms into existence as early as possible.

Sir, the Round Table Conference suggested the formation of certain Committees for investigating certain points. Those Committees have sat; they have investigated the respective points; they have submitted their elaborate reports and they have been before His Majesty’s Government now for some time. Under these circumstances, I respectfully ask that having all the materials before you and these reforms being framed in the nature and with respect to the submissions you have approved of, an early decision should be arrived at. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru in the memorandum that he submitted to the Joint Parliamentary Committee began by saying :

“It will thus appear that the process of examination has already covered a considerable time both in India and in England and early decisions are anxiously awaited in India.”

[Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar.]

Sir, I have read out his statement, because I entirely agree with it and I was afraid that I would not be able to put it myself in the nice language that he has done. Further on he says:

"I would further urge that the time factor should not be lost sight of. During the last six years or more, as already stated, Commissions, Committees and Conferences have followed one after another and, while I recognise the value of caution and prudence in building up a constitution for a vast country like India, I would also emphasise the dangers of delay. In short, I suggest that the constitution should come into operation as far as the provinces are concerned towards the end of 1934 and every attempt should be made to make the constitution at the Centre function one year later."

Further on, he says:

"Any further prolongation of the stages or periods of probation can only result in diverting the attention and energy of the people of India from fruitful and constructive channels to agitation, struggle, dissipation of energy and increasing estrangement between the Government and the people."

Sir, for some time past we have been under the heels of the Civil Disobedience Movement and those of us who have lived in the villages know exactly the trouble that we have been undergoing. Fortunately that movement has now subsided, but there is another and a more dangerous and a more insidious movement that has come into existence. Sir, some people openly declare communism and others, under the cloak of all sorts of sentiments and feelings, religious and otherwise, also preach communism. They preach things which lead you to communism and to nowhere. Are you going to allow this sort of unrest to go on calmly looking upon it? Do you want us to wait until it is too late and then abuse everybody all round, because they did not co-operate with you and they did not agree with you as to repressive legislation.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member must address the Chair and not have the whole speech in the second person. It is permissible to address the Government once or twice, but the whole speech should not be delivered in that strain.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar: I will now address you, Sir. Once I was told by your predecessor, when I addressed him, that he was not concerned at all, and he asked me not to trouble him about it. As I am not acquainted with the Parliamentary procedure, I hope you will kindly excuse me. But, I promise that I will hereafter address you and I will bring all the abuses on you and will leave the Government alone. (Laughter.) What I submit is this that this is what is happening in the country and it is impossible for my Honourable friend, the Home Member, whose source of information extends to the whole length and breadth of the country, to say that he is not acquainted with this insidious movement that has been started. I am afraid it will immediately catch the imagination of the people who are hungry and who do not know what it is to have two meals a day and whose number is 40 millions. Therefore, for God's sake do something and do expedite the Reforms. I do not know what His Majesty's Government think about the advice tendered by the Government of India, but I know this that whenever an inconvenient question is raised in the House of Commons about the action of the Government

of India, the Secretary of State always says: We must rely upon the man on the spot. But, I have a suspicion that when suggestions go from here, they sometimes do not suit the taste of the Secretary of State or some of his advisers. In the course of the discussion in the Select Committee on the Reserve Bank Bill, certain proposals were made and they were cabled to the Secretary of State. And what was cabled in reply? Not the substance to be put in Sir George Schuster's own felicitous language but he would insist upon his own language being reproduced here. That is the way they rely upon the man on the spot. I do not know what their attitude is, but what I would submit is that if you mean to rely upon the man on the spot, then rely upon him. I do hope that they will make a real attempt, a genuine attempt, to solve this question immediately rather than go on considering it for an indefinite length of time.

Sir, the next witness that I call in support of my suggestion is the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhai, the President of the Council of State. Speaking yesterday at the Dinner given to His Excellency the Viceroy, he said:

"I have referred to this matter only because I firmly believe that any undue or prolonged delay in inaugurating the new Constitution may lead to general disappointment and will spread dissatisfaction and discontent."

That, Sir, is from the mouth of a gentleman whose great pride is that he has got in an extraordinary measure the virtue of silent and moderating criticism. I think I need not call a stronger witness and although I am guilty of impatient loquacity, my only regret is that that term is applied to the entire Assembly, because it is rather hard on our friends on the Treasury Benches that having observed strict silence and not opening their mouths and say what they have got to say, they still are accused, because the Assembly as a whole is accused that they are guilty of impatient loquacity. Whether it is due to me or to other persons, I shall not be guilty of any further loquacity, though I am certainly impatient.

Having now called witnesses in the affirmative that these Reforms must be expedited, and having told you, Sir, what in my humble opinion would be the consequence in the country of not expediting the Reforms, I have also got one or two matters to bring to your notice and that is that if you do not expedite these Reforms, we will have an invasion of these ubiquitous Tory Members of Parliament or otherwise from England. You remember, Sir, the other day that you convened a meeting at which all of us had the honour of being invited, and a gentleman, by the name of Captain Cazalet, Conservative M.P., for Chippenham—he came and he saw and what did he do? Whether he conquered us or was conquered by us, this is what he says and with the last portion I entirely agree. He says "if you do not bring into existence these Reforms, our trade will be lost and our Empire will be lost". I am glad he said that. But at the same time he records a statement that the country as a whole is prepared to work the White Paper scheme. That is rather unjust and unkind of him. Some of us who were present at the meeting do not remember to have said that we are going to support the White Paper scheme. I do not think anyone of us said that. However, I am quite prepared to excuse this gentleman for saying that, because he also warned the people of England and his own party people that if these Reforms do not come, the Indian Empire will be lost. I know that it will create a trouble in the minds of Mr. Winston

[Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar.]

Churchill, because, he wants to keep India for the benefit of England. He does not want to lose India. This is not the end of the agony, that is only the beginning, because yesterday's newspapers say that there is going to be a Tory Commission to enquire into, what? It says:

"The next group of visitors to India will reach Bombay on the 8th instant. It will consist of three Members of Parliament led by Lord Lynton, a Tory politician 36 years old and strong Imperialist."

So it will be observed that youth is not at a discount. Much water has flowed under the bridge until the younger Pitt repudiated the atrocious crime of being a young man:

"The Secretary of the delegation will be Mr. D. Madhava Rao, Indian correspondent of the *Morning Post*,"

—What a fine newspaper and what a fine set of gentlemen coming out to find out what the position in India is. On the top of that, a gentleman, who is the correspondent of the *Morning Post*, accompanies them. I do not know what the individual views of this correspondent are, but I know a little bit of the views of the *Morning Post*, and it is rather ominous that these three gentlemen should combine to enquire into the question of granting of Reforms for India.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: But Mr. Madhava Rao, the Indian correspondent of the *Morning Post* belongs to your Province.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar: That does not matter. According to the Hindu religion, we also worship the God of Death, and that does not mean that you are all anxious to go and hug and embrace him. That is nothing. The newspaper report further goes on—

"a paper which has consistently attacked the policy of self-government for India from the days of Mr. Montagu. The members will tour India and secure evidence on one important issue amongst others: Is there any whole-hearted support for the Hoare scheme among Indian politicians? Sir Samuel Hoare claims that there is satisfaction in India over the White Paper scheme. The Lynton group want to test the truth of that claim."

This is the next stage of the agony that we would be put to when these Tory M.P.'s led by this young Indian tours the country. I do not know what they are going to say eventually. But, I know this that coming from the source from which they come, I am perfectly sure that they will tell the people of England that India does not support the White Paper scheme and so why should England waste a lot of money in inaugurating the Reforms. They would fall in line with Mr. Churchill. In making these observations, I entirely realise the difficulties in which the Secretary of State is placed. On the one hand, there is Mr. Churchill and his party who has tabled a motion against him that they will have nothing of these Reforms at all, on the other hand, the people in India say, we do not want your proposals, we want more, and, in this predicament I greatly sympathise with the Secretary of State in his position.

Those of us who have read Mr. Montagu's Indian diary know that outside all these things there are a good many other things that the Secretary of State has got to fear and they, Sir, are the friends of newspapers. If you read Mr. Montagu's diary regarding the last stage of his stay in India, he particularly asks his Secretary not to antagonise a certain

gentleman, because he was a great friend of the Editor of the *London Times* and he might create trouble when he goes back. Those who have read Mr. Montagu's diary will find this in the record of his doings during his stay in Delhi. So, if you are going to govern a huge Empire, all this is part of the day's work. Remember what the Sovereign has pledged to us, remember what the Prime Minister as the head of two Governments, the Labour Government and the Nationalist Government has told us, remember what all other people have said, and do not try to whittle down the pledges that you have given because a censure motion has been tabled against an unfortunate Governor who came to India only the other day. He seems to have won golden opinions in his Presidency and he sent a message of an innocuous nature to the Sind Boy-Scouts and outcomes a censure motion in the House of Commons at the suggestion of our old friend, Mr. Churchill. That sort of mentality will not do. The English people should clearly understand that if they are going to take the suggestions of all these Tory M. P.'s who are touring the country, we are not going to stand any such thing. They must rely on the people on the spot. Otherwise what is the use of their sending these people here? I would respectfully invite the British nation, whose heart is quite sound, not to be led away by these people either for self interest or for personal pique or whatever it may be, not to be led away by the opinions of these people, but to be guided by their own representatives upon whom they rely and whom they have sent here to govern India and also give weight to the representations of the people of India. You have called certain of our people as representatives at the Conferences and they told you exactly what we want. All the time all the representatives were saying that India does not want to go out of the Empire, we want to be within the Commonwealth and work for the good of India. Not co-operation at your dictation, but co-operation as two equal men would desire one from the other. That, Sir, is the position which I respectfully submit for the consideration of Government, and I ask that they should support me in this matter. Because, do they not know the position in the country? It is upon that ground that I put it, and there should not be much difficulty in their seeing eye to eye with me in this matter.

Lastly, I will say one thing. I do not mind whether you dissolve this Assembly or you continue it. But I want to be told exactly
 3 P.M. what the position is going to be. If you are going to dissolve the Assembly, tell us that you are going to do it; and if you are not going to dissolve the Assembly, tell us that you are not going to do it; because, fighting an election, specially under existing conditions, in the Provinces is a somewhat difficult and expensive affair, and we ought to wake betimes to see what we are going to do, assuming that we want to come back again to this Assembly. Consequently, I respectfully submit that Government should make a pronouncement upon that. I know they will say that it is within the province of the Governor General, but I do not believe in that fiction, and I will tell you why. Of course I do not dispute that it does lie within the Governor General's discretion and he does exercise that discretion. But there is such a thing as a Constitution and there is such a thing as constitutional procedure. For instance, when people were invited to the Round Table Conference, there was a complaint made that some other persons were not invited. Government said that it was the Secretary of State that had invited them. Do they ask us to believe that the Secretary of State over there knew exactly who we are and whom we represent and whom not to invite, and all that? No, Sir, that sort of thing will never do. (Laughter.) It is rather slim and it does not go

[Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar.]

down our throat. Consequently, do not take us to be babies. We can understand the thing, only we do not say so, because, according to an ancient Sanskrit *sloka*, where we want to be friends, we must never enter into a discussion. You take what he says or he takes what you say.

Lastly, Sir, I will conclude with the recital of one small story in connection with the repudiation of pledges. A shepherd, with a huge flock, was caught in the middle of a storm and prayed to God, "Oh, God, if you save my flock, I will tomorrow give you one goat in sacrifice". His wife was behind him and said, "How can you afford to lose one goat?" Well, Sir, having attended dramatic performances, you know such a thing as saying aside. This shepherd made a sound of saying aside, "Let the flock be saved, and I am not going to give one hair to God Almighty". (Laughter.) Do not take that line, and that, Sir, is my respectful submission.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Cut motion moved:

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

Bhal Parma Nand (Ambala Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to oppose the motion moved by the Honourable the Leader of the Centre Party. The Raja Bahadur, in the beginning has told us that he wants to expedite the Reforms although he says that he does not care to enter into the merits or the demerits of these Reforms. I wish to say that before we want to have the Reforms hurried up, we ought to have some idea of the stuff of which these Reforms are made. What do we mean when we talk of these Reforms to be hurried up? We simply mean the White Paper scheme. Now, there are two different points of view in judging the White Paper scheme. The one point of view is, how much power is being granted to India by that scheme, and the second point of view is, whether that scheme increases our worth and fitness for the use of those powers or not. We may not care to know, according to the Raja Bahadur, the merits or the demerits of the scheme, but we should have one thing clear in our minds; and that is, whether that scheme is going to lead us on the road of development towards a common nationality and self-government. Taking these two different aspects into account, I do not want to speak about the powers, though I share the general complaint that they are much below the expectation, but so far as our fitness for the use of these powers goes, I have got definite views on that point. I think the scheme of the White Paper, instead of leading us towards the further development of nationality or self-government in this country, is taking us much backwards. In order to explain what I mean, I will read one sentence from an article that appeared in the *Hindustan Times*, on January 22 last. This article is from the pen of an Englishman whom I do not happen to know. He says in the very beginning:

"Britain is committed, or so we are told, to the policy of progressive realisation of responsible self-government in India."

And then he adds:

"The White Paper's idea of responsible government is a mixture of mediæval institutions that will make India a vast continent of warring creeds in every Province."

The rest of the article is simply an explanation of this first sentence. I want to say that I quite agree with this view that is so clearly expressed by an Englishman who is unknown to me.

We have to note that there was a time when India was free and independent. Then we lost our independence. And now we are trying to reach the goal of self-government. While making that attempt, we ought to see what were the defects which originally brought us to this state of subjection. I believe it were the differences and divisions among various communities, and religions and differences of Provinces that proved the great stumbling block in the way of the growth of a common nationality in this country. That was the main cause of India losing her independence. Now, again, while on the one hand we are being granted certain political privileges in the name of advance, practically, as far as the real situation is concerned, we are being brought back to the old condition of division of races, communities, religions and even of Provinces in this country.

I think the idea, that was mooted here that we should settle among ourselves with regard to our claims in the future Constitution, was not fair and was not the right process. If a new Constitution was to be framed for this country, the only practical way was to do it on just and proper lines and it could be done by those in whose power it was to frame the Constitution. But to start by asking the different communities to come to agreement on a question of their claims, was, I think, merely a trick to divide the communities and to lay emphasis on the differences amongst them. However, we see when once this move was made, the Indian National Congress took up the challenge. They appointed a Committee which brought out the Nehru report, I want to lay before you the principle which that Committee adopted with a view to settling this question among the different communities. That Committee laid down definitely that, in the future Constitution, there should be no separate electorates, there should be no reservation of seats for the majorities, and that for Muslim minorities seats should be reserved wherever separate seats were demanded. Next we come to the Central Indian Committee. That Committee was composed of certain Honourable Members of this House and certain other gentlemen, and in their report they also laid down the principle that while the Muslim community was desirous of separate electorates, "the majority of the members of the Committee believe that wider considerations must override the wishes of particular communities and that communal electorates should be abolished throughout the country". At the first Round Table Conference, we find the Premier making a very fine speech against communal electorates and at the end of which he said:

"I am convinced, my friends, that you can settle this problem. . . . I am also convinced that an imposed agreement might make your Constitution unworkable."

I want to draw the attention of Honourable Members to this sentence "an imposed agreement might make your Constitution unworkable". That was said by the Prime Minister of England in the speech delivered at the First Round Table Conference. My point is very simple. I have been throughout the country and I have met thousands of people in various places in each Province—I mean the Hindus—and I can say with authority on this point that I have not found one single Hindu in any place who would consider that this Communal Award given by His Majesty's Government was satisfactory or acceptable to the Hindus. If the idea is that without agreement no Constitution could be formed or worked, I do not understand how a Constitution like the White Paper scheme, based on an arbitrary award, can be drafted while there exists no agreement and while one large community in India has no mind to submit to this scheme.

Now I come to the Simon Commission's Report. I want just to quote one remark. They say:

"It is evident therefore, that communal representation is a very thorny question. . . ."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Chair does not want to interrupt the Honourable Member's speech. The Honourable Member, Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar, made it perfectly plain that what he intended to raise by this motion was the question whether the White Paper Scheme was to be expedited. The Chair allowed the Honourable Member to proceed so far, because his object was to show that the White Paper Scheme was not satisfactory to him in certain respects, and, therefore, that scheme should not be expedited. But beyond simply indicating that, the Chair cannot allow him to go into the details of the scheme of the White Paper, including the Communal Award. That he cannot do; it is clearly outside the scope of this motion.

Bhai Parma Nand: I submit, Sir, that I am not going into the details of the Communal Award at all. I am just giving the principle on which this Award is based: the Communal Award forms the basis of the White Paper scheme, and you cannot take away the Communal Award from that scheme and still talk of Reforms in any sense.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member will be entitled simply to say that the Communal Award is unsatisfactory to him and so vitiates the scheme, that in his opinion this scheme ought not to be adopted. Beyond simply making that statement, he cannot examine the Communal Award and enter into an elaborate analysis of that.

Bhai Parma Nand: I beg to submit again that I am not entering into the details of the Communal Award. On that, I have already spoken in this very House and spoken in detail. I am not talking of the details, but I am talking of the principle on which this Communal Award is based and on which the whole of the White Paper scheme is based. The Communal Award is an essential and integral part of the scheme, and, therefore, when I speak of the principle on which this Communal Award is based, I must show that the entire White Paper scheme is coloured with this Communal Award, and, therefore, it is unacceptable to us. I am not talking of either what the Communal Award actually is or how it is unjust. I am merely discussing the principle of the Award and how the principle was considered by the Central Indian Committee, by the Government of India or by the Simon Commission

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member has got just three minutes more and he must conclude.

Bhai Parma Nand:

"It is evident therefore"

—say the Simon Commission—

"that communal representation is a very thorny question and one as to which there cannot be said to be anything approaching agreement in India today. When the Montagu Chelmsford Report was written, its authors, in dealing with this subject, were a great deal influenced and helped by the fact that the Lucknow Pact had been recently arrived at and could still be regarded as embodying a compromise which carried the assent of the leading representatives of both communities."

And this is what the Government of India say in their despatch:

"The Commission's report contains a carefully prepared and closely reasoned examination of the issues at stake. The conclusion reached is that in the absence of agreement between the Muhammadans and the Hindus the Commission are impelled

to assume in this matter a continuance of separate communal electorates; and if there are to be communal electorates, the outstanding question left for decision is the proportion of seats in various Provincial Councils to be set aside for different communities."

Mr. S. G. Jog (Berar Representative): May I know whether the Honourable Member means to say that he does not want the Reforms?

Bhai Parma Nand: Then the Government of India go on and say very clearly that the Commission held that, in view of the weakness of the Muslim minorities in six out of the eight Provinces, the present scale of weightage in favour of Muslims may properly be maintained. On the other hand, the Commission ranged themselves definitely against the full claim put forward by the Muslim community.

I simply want to say this much: With regard to the communal principle, the principle that was laid down in the Nehru Report was practically corroborated by the Central Indian Committee, but the Simon Commission, while being forced to accept separate electorates for both communities, said that they did not want to go beyond the Lucknow Pact to which they had agreed. The Government of India Despatch also confirmed the same view. They knew that no agreement was possible, and, therefore, they said that as regards the allocation of seats to different communities, the present proportions should be continued. Now, what do we find as the basic principle of the Communal Award? . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Order, order. The Honourable Member's time is up.

Bhai Parma Nand: I will take only one minute more and then finish. The principle underlying the Communal Award is that no regard is to be had for justice or equity. The Government are determined to show special favour to one community without paying the slightest consideration to the recommendations of the Commission or of the Committees that had made investigation on the subject. They have given an Award which was not needed at all. Had they even followed the principle of justice and equity, all this trouble would not have occurred. Therefore, my point is that this Communal Award is very favourable to one section, while it is unacceptable to the other. And, as the whole White Paper scheme is based on the Communal Award, I say that, as long as the Communal Award forms the basis of the White Paper scheme, we are not going to accept it; and unless it is modified considerably, I do not see any use in hurrying this scheme through at all. So I oppose the motion.

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali (Lucknow and Fyzabad Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I do not want to enter into any communal wrangle or to discuss the scheme of the White Paper on communal grounds or any other grounds, except on national grounds. Sir, the goal of India has been not to obtain this White Paper which has been flung at our faces like theatrical publications. Our goal is Dominion Status and full Dominion Status. What we want is that the Reforms should be expedited. That is the crux of the whole motion which has been brought forward today by my friend, Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar, and not the White Paper scheme. If it is said that the whole scheme is contained in this White Paper, I say it is not, and nobody in this House will agree with the view that everything that we want is contained in

[Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali.]

this White Paper. The whole picture is not here. When the Indian delegates went to Europe, we were blamed that we were fighting among ourselves, but, Sir, are we not sitting silent and united today? We are doing absolutely nothing except listening to the stories of Rothermeres and Churchills. But what do we find in England? We find that parties are flinging themselves upon each other, they are cutting each other's throats, they are denouncing each other, they are sending deputations after deputations, Commissions after Commissions, and what is more, even private persons are coming out to find out what view we hold today about the Reforms. Sir, it is really very strange that people in England as yet do not know what India wants, and it is a matter to be deprecated very strongly that the Indian Government or even the Secretary of State has not taken the trouble to enlighten the English public as to what India really wants. (Applause.) I do not like to blame those friends who went from here to the Round Table Conferences, —and among these friends there were not merely men, but also ladies,— I would not blame them, but I would call the whole show a theatrical performance and nothing more.

Sir, conditions in India are very discouraging and unsettled. My friends in this House may be absolutely safe, but I say and say it boldly that unless we make India's goal self-Government or full Dominion Status, we shall find the whole country ranged against us if we go for elections. We feel, Sir, that we are not getting what we want. My friend, Sir Henry Gidney, complained that his people were not getting what they want. Here is my friend, Bhai Parma Nand, who says that he is not getting what he wants, but whatever that may be, I must warn the Government that we are going through very critical times. There is terrorism in Bengal, there is starvation and misery in Bihar, there is unemployment in the country, people on the Frontier are aspiring for freedom. With all those conditions facing the country, the White Paper scheme, as it is presented to us, would hardly meet the needs of the country today. We all with one voice object to the safeguards. Innumerable safeguards have been put in the White Paper, and we all object to them. We do not say that we do not want any Reforms; on the other hand, we do want Reforms, we want such Reforms which may be consistent with our self-respect. I would ask the Government to give up this unreality. What I find now is this. Almost all the conditions, which have been laid down in the White Paper, have been fulfilled by the Indian people. The Reserve Bank Bill has been passed, and the Reserve Bank will come into existence very shortly. All the financial conditions which were prescribed as a pre-requisite in paragraph 32 have been at least practically fulfilled. Those conditions are these.

The first condition is that the Indian budgetary position should be assured. I ask the Government whether the Finance Member's Budget is not enough to show to the British Government that our budgetary position is quite all right. The second is that the short term debt of the Government; both in England and in India, should be substantially reduced. I ask whether this too has not been done, and I say that it has been done. The third is that adequate reserves should have been accumulated. I would say that more than adequate reserves have been accumulated both in England and in India. But I would say this much that the substantial export of gold is really ruining the Indian position to a very great extent, and, just as our gold has gone. I know

that after a few months Sir George Schuster will also have gone out of India (Laughter), and we shall be poor both in gold and in Sir George Schuster. The fourth condition is that India's normal export surplus should have been restored. It is a matter of regret that our exports and imports have not improved.

An Honourable Member: But it is improving.

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali: What I meant to say was this, that if such pleas were taken by the British Government, and if the members who are coming out from England were to enquire into the affairs in India and find out that the fourth condition was not fulfilled to its perfection, and report "Here is an item that we have found out which is not satisfied, and, therefore, Reforms should not be given to India",—if such pleas were taken, I submit that it would really be to the detriment of this country, and God knows what will happen by the time the Reforms come. There is a provision in the White Paper, and the time has come when Parliament should take action under that provision. This is the provision:

"But the coming into being of the autonomous provinces will only be the first step towards the complete Federation for which the Constitution Act will provide; and His Majesty's Government have stated that if causes beyond their control should place obstacles in the way of this programme they will take steps to review the whole position in consultation with Indian opinion."

In this way speed up the Reforms.

After these five or six years that we have been having these Round Table Conferences and Franchise Committees, and so on, we are now going to have private commissions coming out to India, and I think the time has come when the British Government should take stock of the whole situation and take some action in consultation with opinion in India. And what is the Indian opinion? I have stated that opinion before, namely, to have self-government and full self-government for India.

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): My Honourable friend, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, cries *Bapre Bap*. I am going to disappoint him on the present occasion.

An Honourable Member: In what way?

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria: In ways which I shall presently mention. When I learnt of this cut motion, I had some doubts as regards its propriety at the present juncture.

An Honourable Member: Coming from your Leader?

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria: I thought a motion of this kind at this time was likely to do more disservice than service to the country by embarrassing our friends in England.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury).]

[Mr. N. N. Anklesaria.]

But the Honourable the Mover has made it quite clear that it is not his intention in moving this motion to give scope for bitter controversies which are at present happily not in fashion in this country. My Honourable friend, Bhai Parma Nand, has somewhat disappointed me as regards the attitude which he took up. I can assure him that utterances like his are more likely to do harm than good to the interests of this country.

An Honourable Member: In what way?

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria: The way in which they would do harm is, firstly, that it would embarrass the Secretary of State and make his task much heavier than what it is in fighting the opponents of the Reforms in England.

An Honourable Member: Supposing we do not care for that?

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria: If you do not care for that, then I say you do not care for your country. If this motion serves to bring to the notice of the British people that delay has been causing a good deal of discontent in this country, it will have done some service to the country. There are really dangers in delay, both as regards what is happening in England and what is happening in India just at this juncture. When I was in England, I had opportunities of talking on the present Reforms with several English gentlemen, and my conclusion was that a vast majority of the English people were genuinely anxious to see that Indian political aspirations were satisfied and satisfied at the earliest moment possible. There is some opposition no doubt, but the opposition is from certain vested interests and certain political cranks and political back numbers who oppose every Government measure simply for the sake of opposition. We should have expected that personalities like Sir Samuel Hoare, Lord Irwin, Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Baldwin should have by the strength of their own character and by means of the public confidence which they undoubtedly enjoy in England, and lastly by the righteousness of the cause they have been advocating—would have taken some decisive action to overcome the intrigues and machinations of the reactionary elements in England. But unfortunately while these great men are hesitating, undecided opposition to them in England is thickening and daily gaining in volume and momentum. There is no doubt that the present Government is one of the strongest Governments in the history of England, but the strongest Government is enfeebled by continual criticism and opposition and that is exactly what is happening in England today. The Government have been losing election after election and the Government majorities are dwindling. In these circumstances, instead of adopting a bold and decisive policy, the British Government are adopting a policy of, what I should say, cajolery and compromise and the whole White Paper scheme is being whittled down by assertions, by criticisms and by explanations and contradictions of those explanations. I would not mention the fuss about the statements of some of the Governors and of the Viceroy on which my Honourable friend, the Diwan Bahadur, spoke the other day, but these are instances in point. Caution is no doubt essential in connection with all political innovations, because the phenomena which are being dealt with are so

very complex. We can predict with certainty what will happen if an acid is added to an alkali; but when 350 millions of people in all stages of material and moral and political development are granted by their foreign rulers democratic institutions and political freedom to which they have been utter strangers for generations, who can say what the result will be. The stage of caution, however, is past. After the momentous decision has once been taken to grant India the status of a dominion, in the fullness of time, of course, by the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, that decision has got to be implemented without hesitation and doubt or misgiving, for, Sir, in the words of Mr. Montagu, we are now entitled to say to the British people "Intellectually we are your own children, and now we have attained our age of majority and you cannot withhold from us what you, to your eternal glory, have been teaching us for generations to regard as our birthright".

If the delay as regards the granting of Reforms is doing harm in England, the effect which such delay is producing in India is even more disconcerting. Firstly, the whole Federal idea on which the Reforms are based is losing ground. The main prop of the Federal idea, I mean the princes, are now slackening in their support of the scheme and this I know from personal conversation with some of the princes. No doubt, Hyderabad, Baroda and Mysore have expressed their definite approval of the Federal idea, but they have made it perfectly clear that no final decision can be expected from them till the complete picture is put before them and, even in this their mere approval of the scheme, some of the smaller States now refuse to join, because they believe that while these big States have got some *quid pro quo* for their having approved of the scheme, the smaller States stand to lose everything and can gain nothing by entering the Federation. The worst of the thing is that the *yuvarajas* or the heir-apparents are now beginning to ask their elders as to what they are doing with the inheritance which they, the elders, are bound to transmit to them undiminished and undamaged. Personally I am humbly of opinion that the non-entry of the princes into the Federation should be of very little concern or should be of very little regret to anybody in this House. "Put not thy faith in princes" is as true today as it was when it was first written, and I say if any British politician relies on the princes as an element of stability in the Constitution, I say he relies on a broken reed, and I am prepared to cite historical instances to show that these princes are likely, more often than not, to behave like battle elephants, who do more harm to their own party than to their enemy.

An Honourable Member: What about the Princes Protection Bill?

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria: That has got nothing to do with this. Secondly, suspicions and fears are being aroused in the minds of responsibly minded Indians by this delay. Many fear that the history of broken promises and repudiated pledges is on the eve of being repeated. Sir, to placate the opposition of their followers, Sir Samuel Hoare and his friends are adopting a policy, as I said, of cajolery and compromise, and we Indians feel that even the scanty Reforms given in the White Paper are being whittled down by heaping safeguards upon safeguards.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury): The Honourable Member must now conclude.

Mr. N. N. Anklesaria: I shall take only one minute, Sir. That what is being given by the British Government with one hand is being taken away by the other. Sir, there is much justification for this feeling among the responsible-minded Indians and it is a feeling which no sane-minded British public man can possibly ignore. Sir, I am decidedly of the opinion that these safeguards, while safeguarding nothing, will only irritate and antagonise opinion. (Hear, hear.) After all, Sir, this is an empire of opinion. Damage or destroy that opinion and there is nothing for the empire to rest upon. I would say to the British Government: "Do not delay, do not waste time in haggling over safeguards". I would say to them in the wake of the Great Queen:

"In our belief in the purity and impartiality of your justice, in our belief in the righteousness of your rule, and in our belief in the benefit of the British connection have always lain and will ever lie your greatest guarantee, your best bulwark, your safest safeguard".

Sir, I support the motion. (Loud Applause.)

Sir Qasim Jahangir: Sir, I do not know whether the intention of my Honourable friend, the Raja Bahadur, in moving this motion has really been fulfilled up till now. I believe his intention was to impress, as far as it is possible for us to impress anybody outside this House, with regard to the urgency of the Reforms being put into execution in this country, and he very wisely stated that this was no occasion to go into the merits of the Reforms.

Last year, Mr. Deputy President, we had a full-dress debate on the White Paper. Most of us had an opportunity of expressing our dissent from some of the proposals. Those who had the privilege of going to England for four years gave their opinions in no hesitating manner in England, and most of those opinions have now been embodied in a memorandum signed by our four colleagues here and others who went to the Joint Select Committee. Sir, the issue raised by this motion is: "Do we want the Reforms as soon as possible, or are we prepared to stand some delay?" I do not think there is a single Honourable Member in this House, whether it be from the European Group or whether it be on the Official Benches, who will say that they want any unnecessary delay. There are some in this House who will say that they do not agree with certain parts of the proposed Constitution, like my friend, Bhai Parma Nand. There are others, most probably who will follow me, like my friend from the Punjab who will say that the Sikh community has not received justice. There may be others still who will contend that Sind should not be separated from my Province. There may be even some more like my friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, who will say that they are not quite satisfied that their community has got all they demanded, but, Mr. Deputy President, I believe there is not one single Honourable Member in this House who will seriously contend that there is scope for delay in Reforms for this country. Sir, my Honourable friend, the Raja Bahadur, gave some very cogent arguments for there being no further delay; and if I may point out to him, there was one symbolical argument in the red shirt he has worn today. (Hear, hear.) Sir, he warned Government of some thing. They are well aware that there is a school of thought, increasing in numbers, who are looking towards Russia for inspiration. That is a very serious warning, a warning that should not be neglected. But, Mr. Deputy President, I would venture to suggest to my Honourable friend that he was moving a Resolution amongst those who are already converted. He ought really to

have gone to England and lectured to many of the English politicians who are anxious not only for delay, but that there should be no Reforms at all; and, believe me, Mr. Deputy President, it surprises one in India to find such ignorance even now in England about this great country, and sometimes one cannot help thinking that the ignorance betrayed by some well-known public men in England is deliberate. They do not want to learn. They are anxious to remain ignorant, and they are anxious to remain ignorant for the sake of party politics, and it is most unfortunate that India should have become a part and parcel of British party politics. Here is a speech that has been reported in all papers by a fairly well-known Member of the House of Commons, Sir Henry Page-Croft. Now, this Sir Henry has told an audience in a speech at Chichester that there is nobody ready to work the Reforms sketched out by the White Paper. Then, why, he asks, do Government give any Reforms to India if such Reforms are not going to satisfy anybody? Then, he further suggests that it might be tried in two Provinces if Government are determined to have a more democratic form of administration in this country.

Now, Sir, I am fully aware of the fact that there is a school of thought in this country that does not hide its light under a bushel and
 4 P.M. who have proclaimed from the house-tops that they would rather have no Reforms than the Reforms sketched out in the White Paper. But they do not constitute the whole of India, and I do not think it is playing the game for men who ought to know more and better to say that these Reforms will not be worked by anybody and to make party capital out of such arguments. I am prepared to agree that there is nobody who is quite satisfied with the White Paper. Every one of us has criticised it and every one of us requires amendments in it, but the crux of the question is that if the White Paper becomes law, who is going to run the administration of the country in India? I contend that, if the White Paper, as it stands today, becomes law, there will be many men ready to co-operate and work the Constitution, but they will do it with the object of getting further Reforms. They will do it with the object of putting further pressure upon His Majesty's Government to give further Reforms. But if the future Reforms are not exactly on the lines of the White Paper and the White Paper is amended on the lines suggested by ourselves during the last four years, then I contend that the Reforms will be worked by a very large body of men in India with the object of making these Reforms a success; and for a number of years at least the Constitution will not require further amendment. It is because that we desire to work a Constitution that will not require amendment for a number of years that we press and press most strongly our views upon His Majesty's Government that the White Paper should be amended as suggested by ourselves during the last four years, for we believe that in that case, not only those who today are called Moderates, but a very large percentage of those who are today called Extremists will come in to work the Reforms and to work the Constitution to the benefit, not only of India, but of the Empire. Therefore, I believe that the motion moved by my Honourable friend has the unanimous support of this House. We have our reservations, every one of us, but on the whole there can be no doubt that everybody in this country is anxious that the Reforms should come as soon as possible and that delay would mean great danger. We would point out to our critics both in this country and in England, who are known as die-hards, that they are no friends of their own country and their Empire and history, we believe, will prove that their own country and the Empire have no greater enemies than

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

those whom today we know by the name of die-hards. Sir, one cannot but come to the conclusion that this agitation in England—in Parliament and on the public platform—against any kind of Reforms is a part of party politics which comes from disappointed men, men who once hoped to be in office, but find themselves now out of office, and nothing to do. I would invite them all to India, and I believe the House of Commons would be most grateful if they accepted our invitation for a year or so. If I had the power, I would make some of them Collectors of certain districts in our Presidency or in any Presidency in India—say, in Bengal—and I feel certain that after the end of a year or so they would go back to their country very different men to what they were when they came out. It is very easy for these men to criticise their own countrymen in this country and ourselves, sitting in arm-chairs in their clubs or in arm-chairs in the smoking room of the House of Commons, but if they and their families had to work in this country amongst people who are dissatisfied and disgruntled and who do not want to co-operate or had to work in certain parts of India even at the risk of their lives and the lives of their wives and children, then they would realise and realise very soon that a change was necessary in this country and that too as soon as possible, both in the interests of England and in the interests of the Empire. Nothing can teach them that lesson unless they are made to come out and face the realities in this country. Therefore, I welcome to this country the visit of every Tory M. P. The greater the die-hard the more I would welcome him, because I feel certain that when he went back to his country, he would not criticise Governors or Members of Government for even mentioning the word "Reforms", and he would learn that such criticism is contemptible and is believed to be contemptible by all right-minded men—Indians and Englishmen—in this country.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural):
Sir, there is a Persian proverb:

"Danan dushman bih zi nadan dost."

It means that a wise enemy is better than a foolish friend. We have got in India a lot of foolish friends who, in their zeal to speak out the mind of the public and of the masses and thinking that they are pleasing some people outside by creating some kind of agitation, go on with these communal talks, but they are not alive to the injury that they cause to India's good. These people think that they are pleasing this House and also the people outside, but they are the greatest hindrance to the progress of this country and they are the cause of the slavery of this country. Every time they get up on the floor of the Assembly or outside, they speak of this communal tangle and thereby they strengthen the hands of the enemies of India. My Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, has read out extracts from a paper and it is such talks that strengthen the hands of the die-hards in England who do not want to give any Reforms to India. What is the good of people in India getting up and saying, we do not want this thing or that thing, because it does not satisfy the whims of certain individuals? May God save India from the hands and from the counsels of such friends. They are injuring the cause of India immensely. I was greatly amused when I heard my Honourable friend, Bhai Parma Nand, speak. I have great respect for my Honourable friend, I only pity him, because he is misguided. I knew him since 1913 and I still give

him credit for his outspokenness, but I think his advocacy on certain matters does not bring credit to the vast community to which he belongs. I think by his speech he is doing the greatest injury to the cause of India. My friend was saying that he was speaking as a nationalist, and when he was talking nothing but communalism, I was reminded of a Persian proverb which says:

“*Nihand nam bur uks zungi kafur.*”

It means that the negroes always give to their children the reverse name to their own colour, that is they give them name “camphor” which is of white colour, when the child is black. Sometimes we call our friends snowballs on account of black colour. So when a man speaks nothing but communalism, he begins to say that he is a nationalist. My friend may say that he went round the country and that he addressed vast numbers of people in different places and he found that everybody was dissatisfied with the White Paper. I think he was exaggerating a little bit.

Bhai Parma Nand: I was referring to the Hindus only.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: I too have got many friends amongst the Hindus and I mix with a lot of them and certainly they do not share the views which have been expressed by my Honourable friend.

Bhai Parma Nand: Can you name one public man amongst the Hindu community in favour of the Communal Award?

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury): The Honourable Member is not giving way.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: I say, Sir, that they would all like to live peacefully with the different communities. There are thousands of Hindus who want to live peacefully with other communities. My Honourable friend was touring the country inspiring the people from place to place to carry on agitation. I myself have read in the newspapers that Bhai Parma Nand visited such and such places and all the people agreed with his views. What could the poor people do? They do not know what is good for them and what is bad for them? If anybody stands up in the name of the Hindu religion and creates a disturbance in the minds of the masses, these poor people are led away. Of course, if I want to create a disturbance in the minds of my Muslim friends, I can do so in one day. If I get up on a platform in Chandni Chowk, I can get a huge following by making a fiery speech and calling upon the Muslim to have *Jehad* on the Hindus. But will I be doing justice to my country? So there is no use of my Honourable friend, Bhai Parma Nand, saying that the Hindu community agreed with his views. The Hindu masses did not know what the real point was. They did not know what was going on in politics. I may say from my experience that the Hindus do want to live peacefully with their neighbours and they want to mix socially with all the people. Supposing there is a *panchayat* in a village. Unless all the people belonging to all castes and creeds are invited, that *panchayat* is not complete. No settlement can take place in any village unless all the communities are represented in that *panchayat*. This has been the custom from time immemorial. People have been living peacefully with their

[Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

neighbours. A handful of people in India may create agitation and try to convert other people to their own views, but the masses of India, in whose name my friend purported to speak, whether Hindus or Mussalmans, do not want this agitation. By his speech in this House, my Honourable friend is creating a wrong impression, both inside this House and outside India, that the people are ready to follow him. By his action my Honourable friend is only strengthening the hands of our enemies who will say that India is hopelessly divided, that the Indian people do not see eye to eye and that one man, if he does not get the things he wants, says "I do not want the whole thing absolutely".

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

My Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, said that there is another gentleman in this House who will get up and say that because Sind is going to be separated, no Reforms are necessary for India. In this way, we will go on fighting and our enemies will simply laugh at us.

I can say about the United Provinces that we, Muslims, form only 14 per cent of the population, and because we cannot get a majority in the Council, does it mean that we should get up and say: "We do not want Reforms for the whole of India, because the Muslims in the United Provinces will suffer"? Have we ever said that? We have always relied on the goodwill of our Hindu friends in the United Provinces. We stand by our Hindu friends through thick and thin. We do not mind if our Hindu friends get a majority in the United Provinces Council. We have seen that the Hindus and Muslims in the United Provinces have been living most peacefully and amicably. We have found that even the Muslim Minister in the United Provinces has got the greatest support from the Hindu Members of the Council. Because it is the United Provinces, we are all united. This kind of impression given out by my Honourable friend, Bhai Parma Nand, and communalists like him will give a handle to our enemies in England, and the progress of Reforms will be much retarded. Let these two Provinces separate if they want to. As a matter of fact, Sind was formerly no part of India. There were two countries, as we find in old books, Hind and Sindh, Hind being India and Sindh being beyond the Indus and not included in India. If they want to be separate from India, let them be so, but why do they disturb the peace of the whole country? If the people of the Punjab had not disturbed the other Provinces, then the other Provinces would not have demanded communal representation or separate electorates, etc. I say, for God's sake do not speak in the name of India, and let us live quietly and peacefully.

Sir, I support this motion, because this will stop the methods of people of this type who are still creating agitation in the country. And these agitators will live only till the Reforms are introduced. When that is once done, everything will settle down and we will have peace.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member should conclude now.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: That is why I support this motion, but, at the same time, I think there is no use in the Raja Bahadur's dividing the House on this motion. We cannot censure the Government of India for not expediting the Reforms, because it is not in their power to do so.

It lies entirely in the hands of Parliament, and when the report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee is published, we know that no time will be lost, and I do not think there is any justification in censuring the Government of India, except to draw the attention of somebody outside through the Government of India that it is desirable that the Reforms should come soon.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I shall not be very long as I know the Honourable the Leader of the House will have to interfere in this debate.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Why should he interfere?

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: My friend, Mr. Amar Nath Dutt, with his usual sense of humour, asks me, why should he interfere. He will interfere probably to inform us that this debate will be communicated to the Secretary of State for India, because, so far as this House is concerned, I am perfectly certain that Mr. Yamin Khan was expressing its views when he said that we were not going to divide the House on this issue. Sir, I did not imagine that Mr. Yamin Khan would put his head into what I might call a communal halter (Laughter), but when he did so, he did it with a view to supporting this motion which in a sense Bhai Parma Nand also while opposing supported. He only wanted incidentally to have an opportunity under the rules of this debate to put in his claim to express the views of the Punjab and of the great Hindu community which in this House and outside in the country he has always courageously represented. As the President of the Hindu Mahasabha, I know, Bhai Parma Nand—more than any single individual in my community, so far as this House is concerned,—I know, Bhai Parma Nand commands great respect and great influence. He has only one rival in the country and that is the Indian National Congress.

Kunwar Hajeer Ismail Ali Khan (Meerut Division: Muhammadan Rural): What about Mahatma Gandhi?

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Well, we shall come to Mahatma Gandhi presently. That is a very interesting question. I do not know Mahatma Gandhi's views on the question of council-entry, because I did not meet him while he was in Delhi. But to judge from a statement published in the Press and not contradicted by the Mahatma, he said, "Why continue this paralytic existence? Why not go into the Legislature if you cannot come with me or go somewhere working up your views and your politics?" I am very grateful to my friend from the United Provinces for having interrupted me, for it brings me direct to the issue raised by this cut motion, and it is this. In India today people are tired of the Civil Disobedience Movement. Even those who have been in it and believed in it are tired of it, because it has been defeated.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal: Landholders): It has not been defeated.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: My friend from the Independent Party represents, I am certain, the views of his constituency in Bengal when he says that it has not been defeated, and when he says so, I am sure he speaks with that Bengali imagination. No movement, as was once said by

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

Deshabandhu Das, can be defeated if men who enter that movement have a will of their own. Sir, where there is a will, there will also be a way, and the way at present is the Council way. That was the lead that Deshabandhu Das gave after going through the Civil Disobedience Movement. He knew there was the unconquerable will of the nation to come into its own and he decided,—not having had an earlier opportunity, at the Calcutta Special Congress—to translate the storm centre from the country to the Council. That opportunity was availed of by the Congress and once again,—history is repeating itself—the Congress is thinking of going into the Councils. But at such a time it is for His Majesty's Government not to delay matters, for political waves and political winds do not flow and blow always the same favourable way. There has been no time in the history of recent Indian agitation so favourable to introduce the new Reforms with the purpose of transferring the forces of agitation from outside to inside as now. And I want the Government of India to inform His Majesty's Government to seize the occasion by the forelock, and not tire the country, to introduce the Reforms. Sir, I would say to the Secretary of State through you and the Government of India who will communicate this debate to him:

"Shun delays, they breed remorse,
Creeping snails have weakest force."

And the position of the reformer, of the constitutional agitator, the Constitution itself, will be that of a creeping snail if they do not immediately without delay introduce the Reforms, and that will involve, I know, speeding up in Whitehall. I am not today going into what the Raja Bahadur referred to and other speakers referred to including my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, who thought it would be a good thing for Members of Parliament to come into this country and amuse themselves and in the meantime carry this Government of India Bill, however controversial it may be, embodying the White Paper, through the Commons. I do not mind their being in their own country, for they are people whose vision is not wide. They are people who are animated by views which were popular in a century that was, and some of them, whom I have seen and talked to like Mr. Winston Churchill, are men with great patriotism, very great imperialists, genuine and sincere in their agitation, who are anxious that the power and the glory of the Empire should not become less than what it is. I told Mr. Winston Churchill, I had read that chapter in his book "My early life", about his "Education in Bangalore" with great interest. I do not for a moment believe that if Mr. Churchill today were in the Cabinet he would have abandoned the fight that he is putting up in the country. He fought on the issue of the Irish settlement; he fought on the issue of the Egyptian settlement; he would have fought, not us, but his colleagues in the Cabinet on the issue of the Indian settlement. It is a great pity, it is a tragedy that such a resourceful personality was left out of the Cabinet, for, had he been inside the Cabinet, he would have been isolated and he would not have let loose that great agitation with all his remarkable powers, that he has let loose in England. Consequently, as I said the other day, Englishmen hate us as they never hated us before, and Indians, if these Reforms are delayed, will once again develop a national antipathy, which it will not be wise for us to allow them to develop. That is why I say that those who believe that the White Paper Scheme is good must proceed immediately with every ability and every resource that is theirs, proceed immediately with the scheme and place it on the

Statute-book. Good is best when sooner wrought; lingering labours come to naught. Especially so in India where the constitutionalist has to face two opponents. He has to face the wreckers who will come into the Legislature with the purpose of wrecking the legislative machine just as it was wrecked in Russia—the Duma was suspended, and after the suspension of the Duma, there were revolutionary forces working in Russia. That will be the method of the wrecker who will come into the Legislature; for I know my friend, Mr. S. C. Mitra, was once upon a time the organiser-in-chief of the most expert wrecking Party in this Legislature, namely, the Swaraj Party; your mantle, Sir, fell on him and he became the Whip of the Swaraj Party. You, Sir, were also flirting with the wreckers. (Laughter.) Therefore, those who come to wreck will stay to work. I am not so much afraid of the wreckers inside the House: I welcome them to this House. Out in the country it may be I may have to measure swords with them, I may have to fight them; but let us fight on a living issue, namely, the new Constitution, not over a corpse, a carcase like the old Constitution which it is time is cremated. That is why I say, works adjourned have many stays, long demurs breed new delays. They also breed new dangers. For there is a split in the Congress. The Right wing of the Congress wants to come into the Legislature; the Left wing of the Congress wants to wait, wait for the tide of public opinion to rise in their favour once again. Are the Government who believe in rallying the Moderates—though there are no Moderates in the Congress—willing to rally the Right-wingers of the Congress? They have got public opinion behind them; if the new Reforms are to be worked, do not delay introducing them. If, on the contrary, the Honourable the Home Member loves revolution, or at any rate a revolutionary atmosphere and then let loose the hounds of Bellona upon the revolutionaries in the shape of Ordinances, repression, and so on, if Sir Samuel Hoare desires a revival of a revolutionary atmosphere in this country and then use all the beautiful machine of repression to crush it, if that is the way in which India is to be governed in the future, the nicest thing will be to delay the Reforms. But then they will be playing into the hands of the revolutionaries. The Government have delayed the Reforms unnecessarily through these tedious Round Table Conferences. Probably these Round Table Conferences were meant for the education of the British people that there is a continental Kilkenny at this end. Fortunately our Kilkenny cats have come to some kind of arrangement; some scheme amidst formidable difficulties has been brought into existence and that scheme, with all its imperfections—and schemes of compromise are imperfect—will be worked; an attempt will be made to wreck it in this country, and if those who want to work it, however dissatisfied they may be with it like Sir Abdur Rahim, like Sir Cowasji Jehangir, like Sir Hari Singh Gour, the Leader of my Party (Hear, hear) and like Mr. Joshi who says "Hear, hear", if all these people and their followers in the country are to work this scheme and if they are denied a chance of working it at the next General Election, which I presume will be on the new issue and not the old carcase, if they want also to bring into this fight and into the working of the scheme some right-minded Congressmen, I will say "Do not delay very long. Try to get through the Reform Bill which cannot be improved, not because it is perfect, but because there are obstacles in the way of improvement, get through this scheme as soon as possible through the House of Commons and the House of Lords. Face your opponents in India with a *fait accompli*. Even some of those who are quarrelling with the scheme, even some of those who are using the language of the revolutionary, even some of those who are willing to wound, I am certain will be afraid to strike, if the new

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

Constitution is brought into existence. (Cheers.) As a constitutionalist who believes that constitutionalism hath her victories no less renowned than civil disobedience, I will urge with all the emphasis at my command that there should be no further delay, for procrastination is the thief of time, not only in private life but also in political affairs. (Applause.)

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter (Leader of the House): Sir, the object of the motion is to discuss the necessity of expediting the Constitutional Reforms. I may say at once that Government are in full sympathy with the object. (Hear, hear.) We have made it clear in this House more than once that the Government of India and the Secretary of State are doing their best to expedite the framing of the Constitution which as the House will realise, is now beyond their control, and lies with the Joint Parliamentary Committee. It is impossible for me to give any idea to the House as to when the Joint Parliamentary Committee will conclude their labours. I was asked by one of the Members,—I forget who—as to when the general elections would take place. That would depend upon the progress of events in London. But I can assure the House that the Government of India and the Secretary of State are fully conscious of the necessity of expedition. They fully realise the disappointment and discontent which delay in the inauguration of the Reforms will cause. Sir, when the Government are in agreement with the object of the motion, I do not see any point in dividing the House on the motion. If it be the desire of the Raja Bahadur that the debate should be forwarded to the Secretary of State, I shall be only too glad to do so, although it has not been of a very edifying character. It is characterised more by hilarity,—probably last night's rain is responsible for it than prudence—anyhow, if that is the desire of the Mover, I shall comply with his request. If, on the other hand, he wants the Government merely to communicate to the Secretary of State that it is the unanimous opinion of the House that the Reforms should be expedited, then we shall do that . . .

An Honourable Member: That will do.

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: I am suggesting two possible courses, and, in the circumstances, Sir, I would request the Honourable the Raja Bahadur not to press his motion to a division, but to indicate what he would like us to do. As I have said, we are willing either to forward the whole of the debate or to communicate to the Secretary of State the views of this House . . .

An Honourable Member: Unanimous.

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: I have just one word to add. In the course of the debate, the White Paper has again been criticised by Bhai Parma Nand and by several other Members. Today we are not discussing the White Paper. We are discussing the simple question of expediting the Reforms. What the Reforms will be, nobody knows. It may be the White Paper as it is, it may be the White Paper modified by the Joint Parliamentary Committee, or, further modified by Parliament,—we do not know what it will be. All that we are considering today is that the ultimate Reforms as they will emerge from Parliament should be expedited. That is the issue before the House. Therefore, all these criticisms about the White Paper are somewhat beside the point, and that is

why I suggested that we should not send the whole debate. If the Raja Bahadur will indicate what his wishes are in this matter, I think we shall be able to come to some arrangement.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar: Sir, I consider myself exceptionally fortunate, because, although I have been in this House for nearly three years, I do not remember any one motion from this side which has been very gladly and readily accepted by the Government. So, Sir, I congratulate myself upon this victory just before I leave this House. If the House will allow me, Sir, I should certainly withdraw my cut in view of the assurance given by the Honourable the Leader of the House that the substance of the debate together with the fact that the Government of India are in entire agreement would be communicated to the Secretary of State and that he would be requested to expedite the Reforms as much as possible.

There is, however, only one thing with which I am not quite satisfied, and that is my friend, the Honourable the Leader of the House, is not able to tell us whether they have come to any decision at all regarding elections. It is all very well to say that you cannot say anything, but look to the trouble we are in. Surely, my friends opposite can tell us something more definite than this oracular pronouncement. This is not satisfactory.

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: Sir, I am authorised to say this, that as soon as the Governor General has got a clear idea of the time table in London, he will lose no time in announcing his decision to this House as regards the date of the general elections.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar: Thank you, Sir. I suppose the announcement will take place some time in October, and not before that. Anyway, in view of the assurance given by the Honourable the Leader of the House, I would ask for leave to withdraw my cut motion.

The cut motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The whole of tomorrow will be devoted to the motion of the European Group to raise the question of planned economy. Members who are unattached have not come to any agreement among themselves, and, therefore, . . .

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I say one word, Sir, about the unattached Members? These are unattached, because we cannot agree among ourselves. I would, therefore, request you to give us one day, and then we shall certainly agree among ourselves as to how to divide it.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The unattached Members appear to be too detached for this purpose. So beginning from the day after tomorrow, the motions as they appear in the order paper will be taken up.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 8th March, 1934.