

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

WEDNESDAY, 8th AUGUST, 1934

Vol. VII—No. 3

OFFICIAL REPORT



CONTENTS.

Short Notice Question and Answer.

The Indian Navy (Discipline) Bill—Referred to Select Committee.

Appendix.

SIMLA : PRINTED BY THE MANAGER
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS : 1934

Price Five Annas.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 8th August, 1934.

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

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER.

INTRODUCTION OF AN AMENDED CANTONMENT BILL.

***Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin :** Are Government aware that Cantonment people are very keenly watching the introduction of an Amended Cantonment Bill, proposing certain important reforms mutually agreed upon between the Government officials and the Cantonment representatives in an informal conference held some two years ago ; and, if so, will Government be pleased to state whether they are prepared to introduce a Bill during the life of the present Assembly ?

Lieut.-Colonel A. F. R. Lumby : It is true that Government are contemplating introducing legislation in the near future to amend the Cantonments Act in certain important respects. Their proposals are, however, still under consideration, and even if the pressure of other legislative business permitted such a thing, it would not be possible for them to introduce a Bill during the course of the present Session.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh : Are Government aware that the present Cantonment Act gives very wide powers to the Cantonment authorities and that they are turning out people from their private properties in many of the cantonment areas in the North-West Frontier Province ?

Lieut.-Colonel A. F. R. Lumby : Government are aware that there are many shortcomings in the Act, but I am not prepared to admit that the Act is defective in the respect to which my Honourable friend refers.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai : May I ask, Sir, if that question will be considered when the Bill is framed ?

Lieut.-Colonel A. F. R. Lumby : I have no doubt that that question will also be considered.

Kunwar Hajee Ismail Ali Khan : May I know, Sir, when do the Government propose to introduce this Bill ?

Lieut.-Colonel A. F. R. Lumby : I hope it will be ready to be introduced in the next Session of the Assembly.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh : Are Government aware that the general dissatisfaction with regard to the provisions of the Cantonment Act was given expression to by a deputation which waited upon His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief sometime back ?

(1197)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Order, order : We cannot discuss the Cantonment Act now.

THE INDIAN NAVY (DISCIPLINE) BILL.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The House will now resume further discussion of the Naval Discipline Bill.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju (Ganjam *cum* Vizagapatam : Non-Muhamadan Rural) : Sir, yesterday I said that if this measure were to be a mere disciplinary measure, and that if it is intended to be brought into line with the disciplinary powers which the British Navy possesses, we in this House will not have the slightest objection to give such disciplinary powers. The only other reason which was advanced to commend this legislation to us is the status which it would give to the Indian Marine by being converted into the Indian Navy. As a matter of fact, strictly speaking, this Bill really does not convert the Marine into Navy, but merely puts its *dhobi* mark to a legislation that was already enacted in the British Parliament converting this Marine into a Navy. Sir, even assuming for a moment that we have got this satisfaction of joining our hands with those of His Majesty's Government in trying to convert this Marine into a Navy, I am afraid that would be ignoring the history of this problem since, at any rate, 1612. From 1612 right up to 1862, we had, as a matter of fact, an Indian Navy, and it was only in 1884 that it was converted into a Marine. Off and on, it used to be either a Navy or a Marine just as it suited the purpose of the then Government. Whenever they wanted a combatant force, it was a Navy, and whenever they were satisfied with a non-combatant force, it was kept as a Marine. It was a question of the expediency. Therefore, it is not a new discovery of the merits of a Navy that prompted this legislation in the present shape and the Indian Marine is converted into a Navy. But it was converted into a Navy, as I said, recently under the Act of 1927 by the British Parliament. The British Parliament took that step without consulting this Legislature. Even in that House, a question was asked as to why the consent of this Legislature was not obtained before such a step was taken, and the Under Secretary of State, on behalf of the then Government, said that the Indian Legislature ought to have known the intentions of His Majesty's Government when they published their Departmental Committee's report. Sir, it is not necessary for me to comment upon such a remark. The fact, however, remains that this Legislature was not consulted and that there was absolutely no justification whatsoever for not doing so before they introduced the legislation in the British Parliament. It was said—perhaps very rightly,—that the original intentions of the British Government of 1884, when they converted the Indian Navy into the Indian Marine, did not exist particularly in view of the experiences of His Majesty's Government during the War in the light of the experience gained on account of the activities of the “ Emden ” as I remarked yesterday. They thought that it was necessary to have a combatant force in our waters to protect ourselves. Be that as it may, my point is this, that it is idle to say now that we have got a new status conferred upon us. The whole point, from our point of view, is, why did you make this change without consulting us ? My Honourable friend, the Army Secretary, referred to the amended section of the Government of India Act, section 66, and said, on the

authority of that amended provision, that we have no right even to have a self-contained Act for ourselves even though that self-contained Act would be in accordance with the provisions of the legislation enacted by the British Parliament. He said that was the legal position. He said further :

“ You have no right to have an Act for yourself ; all that you have got to do is, if you have got anything to do in order to satisfy any requirements which are absolutely your own and which were not contemplated by the British Act that you may make such additional provisions as may suit your conditions to the Government of England's Act, but you have no right to have a separate self-contained Act of your own.”

Sir, he also referred to the British Act of 1884 to emphasise that point of view, and when he referred to that, he thought that all that could be said have been said and nothing could be said further. Sir, I would like to invite the Honourable the Army Secretary to go a little earlier than 1884. I would like to invite him to go right from the beginning, from the year 1858. I said right from the beginning when I mentioned the year 1858, because, so far as the British Parliament and the British Sovereign are concerned, prior to 1858, in the words of Lord Palmerston, they themselves had no power. It was entirely vested in a certain mercantile community. Therefore, I start with the year 1858. In starting with the year 1858, I would like to say further that the proclamation of the Queen along with the enactment that was passed in the British Legislature are documents of great constitutional importance to us, because it would throw a light upon the terms, conditions and circumstances under which this country passed on into the hands of the Sovereign. In that connection I should like to read only a very short passage from the first Proclamation itself :

“ We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to all our other subjects and those obligations by the Blessing of Almighty God we shall faithfully and conscientiously fulfil ”,

And there it was further said,—

“ We hereby appoint Viscount Canning to be our first Viceroy and Governor General in and over our said territories and to administer the Government thereof in our name and generally to act in our name and on our behalf, subject to such orders and regulations as he shall from time to time receive from us through one of our principal Secretaries of State.”

“ Assuming the direct Government soon after a bloody civil war and giving them pledges which her future reign is to redeem and explaining the principles of her Government, such a document should breathe feelings of generosity, benevolence, and religious feeling, pointing out the privileges which the Indians will receive in being placed on an equality,”

—mark the words.—

“ on an equality with the subjects of the British Crown and prosperity following in the train of civilisation.”

In referring to this document, I would like to say that, we acknowledged the Sovereign and the Sovereign had given us the right that She shall treat us with absolute equality with the other subjects of Her Majesty. In other words, this document does not give the right for the fellow subjects of Her Majesty to dictate to us and that we should be subordinates to her fellow subjects. We are all alike and equal before the Sovereign. With particular reference to the question of Army, I should like to read one particular passage from the speech of Lord Derby in

[Mr. B. Sitaramaraju.]

1858 on the Government of India Bill. The 55th clause of that Bill deals with the first of these subjects. He says :

“ It has been objected to that clause that it appears to interfere with the prerogative rights of the Crown inasmuch as it provides that none of Her Majesty's forces maintained out of the revenues of India shall be taken except in cases of urgent emergency beyond the frontiers of that country without the previous consent of Parliament. Now, it has been thought—and I confess that the wording of the clause makes it open to a construction which was not intended by its framers.”

They did not intend that Parliament should assume control and that the transfer of these soldiers should be in any way controlled by them in a manner to restrict the powers or the prerogative which the Sovereign possesses. Therefore, there was a strong opposition to that clause and the Mover of the Bill, Lord Derby, says as follows :

“ But your Lordships will recollect that although there is no prerogative of the Crown more indisputable than that of making war or peace, the constitution has provided an equally indisputable check on the practical exercise of that prerogative by rendering it necessary for the Crown to come to Parliament for the supplies necessary to raise and maintain the troops, without which it would be impossible to carry on a war. *But with regard to the troops in India there is, and there can be no such Parliamentary control.*”

Sir, on this last sentence I wish to lay stress. As I will presently deal, the ordering of the troops, the commanding of Navy and things like that are the exclusive prerogative powers of the Crown, but, so far as the powers of the Crown within the realm of the United Kingdom are concerned, those powers are curtailed as a result of the constitutional struggle which the English Sovereign and the English people have had for a number of years, but so far as the powers of the Crown with reference to the United Kingdom were concerned, there is no doubt as Lord Derby has said that those powers are maintained. But, as he says, so far as India is concerned, there is and there can be no such Parliamentary control. In some subsequent passages of his speech, he gave the reason why such a provision had to be made in the Act of the Government of India of 1858. The Queen was not only the Queen of India, but she was also the Queen of England. If the Queen were to engage herself in a war with another nation, she has the prerogative right to do so, but she must have money to carry it. If she were to depend for that on the revenues of the United Kingdom, the British Parliament had the power to withhold funds and limit the exercise of prerogative power. Therefore, it could exercise a check upon that sovereign right by refusing the supplies. But, in the case of India, as no such control vests in the British Parliament, they were afraid that if the Queen of England were to go and utilise her armies of India and engage in a European conflict, they, the people of the United Kingdom, as the subjects of that Queen, will be dragged into the conflict without their consent. They wanted some sort of protection for themselves against the exercise of that prerogative power with regard to India. That is the reason why, in the original draft Bill, they said that Her Majesty should not use the Indian troops beyond the limits of Asia. As even that was too wide, they subsequently modified it by enacting that she should not exercise that power except for the defence of India. They merely stipulated for a safeguard against being dragged into a European conflict with the help of Indian revenues and troops, transcending the limitations imposed on her by the constitution of the United Kingdom. Therefore, they wanted that the prerogative power should be

restricted to this, that so far as India is concerned, she cannot utilise those Indian forces without the consent of Parliament for purposes beyond the defence of India. That being so, I should like to say that the present legislation, which interprets those provisions in a contrary way by Parliament assuming a control instead of keeping to the safeguard, is putting the position the other way round, and I consider that a legislation of this description, if such a provision is enacted by the British Parliament, would constitute not only an invasion of the rights of the Crown vested in the Crown as its prerogative power, but it is equally, as I shall presently show, an encroachment upon our inalienable right. It may be asked, how our position is materially improved by this power being absolutely vested in the sovereign from its being shared by the sovereign with the British Parliament. It is not necessary for my present purpose to go into that question, but for which purpose it is necessary that I should briefly observe the powers of the Crown itself.

The Crown, generally like all Crowns, has all the powers vested in it. The powers of the Crown are all-embracing. The legislative, the judicial and the executive powers are all vested in the Crown. These triple powers of the State are all vested in the Sovereign absolutely. Now, of those three powers, I am now directly concerned with the legislative powers. The legislative powers, it cannot be denied, are absolutely vested in the Sovereign. There can be no Parliament without the Crown summoning it, there can be no Act of Parliament without the Sovereign's consent. There can be no Parliament without the Sovereign. Parliament means, Commons, Lords and the Sovereign. It cannot even function without the Sovereign's orders. But so far as the United Kingdom is concerned, the absolute powers which the Sovereign possessed with regard to the Legislature after a constitutional struggle between the Crown and its subjects in the United Kingdom were to a certain extent limited. It is not necessary for me to go into that limitation exercised by these subjects within the United Kingdom. From our constitutional point of view, the Sovereign has got the legislative power, but the Sovereign has no legislative function. I hope, Honourable Members will draw a clear distinction between the legislative power and the legislative function. So far as the United Kingdom is concerned, the legislative function was vested in the British Parliament, whereas, in possessions beyond the realm of the Kingdom of Great Britain, wherever the Sovereign has not created a Legislature, that legislative function is not satisfied, and, therefore, the legislative function is discharged by a vicarious authority, the British Parliament. I refer Honourable Members to Jenkins' "British Rule" and also to the leading cases on that subject noted therein. I particularly refer to the case, known as Sandy's case, where it was observed that where the sovereign creates a Legislature beyond the realm of the United Kingdom and vests in that possession a legislative body, the legislative function of the sovereign is satisfied. And what was more important for us was that it was clearly and specifically stated that even the Sovereign, which vests the legislative function in another legislature, had no power herself to withdraw those powers once vested. It may refuse to sanction their Acts, but cannot deprive the function once vested. Therefore, Sir, my submission is that there can be no doubt that that is the legal position and also the proper position and that is the legitimate attitude for any reasonable person to take, because there can be no two Legislatures in one State.

[Mr. B. Sitaramaraju.]

Either the British Parliament must legislate for us for all purposes or we must exercise those powers. There can be no partnership. If they exercise those powers and want to take us only into partnership, we respectfully submit that that is a position legally untenable, constitutionally improper and morally unjustified. In stating this position, I may mention that I am not the discoverer of this point of view. If Honourable Members only care to read the constitutional struggle which went on for nearly a hundred years between Great Britain and Ireland, between Britain and the Colonies, they will find that this is a point of view that was not only pressed hard on Britain but finally had to be conceded by the British Parliament. If Honourable Members look into the circumstances under which the Renunciation Act in the British Parliament was passed, so far as Ireland was concerned, the whole of the circumstances and the struggles which led to the passing of that Act by which the point of view had to be conceded that the British Parliament should not legislate for Ireland would be evident. Further, I do not refer to the question of the United States of America, because, the constitutional struggle between the United States of America and the United Kingdom did not take a peaceful course of a constitutional agitation, but a much more serious aspect. The result was the loss to the United Kingdom of a great empire in America ; but with regard to the various small mushroom colonies that are scattered all over the world, the struggle was very bitter. Finally, in their case also, the struggle compelled the Government of England to withdraw the Registry Bill which they had enacted in the British Parliament, giving ultimately the success to the point of view that Parliament should not legislate for them. The position of India is even stronger than that of these colonies. I consider it as even parallel to that of Ireland than the colonies. No doubt the Honourable the Law Member is very much amused, but I would like to point out again that the whole point is this.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Law Member) : I can assure him that I am not amused ; I am rather oppressed by the length of the Honourable Member's speech.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju : The whole point is this : that with regard to the various colonies and the British people settled in different parts of the country the law is that though they might have migrated from England, their own native home, still they are under law bound by the laws of the United Kingdom and they are expected to owe allegiance to the British constitution. But so far as India is concerned (I can say that it holds an exact parallel to Ireland), there is no inherent right for the British people to legislate for us and expect us to owe allegiance to the House of British representatives. The way in which this country was transferred to the Crown and the pledges that had been given would only make us feel that any act of legislation, when once a full-fledged legislature is created in India,—as we are expecting will be created now,—then the British Parliament should not have any interference with our Legislative Rights. In presenting this point of view, my main purpose is to have it on record, because I do consider that the British Parliament could not be said to have been encroaching very much prior to the year 1919, because the British Parliament on two occasions,—one on the question of the opium revenue and the other on the question of the Indian Civil Service,—passed

two motions, the one in the year 1892 and the other in 1894 ; in those days, the Government of India, being a strong government, did not allow the British Parliament to interfere with them, and the two motions which were passed by the British Parliament were not accepted by the then Government of India. So much regarding Parliamentary control prior to 1919.

Of late, the Government of India are only holding a watching brief for the Secretary of State and His Majesty's Government. A new orientation had taken place from the year 1919. For the first time, in 1919, when the salary of the Secretary of State was transferred from the Indian Revenues to the British estimates, the first link of controlling this country by the British Parliament was forged and the subsequent legislation of which this Navy Act is an important piece, and the legislation that is now contemplated are further measures to bring in more provisions to effectively control this country and bring it under the subjection of the British democracy more and more.

Without detaining the House longer, I wish briefly to state that this point of view that the British Parliament should not encroach upon our legislative rights, the principle fought by Ireland and the Colonies in the past was not pressed by us so far because the justification or cause for it has been only forcing itself upon us since 1919. Therefore, I wish to point out that the more control the British Parliament try to exercise, the greater will be the incentive to press this point of view, and, I wish to have it on record that this point of view is not only legitimate, but is just. With these words, I oppose the motion.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, before I deal with this matter, I desire to offer my congratulations to the Army Secretary, Colonel Lumby, for his very excellent speech, and for the very lucid way in which he explained what has been to this House a sealed book, and also for the very fair and square manner in which he tried to dispel the suspicions that have been lurking in the minds of Members on all sides of the House. Having said this, Sir, let me remind Honourable Members that there is a common saying in colloquial English, when a thing is really not what it really is, *i.e.*, when it is a gross exaggeration or incorrect statement, to retort : " Tell it to the Horse Marines ". I was tempted to ask, in view of the Royal Indian Marine never having, in the past, played the part of a Navy, whether this saying had its birth in the Royal Indian Marine in the past—not in the present, which, under the present able Vice-Admiral, is an effective Force. This Bill to my mind is meant to change the name of Royal Indian Marine into the Royal Indian Navy and to give statutory effect to the Indian Naval Discipline Act and so afford the Flag Officer Commanding the Squadron power to deal with his own budget without being, in any way, subordinate to the Commander-in-Chief for the expenditure of his annual budget of 67 lakhs. This object of the Bill, I am sure, will find support from all parts of the House. But let us see what the Royal Indian Marine really is. Very few people know that its ships are known in Bombay as the white elephants of the Government of India. It has a number of sloops, five I believe, one Depôt Ship and two patrol boats. It is doubtful whether a change of name is going to improve its efficiency and make it more attractive to the youth of India : I hope so. The Royal Indian Marine,

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

Sir, has had a very chequered career, as the last speaker pointed out. Indeed, history tells us that in the year 1830, it was called the Indian Navy. The present Royal Indian Marine had its life from, I think, 1686, when it was used to defend the trade of India against pirates, especially some very notorious pirates, one in particular named Angria. From that time onwards, it has been called by different names, until in 1929 a Bill was presented to this House, that had already passed both Houses of Parliament, but which was thrown out by this House by one vote. But despite that, the Indian Government, with the permission of the Home Government and the Admiralty, did effect certain changes in the Royal Indian Marine, in that it gave permission to its officers to wear the same uniform, but with different buttons to the Royal Navy, and His Majesty allowed the Royal Indian Marine ships to fly the White Penant and Ensign, and, so, we see the Royal Indian Marine as it presents itself today for improvement and conversion into the Royal Indian Navy. I mean its past position, almost like the Portuguese Navy consisting of Admirals and Captains and a host of other officers, but with no ships or men. But the Royal Indian Marine today, Sir, is a much improved and efficient arm of maritime defence. It has certain distinctive features and certain distinctive functions to perform. I think I am right in saying that its function is not a naval one. It is mainly employed in sweeping mine, for which they have a staff of officers which compares favourably with the Grand Fleet, and is also trained in signalling, gunnery and musketry training and so forth, but to say that it is a Navy in the strict sense of the term is absolutely wrong. Sir, I will not weary the House by going into the details of the composition of the Royal Indian Marine, except to say that of the sloops it possesses today though most of them are seaworthy, they take no part in defending the coasts of India, which maritime defence has been entrusted, since 1869, to the Royal Navy. Now, in introducing this Bill, the desire of the Honourable the Army Secretary and the Government of India is to so improve the Royal Indian Marine that it will form the nucleus of an Indian Navy. The Honourable Member has explained to us, with great emphasis and force, that the Royal Indian Marine today is not very attractive to the Indian lad, that ever since it was thrown open to competitive examination, only 51 candidates have appeared as officers and three have been selected, and that the total of Indian officers and officers-designate is fourteen. Sir, in this connection, I would like to point out that the Officer-personnel of the Royal Indian Marine is 118. The total ratings is 1,011, which gives a proportion of one officer to ten men. Now, what I would like to point out to the Honourable Member is this,—much as I agree with him that it is necessary to improve the Royal Indian Marine and to make it more attractive to the youth of India, I think, it would be much better, if one started the change not from the top, but from the bottom. We have in the Royal Indian Marine five sloops and three or four other smaller vessels, but this small Fleet has an officer-personnel out of all proportion and needs to its total strength of 1,011. Indeed it is so top-heavy with officers, as to amount to financial profligacy and, in my opinion, could, without loss of efficiency, be halved. It has a Vice-Admiral and various other staff officers, as Chief of the Staff, etc., and it seems to me that this personnel is an extravagance. I would suggest that in this Bill, we of the Committee, should be allowed to modify it in such a

way that we might be able to create a Navy starting from the bottom, with more ships and more men and not such a surfeit of officers.

An Honourable Member : Where is the money ?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : I know, the Army Secretary will say that this is impossible owing to financial stringency, but, then, why have a Navy in name and not in game. My desire is, if this Bill is to go to a Select Committee, that the Select Committee should be empowered to make modifications and recommendations which are outside the purview of this Bill. I think this will serve a very useful purpose. I, myself, think that we should really concentrate our attention more on the ships and their personnel, the lower personnel, than add to the cost of officers, as the cost is already hopelessly extravagant.

This Bill, when it was presented in 1928-29, was rejected by a margin, as the last speaker rightly pointed out, for various reasons, by a margin of one vote. The first reason was slowness of Indianisation. The Honourable the Army Member has rightly pointed out that the personnel of this fleet is so small that we cannot possibly satisfy all communal demands. That we will have 14 Indian Officers out of 117 officers in the immediate future, I think, shows a very rapid pace of Indianisation. I want Members on the Opposite Benches to realise that no Navy can be built in one day or a month or a year. It took hundreds of years for the British Navy to achieve its present perfect standard, and we must not think, when the pace of Indianisation is not to our liking, that the Government is not encouraging Indianisation. A too precipitous Indianisation would only ruin the object we all have in view. Sir, if we were to encourage and rapidly Indianise the Indian Navy as some Opposition Members demand, *i.e.*, before they obtain their sea-legs, we would find most of the crew still suffering from mal-demere, or, to put it humorously, indulging in that naval song " a return of the swallow " (sea-sickness).

Sir, what we really want is a steady pace in Indianisation, because as in the Army so in the Navy, you must learn to crawl before you can walk, and you have to walk before you can jump. And we must not, in our desire to too rapidly Indianise the Navy, think that we can build a Navy all at once and recruit it entirely from Indians. Let us see what Indianisation of the R. I. Marine has really achieved. The lower ratings, about 900 strong, are entirely Indians. These Indian ratings are recruited mainly from two communities, Goanese and Muhammadans. The Muhammadans come from the Ratnagiri Coast and are the descendants of the old Mahratta pirates—they make excellent seamen. In this connection, may I point out to the Honourable Member, that he is recruiting Goanese from Goa, which is not a part of British India. I do not object to them. But by recruiting non-domiciled Goanese my Honourable friend is violating the order of the Home Department of the Government of India, which states that no foreigner can be enlisted in the Government of India without the sanction of the Home Department of the Government of India. I make this statement deliberately and purposefully, because, I ask, when you can get the best kind of recruits from Muhammadans in India, why should you recruit for the Royal Indian Marine from a country, Portuguese Goa, that is foreign to British India? I should like the Army Member seriously to consider this point. The Government may talk about Indianisation, and try to do all they can in the new Bill, but the present Bill falls far short of the Air Force Act. The Air Force Act, when it was passed, gave us

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

great hopes, with an assurance, that the personnel would be recruited entirely from Indians, and when eligible Indians were not available, the British Royal Air Force would loan us personnel. This Bill, as far as Indianisation is concerned, falls far short in comparison of the desire of all of us, because it still intends to recruit most of its personnel from England and it is not a true, but a camouflaged attempt at Indianisation of the new Royal Indian Navy. Let me give you another instance of this camouflaged Indianisation, and I do so with all respect to the Honourable the Army Secretary, because I know he is sincere in his desire to Indianise the Royal Indian Navy. This incident happened sometime ago, not during his tenure of office. A few years ago, in 1924, one superior and seven wireless operators for the Royal Indian Marine were lent by the Posts and Telegraphs Department, they consisted mainly of members of the Anglo-Indian Community. In 1928, it was suddenly discovered that these men,—many of whom had served in the wireless stations in the remote coasts of Burma and Persia and other remote parts of the Indian Empire and had proved useful wireless operators,—were inefficient and incapable of doing the work of Royal Indian Marine wireless operators, and the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs decided that they should not continue the work and they were, in 1931, replaced by *ex*-naval ratings who were brought out from England on a high salary of Rs. 250 per mensem *plus* Rs. 60 rations. Does the Army Member call this a serious attempt at Indianisation? I call it an insult to one's intelligence and unworthy of any Director General of Posts and Telegraphs to undervalue his men. I hope the Honourable Member will consider this in his future efforts of Indianising India's new Navy.

The second reason for rejecting the Bill in 1929 was the cost. I know that some Members in this House consider the cost of the Royal Indian Marine to be exorbitant, but the Honourable Member has assured us that there will be no additional cost by the passage of this Bill. That means, in other words, that the development of the Indian Navy will be static. There will be no advance or serious attempt to give India a real Navy. I do not think that any Member of this House would be against starting a Navy which is to be really an Indian navy, provided the cost is within reasonable limits. I think, a Member in the 1929 debate said, that it did not matter whether it cost rupees two crores, he would be prepared to vote this amount for a navy on real lines and not a navy in name. Rs. 67 lakhs is the cost for the maintenance of the Royal Indian Marine and India gives an additional annuity of £100,000 to the British Government for the maintenance of the East Indian Squadron and the maritime protection of her enormous coast line. Personally, I think, that India receives a great deal for the little that she gives, because just conceive of the thousands and thousands of miles of Indian coast that the British Royal Navy is protecting at the ridiculous cost of only £100,000? But I am not complaining of that. What I am complaining of is that today we are maintaining two Navies for the protection of the shores of India, the Royal Indian Marine and the East Indies Squadron. The Royal Indian Marine is commanded by a Flag Officer Commanding who draws a salary, excluding a handsome sumptuary allowance, of over Rs. 3,000 per mensem, and the East Indies Squadron is under a Vice-Admiral, who draws a salary of over Rs. 4,000 per mensem. Here we have two navies in two watertight compartments. Can you conceive of any Indian Army consisting of two separate armies

in two watertight compartments ? I think that we should in this committee realise that the time has come when India should make a serious and practical start to develop her own Navy and not maintain two navies. I mean a real Indian Navy of our own, trained, at first, by British Officers, but with a hope of complete Indianisation in the years to come.

But apart from the cost, the most serious objection to my mind that was expressed against this Bill in 1929 was the constitution, or, in other words, the control of the Navy. Mention has been made, both by the Army Secretary and by the last speaker, my Honourable friend, Mr. Raju, that this Navy Bill is before the Joint Parliamentary Committee. As a member who attended that Committee, I can assure the House that not a word was spoken about it in my hearing.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju : I never said that it was before the Joint Parliamentary Committee.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : I speak subject to correction, but I think, my Honourable friend said that his reason for objecting to this measure was to this effect : why hurry to pass this Bill when the matter is before the Joint Parliamentary Committee, or words to that effect.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju : What I said was that the Honourable the Army Secretary was not justified in anticipating the constitutional changes with regard to the control of the Army and Navy.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : If that be so, I stand corrected, but at the same time, the impression on my mind was this, that one of the chief objections the Honourable Member urged against the acceptance of this Bill was, why hurry with the measure when Government had already expressed their opinion that there was no necessity for such hurry ? If he is serious in this objection, I ask the Honourable Member, why does he hurry for Indianisation of the Army, why not wait till the constitutional changes are known to India ? Again why hurry for Indianisation of the Indian Air Force, why not wait till the new India Bill is passed ? Surely, if you are really in earnest to Indianise the Navy and to get some control, why do you want to wait till the report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee is out, why not make a beginning at once, why waste time ?

Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi (Madras Ceded Districts and Chittoor : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Because the Indian tax-payer pays every pie of the expenditure for the Army and the Air Forces, that is why we want Indianisation.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : I am glad the Honourable Member interrupted me with his observation, because that is just my view. I am with him in his desire to Indianise, but I ask him and the Opposition why delay and put forth as an excuse : " Let us wait for the report on the White Paper and the New India Act ? " Why not get a move now that we have this opportunity offered to us ?

Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi : Let the Government promise that the whole of the recruitment for the Navy hereafter will be Indian, then we shall give our support to it.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : I am afraid that the Honourable Member does not realise that you cannot make or
 12 Noon. Indianise a Navy overnight and that it will take many years before you can get a completely Indianised Navy. (Ironical " Hear,

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

hear" from the Opposition Benches.) Does the Opposition want a toy Navy as is the Royal Indian Marine today? Does it want Indian Admirals, etc., before they have even acquired their sea-legs? If so, such a Navy will be full of men who will spend most of their time indulging in the pastime, I have already referred to, viz., "a return of the swallow".

I see Mr. B. Das is loudest in his ironical "Hear, hear." I ask what does he—a land lubber—in particular, or any other in this House know about a Navy? We are laymen. But the Opposition in opposing this Bill are making use of the occasion, as a means to an end—regarding electioneering speeches and who stands more in need of such help than the camouflaged Congressite, Mr. B. Das?

Here, today, all of us are crying out for an Indian navy but the Honourable Member, Mr. Raju, in the course of his lengthy speech wants to delay the passage of this Bill, indeed to reject it. The Honourable the Army Secretary told us that the incompetency or rather the imperfections of the Royal Marine are largely due to the present state of things and that by passing this Bill he wants to make the Royal Indian Marine more attractive to Indian lads and more efficient. Then why on earth does the Honourable Member, Mr. Raju, indulge in dilatory tactics and ask the Government to wait for the report of the White Paper? You are not going to gain anything in that way at all. On the other hand, you are going to lose a lot.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division : Non-Muhammadan) : Thanks to your membership of the Round Table Conference?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : Yes, Sir, and thanks in abundance to the absence of Mr. B. Das from these Conferences, or who knows, coming as he does from the land of earthquakes and fissures, he may have demanded an Indianised Navy for his Province, Bihar and Orissa.

My Honourable friend, Sir Abdur Rahim, when he spoke on this Bill last time, said that the Bill was not self-contained. At the same time he said that he was in favour of the introduction of British discipline into Indian Navy. That means to say that on its merits, my Honourable friend accepts the Bill and so I say any other reasons for its delay are not real and not substantial, but sentimental and artificial. It would be, I agree, much better if we had a Bill before us such as the 1887 Indian Marine Act, which was really self-contained and which was based, more or less, on the British Naval Discipline Act. But, Sir, this should not deter us from accepting this Bill and sending it to the Select Committee, where we can have opportunities of voicing our opinions and raise other matters than those contained in the Bill; in short that our amendments will not be strictly confined to the disciplinary clauses of the Bill, as presented to this House.

Another objection that has been raised, but one in which I do not think there is much weight is this: A fear was expressed by certain Members of the House that, by passing this Bill, it was the desire of His Majesty's Government to make use of the new Royal Indian Navy as part of the Imperial Naval forces for outside Imperial purposes. The Honourable the Army Secretary has honourably assured us that this is not so though, in cases of emergency, it will be the duty of the Governor-General to use his prerogative, but we are further assured that before the Indian Navy would be used for outside purposes, this House will be given an opportunity to express its views and give its consent. What else do we

want and after that assurance surely this suspicion should not exist ? After all when one realises that the new Indian Navy will consist of a few sloops, with a small personnel and that the total power and personnel of the Indian Navy is not equal to one British warship, there is absolutely no substance in the fear expressed by the Honourable Members opposite and to express such a fear only expresses the weakness and hollowness of their opposition.

The Army Secretary has tried very sincerely and very candidly to dispel our suspicions. He has certainly dispelled my suspicion. (Laughter by Mr. B. Das.) I find my friend, Mr. B Das, laughing in his usual inimitable way. I do not care tuppence for Mr. Das's fear and suspicions. I personally have no cause to entertain any suspicions about the intention of Government. If you examine the outside opinions expressed on this Bill, it will be found it has earned the approval of many public bodies. The British Indian Association, which consists of the largest landlords of Eastern India, has, in its opinion, supported and given its blessing to the Bill and said that this is a move in the right direction. Indeed the Mahasabha has also supported it with certain stipulations. It certainly said that an Indian Navy, in reality and not only in name, was absolutely necessary for India. The Hindu Mahasabha in its report has certainly criticised certain aspects of this Bill, but, in the main it has supported its principles and admitted that such a move will give India its first step in the direction of creating and equipping its own Navy. Members on the opposite side who are opposing this Bill are, I venture to say, guided purely by sentimental and individual considerations. They do not seem to realise that, before India can acquire complete self-Government and be capable of undertaking her own defence, it must be in sole possession of its own Army and Navy. In stressing this point my desire is this : "to ask Members on the opposite side to dispel all suspicions left in their minds. My friend, Mr. Das, can talk more of earthquakes and things of that kind than of the Indian Navy, but I would ask even my friend, Mr. Das, to dispel all doubts and suspicions in his mind and whole-heartedly join the Government in its desire to give India its first step in the path of creating and maintaining its own Naval Force. I frankly admit that in changing the name of the Royal Indian Marine to that of the Royal Indian Navy will not avail us much. We do not want to start at the top and create a Board of Lords of the Admiralty. Let us have more ships and more men, but not more Admirals flying their flags on the heights of Simla, as in the *past* and as in the case of the Swiss Navy. I would ask my friends on the opposite side to view this matter not in an individualistic spirit, but in a national spirit, as I am trying to do. This Bill, if passed by this House, I am sure, would be to the eternal credit and blessing of India, and I do believe, even in its present form, that it presents no insuperable obstacle to the unanimous acceptance of this House to place it in the hands of a Select Committee, where we could but try our utmost to mould it to suit our needs. I, myself, feel that Government is to be congratulated on this its very helpful effort to assist us on our way to the attainment of self-Government in our country—India—whose interests we, in our own lights, are trying to serve. Sir, I support the Bill.

Sir Hari Singh Gour (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions : Non-Muhammadian) : Sir, if I intervene in this debate, I do so with a full sense of my responsibility and I would ask Honourable Members on this side of the House, as well as on the other side of the House, to

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

realise the implications of this Bill and to bring to bear upon the consideration of this Bill a few salient facts which I shall present to them. Honourable Members are aware that in 1925 and 1926 a departmental committee was appointed, presided over by the then Commander-in-Chief, Lord Rawlinson, which decided on the reconstruction of the Royal Indian Marine as a combatant force, to enable India to enter upon the first stage of her own naval development, and, ultimately, to undertake her own naval defence. The departmental committee decided that India must pay for her own naval defence, and, in consequence of the decision of this committee, the Government of India moved the Secretary of State to amend section 66 of the Government of India Act, and I will present to Honourable Members the *ipsissima verba* of the Under Secretary of State for India when moving for the second reading of the amended section 66 of the Government of India Act, the true object and purpose the Government had in view in making the amendment. Let me give you his own words. The Under Secretary of State for India said on the 9th March, 1927.—I am reading from the House of Commons Debates, page 1269 :

“ I come now to the reasons for the creation of this new force, for the re-creation of the Indian Navy. After the War, for various reasons, the question of reorganizing the Royal Indian Marine as a combatant naval force, able to take its place among other navy forces of the Empire, came to the fore. It was examined by Lord Jellicoe in 1919, and by two separate Naval Commanders-in-Chief on the East Indian Station in 1922 and 1924. I think it was, as a result of the recommendations of the last of the two authorities, the Officer Commanding the Naval Force of the East Indian Station in 1924, that a scheme was laid before a Departmental Committee in India, with Lord Rawlinson as Chairman and with the Naval Commander-in-Chief among its members. The outcome was that the Committee's report was accepted by the Secretary of State, by the First Lord of the Admiralty and by the Government of India, and the announcement of the intentions of the Government was made in February, 1926. The policy declared in the announcement followed the recommendations of the Imperial Conference of 1923 and 1926, which were to the effect that the primary responsibility rests on each part of the Empire for its own local naval defence.”

Now, if I may supplement these words, I would point out to the Honourable Members on this side of the House that, immediately after the close of the War, two Committees were appointed. One was presided over by Lord Esher and the other by Lord Jellicoe. Earl Winterton was dealing with the Committee of Lord Jellicoe, and I am now anxious to recall the cognate recommendation of the Committee presided over by Lord Esher. These two combined Committees recommended that in all cases the combined forces of the Empire should be under Imperial control, and that the Army in India and the Army in England should, as regards its equipment and training, be such as to be able to take its field alongside the British Army in case of a national emergency. That was a recommendation which alarmed the First Assembly. Therefore, a Committee was immediately appointed on the motion of one of us, and on that Committee, we steadily protested against the subordination of the Indian Army for Imperial purposes. That Committee was presided over by the then Army Secretary, Sir Godfrey Fell, and, with the consent—mark the words—with the consent of Mr. Montagu, the then Secretary of State for India, we drew up a number of recommendations, one of which was, that the main purpose and the sole purpose of the Army of India was the defence of India. We then demanded that the Army of India should be brought under the same control of the Indian Legislature, and that fight, which began in the First Assembly of 1921, has continued down today.

My friend, Sir Henry Gidney, has told us that he was a Member of the Joint Select Committee of Parliament and not a word was said as to the future control of the Army and Navy of India. . . .

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : Not the Army.

Sir Hari Singh Gour : of the Navy of India. Sir, I wish to point out to the Honourable Members of this House that that it is the established policy of His Majesty's Government that the Navy in India should be subject to the same control as the Army in India. Now let me give you the exact words to which I wish to draw your attention. The Under Secretary of State, dealing with the same point, at page 1271, expressed himself in the following terms :

“ Someone may ask what opportunity will be given to the Legislature in India to deal with the Bill. The opportunity will be this. In the first place, this Bill cannot come into effective operation in India without consequential legislation by the Assembly, and when that Bill is discussed by the Assembly, there will be full opportunity of discussing the whole question of the Indian Navy. In addition, this new Indian Navy will be in exactly the same position in relation to the Assembly as the Indian Army is at present.”

Those are the words of the Under Secretary of State for India, and Honourable Members can now visualize what their predicament would be if they became a consenting party to the creation of an Indian Navy, in which case the position of the Legislative Assembly would be exactly parallel to the position in which they stand in relation to the Army in India. They will vote supplies, or if they do not, they will be certified, and if the strictly logical out-come of the Government of India Act is followed, the Navy Budget will be non-votable, as is the Army Budget. Now, Sir, I wish, therefore, to point out to this House that if it becomes a consenting party to the passage of this Bill, they will be creating an Indian Navy for which they will have no responsibility and over which they will exercise no control. My friend, Sir Henry Gidney, and other Members on this side of the House have been asking for the Indianization of the Navy. That does not disturb me in the least. If every member of the Indian Navy was an Indian, I should not feel happy so long as the Indian Legislative Assembly had no control over its own defence, whether the Army or the Navy or the Air Force. (Hear, hear.) What the Indian public demands is control over the Army, control over the Navy and control over the Air Force. The Indian Army Act has been passed by the Government of India without the consent of this House. We have got, therefore, no responsibility for the Indian Army. But would you be willing partners in the passage of the Indian Navy Bill, the result of which would be to exclude the Indian Legislative Assembly from all control over the Indian Navy ? That is the short question that I ask my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney ? Is he prepared or is he not prepared ?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : I do not quite follow you.

Sir Hari Singh Gour : I would ask any Member of this House whether he is prepared to give his *imprimatur* to the Indian Navy Bill on the condition which would apply to the Indian Navy, namely, that this House will have no vote or voice in the control of the Indian Navy, and that the Indian Navy will be treated exactly on the same footing as is the Indian Army at the present moment ? (A Voice : “ Indian Army is non-votable.”) My friend says in helplessness that the Indian Army is non-votable. But will you create an Indian Navy, an offspring of the

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

elected majority of Indian Legislative Assembly, and consent to its becoming as non-votable as is the Indian Army? That is the question to which I would ask for a reply. Will any Member of this House get up and say that he is quite prepared to give to the Government of India, irresponsible as they are to this House, the power to bring into existence the Indian Navy which would be entirely independent of the vote of this House and irresponsible to its views? That, I submit, is the main question. I am not in the slightest degree perturbed by the question of Indianization or control or whether a few ratings were Indians or non-Indians. I am more concerned with the question of policy. So long as you have created an Indian Navy, you are responsible for it and not we, but when you come to us and ask us for our vote, and when after that vote you create an Indian Navy, you would then tell us tomorrow that this Indian Navy has been created not by us but by the vote of the Assembly, and that it knew that this Indian Navy would be exactly on the same terms and maintained on the same conditions as is the Indian Army of today. That, I submit, is a short question and let every Member in this House think over it. I appeal to every elected Member of this House, including Sir Henry Gidney.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : I am not an elected Member.

Sir Hari Singh Gour : Yes, you are not. But I ask every elected Member whether he is prepared to bring into existence a new force over which he will have no control whatever? That, I submit, is the genesis of this Bill. In the House of Commons, when section 66 of the Government of India Act was sought to be amended by the Conservative Government, loud protests were raised by Mr. Lansbury and by Mr. Wheatley. Let me give you two passages from the criticism of one of the Members of the House of Commons, and you will then realise that when they, your friends in the House of Commons, represented your views and challenged the Conservative Government to pass into a legislative measure a Bill which would exclude the Indian Legislature from any control over the policy of the Indian Navy, what did the Government say? In answer to him, the Under Secretary of State for India said :

“ I did not want to bring this Navy Bill in the House of Commons, but I do so because the people of India want it.”

That was the statement made in 1927, a statement which was challenged and successfully challenged by your predecessors in 1928. Mr. Wheatley, speaking on this Bill, said as follows :

“ I submit that if the Government resists this amendment, then the title of the Bill is a misuse of words. The supreme control of the Navy surely indicates its ownership.”

That is to say, the Indian Navy, which you will create and for which you will pay, will be under the supreme control of the British Admiralty. Let them create a Navy of their own, let them tax the people of India, but let it not be with the willing consent of the elected Members of this House. That is our only objection. We are powerless at the present moment to resist the actions of the Government of India, but we have a responsibility to our own people and, as elected representatives of the people, we must not forget that we are giving the irresponsible executive

a further power and control over the finances of this country. Mr. Wheatley further said :

“If the supreme control is to be vested in this House, then this Navy ceases to be an Indian Navy and becomes for all practical purposes a British Navy. It is surprising that the policy outlined here should emanate from the Conservative Party. India is to be asked to pay entirely for its ships and its Navy. Every penny of the cost is to be met from revenue collected from the poor Indian people. (*Of whom you are the representatives : forget not.*) The Conservative Party comes along and asks us to accept the principle that, although the Navy is paid for by India and according to all the rules of propriety should, therefore, belong to India, we should insist on the right, when it suited our purpose, to be entitled to confiscate this Navy.”

In the time of war, and on any occasion, it will be a part of the British Navy although paid for by India and created by the willing co-operation of the elected representatives of the people of India. In another passage, Mr. Wheatley went on to say :

“I want to take this opportunity of entering a most emphatic protest against the provisions of this measure. I do not know what case was or could be made out for the Indian Navy, but I know that no case can be made out for an Indian Navy which is not under the control of the Indian people. What we are asked to do here is simply farcical.”

So, you are asked to do here what is simply farcical. Vote for the Bill and create a Navy and then wash your hands of it. Sir, I cannot for a moment bring myself to believe that there will be one single Member in this House representing his constituency who would be a willing partner to the creation of such an Indian Navy and upon such terms. Now, listen to Mr. Wheatley's words :

“We are asked to subscribe to a situation in which there will be an Indian Navy which may be taken away by the very people, who in certain conceivable circumstances may be India's chief enemy, and used by these people, while they retain in their power the right to say who is to pay for the Navy during the time it is being used without the consent of the Indian people.”

When this question was put, the Honourable the Secretary of State, I think with his tongue in his cheek, said this is the Navy which is being created with the consent of the people of India and if the people of India do not want it they will say so. This is the opportunity for you, the accredited voice of the people of India to say whether you want an Indian Navy upon these terms.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : Or do you want an Indian Navy at all ?

Sir Hari Singh Gour : We do want an Indian Navy which we will control.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : May I ask my Honourable friend if he will tell me whether he knows of any Indian Legislator or Legislatures in India, possessing adequate knowledge to control and administer any Navy ? To my mind, he knows what I say is correct.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar (Madras City : Non-Muhammadian Urban) : Does the British Parliament possess that knowledge ?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : There are duds there, but they have an Admiralty to advise them.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar : Here also there are some duds.

Sir Hari Singh Gour : Can my Honourable friend show me any part of the British Empire possessing the dignity which India does and which has an irresponsible Central Government like what we are blessed with here ? (Laughter.)

An Honourable Member : Irremovable executive.

Sir Hari Singh Gour : It is the same as an irresponsible Central Government. Now, I wish to point out that the Under Secretary of State for India in answer to the criticisms which were hurled against him from the Labour Benches said :

“ May I say in conclusion that I commend the Bill to the House for the reason that to the best of my belief,”

—mark the words, “ to the best of my belief ”,—

“ and the belief of my noble friend, the Secretary of State for India, and of the Government of India, it is desired by the people of India.”

The Under Secretary of State for India, in sponsoring this Bill for the creation of an irresponsible Indian Navy, permitted himself to say that he was acting as the agent of the people of India, and the Government of India in 1927 assured the Secretary of State that the people of India wanted such a Bill. Now, Sir, I need not comment upon this startling disclosure. Where did the people of India want to pay for an Indian Navy over which they will have no control, and which as it was pointed out in the House of Commons will be a part and parcel of the British Navy ? Sir, Honourable Members on this side of the House have been raising various questions in connection with this Navy, and, on a previous occasion, the Army Secretary said that there is no large policy involved and that it is just a change in name. But I will ask the Army Secretary to answer one question. If we permit him to change the name, in view of the commitments made in the House of Commons and the purpose adumbrated by the Under Secretary of State for India speaking on behalf of the British Government in the House of Commons, should we not be committing ourselves to the creation of an Indian Navy which will be wholly irresponsible to this House ? The second question that I wish to ask is this. It was said on the last occasion by the predecessor of our Honourable friend, Colonel Lumby, that there was nothing at all except a change of name and nothing further was intended or was implied. I have already pointed out to this House that that must have been a statement made under a misapprehension of facts. The object of it was very clearly stated in the House of Commons. The object of it was very clearly stated by the Departmental Committee over which Lord Rawlinson presided and, now, when the Army Secretary comes before us and says, it means no more cost beyond the cost that India is incurring and it simply means a change of name, we gasp for breath and ask ourselves one question. The Army Secretary of today may be succeeded by the Army Secretary of tomorrow and what will the Army Secretary of tomorrow say ? This bright jewel, this diadem in the British Crown, calls itself as being the owner of an Indian Navy with two sloops, and nothing more Gilbertian and nothing more farcical than this is conceivable. You, gentlemen, have agreed to create an Indian Navy. I am naturally bound now to create an Indian Navy worthy of the name. (Hear, hear.) The future Army Secretary will say so and if such a question is put what answer will you give ?

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar : None.

Sir Hari Singh Gour : You will conceal your head in shame when you walk into the beautifully prepared parlour of the Army Secretary who says, walk into this and enjoy yourself and do not live in the wilderness. Sir, if this Bill is enacted into law, it will create a precedent unparalleled in the history of British Parliamentary institutions in that it would create an institution irresponsible and uncontrollable by the Legislature which gave birth to it. I ask, therefore, every Member of the House, to seriously consider before he passes his vote in favour of this motion. Sir, it is not a mere change of name nor indeed it has no additional pecuniary commitments. The Indian Navy, as was stated by the Departmental Committee, must be self-contained and self-supporting. I am not here free to speculate but every reader of newspaper knows what is going on in the Disarmament Conference in Europe and what a pathetic sight India presents as a Member of the League of Nations which costs to India 14 lakhs per annum.

Mr. S. C. Mitra (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : India is an Original Member of the League of Nations.

Sir Hari Singh Gour : In 1921, India became, and was acclaimed to the world as a self-governing Dominion, and, therefore, an original foundation Member of the League of Nations. But where is the vote of India and who is responsible for the vote of India? Who casts the vote of India? It is the Secretary of State. (Laughter.) India has the pleasure and the honour of paying 14 lakhs per annum, but poor unfortunate India has never known the blessings of the League of Nations beyond paying an annual contribution of 14 lakhs. (Hear, hear.) The Disarmament Conference has been going on in Europe and will result in the establishment of a quota for Great Britain. If such a thing happens, we can well understand that India as a foundation Member of the League of Nations will be given two dreadnoughts or so many cruisers to be the possessor of the Indian Navy. And it will be said, before the Disarmament Conference, that this is the Navy of Great Britain and this is the Navy of India. Remember, Sir, India has suffered a great deal in the past by her glorification of status to an equality with the other self-governing Dominions of the British Commonwealth; but do not fall into this trap once more, because the moment you create an Indian Navy you will be liable to a certain quota, a quota for which you will pay and a quota for which you will not be responsible. I, therefore, feel that, when I see the environments around me, the powers in the East and the Far East arming themselves for the coming conflict, when I see the drastic and desperate efforts being made in the West for the limitation of armaments, that India may not, in a moment of hurry and scanty consideration, lend itself to a policy in which the revenues of India will be hypothecated but the people of India will gain nothing from the creation of an institution called the Indian Navy. I would ask every Member, occupying the Opposition Benches, to cast his vote against this motion. (Loud Applause.)

Mr. B. V. Jadhav (Bombay Central Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I rise to support this motion for reference to the Select Committee. This Bill has been seriously criticised on this side of the House and many Members have brought in your name and reminded the House that you took an important and leading part in opposing the Bill, when it came up before this House in 1929. But, Sir, it is well-known

[Mr. B. V. Jadhav.]

that much water has flown under the bridges since then and I do not know, whether if you had an opportunity now of sitting on the front Opposition Benches, you would have maintained the same attitude as you did on the last occasion. Men learn by experience and strong men are not unwilling to correct their wrong opinions formed on former occasions. One of my friends, who is an Executive Councillor in Madras, has recently given an instance in point. On former occasions, he had maintained that Andhra ought to be made a separate Province, but on this occasion, he reconsidered the whole position and re-examined all the facts and came to the conclusion that it would be disastrous to the interests of Andhra Province and to the Madras Presidency generally to separate that Province and other Provinces on a linguistic basis ; and he had the moral courage to say that he had changed his opinion.

Much of the opposition has been based upon sentiment. As the Honourable Justice Din Muhammad has described in his opinion :

“ The criticisms directed against the Bill, both when it was first introduced in 1928 as well as at the time of its present introduction, appear to me to be based more on sentimental grounds than on sound reason.”

And I say, Sir, that even the principle of this Bill is based upon sentiment. What is the principle of the Bill ? The principle is that the forces hitherto known as the Royal Indian Marine should henceforth be called the Royal Indian Navy. And the reason given is that it will add prestige to the men and officers in the Royal Marine, and so on. This again, I say, is a sentiment. Some may even ask, what is in a name and why change the name ? But then, as it has been pointed out, it is a sentiment and I myself honour that sentiment. There is something in that name, and the change from the name of Royal Indian Marine to Royal Indian Navy means a great deal to the personnel of that force. Now, Sir, the opposition is based first on the ground that this House was not consulted by the Home Government, before they introduced legislation to amend section 66 of the Government of India Act in the British Parliament. The only way in which this House could have been consulted was to bring a Resolution for discussion in this House whether in the opinion of this House it was necessary to change the name of “ the Royal Indian Marine ” to the “ Royal Indian Navy ”. I think that was the only course open, if it was intended to consult this House. The vote of this House could not have been taken on the introduction of a Bill for that purpose by the House, because this House at that time did not possess any authority to legislate on the navy question. The powers of this House are limited by the provisions of the Government of India Act, and until the amendment in section 66 of the Government of India Act was passed by Parliament, this House was not in a position to consider any question relating to the Indian Navy. From the tactical point of view, I do think that it would have been better for the Secretary of State and the Government of India to have consulted this House ; but it is well-known in European politics that England is very blunt and is very wrong-headed in these respects. Had Lord Curzon, for instance, when he took over the lease of Berar from the Nizam, consulted the people of Berar as to whether they were willing to go under the administration of His Exalted Highness the Nizam, I am quite sure that the overwhelming majority would have voted in favour of not going under the administration of His Exalted Highness. But, Lord Curzon, as is well-known, was an Imperialist and

quite indifferent to the views of the public, and, therefore, without consulting the people or ascertaining their views he took over the perpetual lease of Berar from the Nizam. This has led to a number of difficulties all of which would have been avoided if he had taken a plebiscite or tried to ascertain the views of the people then. The result would have been the same. People would have remained under British administration : there would have been a few people—I should say, a microscopic minority—who would have voted in favour of the transfer, and Lord Curzon would have been justified in taking over the lease and that question would have been settled for ever. But as is well-known, the Englishman is rather clumsy, and, therefore, is rather callous or indifferent to the views of others. He thinks that as he is doing good in his own way for the welfare of others, they ought to be satisfied and grateful to him. There he commits a mistake, but I do not think that mistake can be cured by any criticism in this House.

Then, another objection to this measure is that the future Navy of India will not be under the control of this House. It is well-known that the three branches of defence, viz., Army, Air Force and the Navy ought to work as a united whole. It cannot be partitioned, especially in the matter of control. The control for all these services ought to be in one hand, and I shall be very glad when the whole control will be in the hands of the Government of India, responsible to this House. But until that time comes, I do not see that it will conduce to the discipline and well-being of any branch of the service to be separated in the matter of control—in fact to have divided control. The control over the Army at present is with the Government of India nominally, but really with the Army Council in England ; and this condition, it is evident, is to continue for some time longer. A beginning has been made to Indianise the Army ; but the pace has been kept so very slow, and the number of officers which will be required to Indianise the officer ranks has been increased to 2 1/3 times more, so that it is very difficult to calculate how many years it will take to Indianise the Indian Army. Then, there is the question of the British Army, and so on. The pace, I think, has been kept very slow in the Army, and so also in the case of this proposed Indian Navy, or as for the present day Royal Indian Marine, it is also very very slow. The Honourable the Army Secretary has promised that the pace will be quickened, but the chief complaint is that young men of the requisite standard do not come forward. He has admitted that for the lower ranks, for the lascars and so on, the material is very good and plentiful. But his complaint is that for the higher ranks the material is not sufficient. I may point out to him that, in the case of sea service, it will not be easy to find material ready at hand. People who have a liking for the sea are to be found on the sea coast and especially among the fisher folk. These communities are quite illiterate, and steps will have to be taken by the Government by granting scholarships and other methods to educate the young boys from among these classes. My friend, Mr. B. Das, whose Province of Orissa is on the sea coast will be of much help to Government if they care to consult him in this respect

Mr. B. Das : I am going to oppose the Bill : you will see later on.

Mr. B. V. Jadhav : But do not oppose the education of the fisher folk.

Mr. B. Das : That will be a provincial subject : I will see to it.

Mr. B. V. Jadhav : In the Province of Bombay too, much can be done in this respect. The Indian Marine Department has recognised the qualities of the Mussalman fishermen and boatmen on the Ratnagiri coast and the lower ranks are almost wholly manned by them. The other Hindu communities, such as the Bhandaris, the Kharvis, and the Daldis, and the Mahrattas on that side too, have a good deal of knowledge of the sea, and, if proper encouragement is given, I do not think that they will fail to supply the right sort of material for the officers ranks in the future Indian Navy. At present, the selection is left to a body, which sits at Imperial Delhi and is disposing of matters affecting the sea. Let them hold the examination at Bombay, or Calcutta, or Puri or Madras, and perhaps they may find more plentiful material coming forward.

Indians in former times have had their navies. It is well-known that
 1 P.M. the ancestors of the Chief of Janjira were admirals in the service of the Great Moghuls, and the founder of the Mahratta Empire, Shivaji, started his own navy when he realised the importance of it. That Navy was guarding the western coast of India, and proved itself an eyesore to the East India Company. It was a pity, Sir, that that navy was allowed to be annihilated by the later rulers at Poona, and there they took the help of the East India Company in putting it down. The commanders of that navy and the captains of the ships were all Indians and were drawn from the western coast of India, and they had at that time proved themselves quite efficient and quite able enough to fight with the ships of the East India Company. The scions of those houses will be very proud indeed to continue the history of their past services, and if proper steps are taken, I do not think that there will be a lack of suitable material coming forward to officer the Indian Navy.

At present, the strength of the Royal Indian Marine is very small, and I agree with my friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, that at some future time, the Government may come forward and ask for some money and more grants to enlarge it and to fit it for the exalted name of an Indian Navy. But, Sir, there is no standard laid down as to how many ships, big and small, should constitute a navy. Small States in Europe and America have got very small personnel in their navy, and still they call themselves nations with a navy of their own.

As for the danger that as India is a member of the League of Nations and that in the future Disarmament Conference India will be allotted a quota which she would have to maintain, I think the quota will not go by dominion, but it will be for the whole of the British Empire Navy. It is well-known that all the constituent parts of the British Empire have got their armies and they have also got their naval forces, but when an emergency arises, and the forces of the whole Empire are mobilised, all these forces are pooled together and used against the common enemy. Therefore, I do not think, Sir, there is any danger of our status at the League of Nations which we have acquired by paying an exorbitant price, and also by paying a subscription of about 14 lakhs a year, being a drag in our way or that it will tie round our neck a bigger navy. I am not enamoured of this membership of the League of Nations, and I think that India does not derive an adequate benefit from it, and it would not be to our great loss if India were allowed to withdraw from her membership of the League of Nations. But, I do not think that in the matter of the Navy, the membership of the League of Nations will be prejudicial to us.

and that in any future decision that may be arrived at by the Disarmament Commission, if it ever succeeds, it will put down a quota of bigger ships and bigger equipment for India.

The Army Secretary, Sir, has assured us that for the present, for a few years more, there will be no increase in the expenditure on the Indian Marine. I am ready to accept that assurance. I see that the present personnel is paid on the same scale as corresponding officers of the Royal Navy, and, therefore, by the change in nomenclature, there need not be any extra expenditure. What will take place ten years hence, one cannot say.

As regards the control, I need not say anything further. It is a great constitutional question, and it will have to be fought out constitutionally, but for the present, I think, the change asked for may be allowed by this House.

Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar (Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, most of the previous speakers dealt at great length with the Bill from a legal and constitutional point of view, but my object in rising to speak on this measure is to make a few observations in support of the Bill, entirely from the defence of India point of view. Sir, the Bill under discussion had its origin as far back as 1925, when, as my friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, said a departmental Committee was appointed by the Government of India under one of the greatest soldiers, I mean the late Lord Rawlinson, the then Commander-in-Chief, but my friend did not explain the object of the Committee. Sir, that Committee was appointed with the object of drawing up a scheme for the conversion of the Royal Indian Marine into a permanent fighting unit to be trained and employed on such service as that sort of force could undertake with that small strength and also without a considerable increase in the cost. At that time, it was also contemplated that by this means the nucleus of an Indian Navy more or less analogous to the naval forces of the Self-Governing Dominions would be provided for India and thus the reconstruction of the Royal Indian Marine as a combatant force would enable India to enter upon the first stage of her naval forces, and eventually to defend the coasts of India. That was the kernel of the whole problem. Now, this Committee presented its Report in 1925, and during the next two years the re-organization of the Royal Indian Marine force was carried out.

Sir, in 1927 a Bill was passed in Parliament amending section 66 of the Government of India Act which made provision for bringing into existence of the Royal Indian Navy, and this amending Act, amongst other things, enacted that the Indian Legislature would have power to apply with necessary modification the British Naval Discipline Act to the proposed Royal Indian Navy. In 1928, Mr. G. M. Young, the then Army Secretary, introduced this Bill to provide for the application of the Naval Discipline Act to the Indian Navy. The question of a navy is of national importance. Naval defence involves, firstly, the maintenance of a fleet of war for guarding the country's shores from hostile invasion and the other is the protection of Indian shipping in Indian harbours and the convoy of sea borne trade in Indian waters. The enormous coastline of India would be peculiarly vulnerable in war, if any power attacked the Indian shores. The Emden's visit in 1914 is sufficient to show what a tremendous damage can be done even by isolated raiders.

Mr. B. Das : What was the British Navy doing then ?

Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar : Many thousands of people of Madras fled away within a few days of the Emden's attack.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar : All foreigners, people from the Punjab and other places.

Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar : I hope that my Honourable friends from Madras would not delay the passage of this Bill, which raises an Indian Navy.

As regards Indianisation, the Army Secretary said that vacancies in the commissioned ranks would be entirely reserved for Indians if suitable candidates were forthcoming, and that facilities would be created by which the Indian youths of this country acquired the necessary training. The proportion of Indians he proposed was to be one-third for the time being, but when suitable candidates came forth, then this number would be increased. If we had at that time in 1928 allowed the free passage of this Bill, we could ask the Government now to increase the number of commissioned ranks to 50 per cent. or even more. But the Bill was delayed, and we are still in the stage of one Indian to two British officers.

Mr. S. C. Mitra : What about the Army ?

Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar : There is no denying the fact that you, Sir, in 1928, in your eloquent and instructive speech brought out many a logical argument, and the Bill was thrown out by a majority of one vote. But if I may say so, today you must be putting yourself this query : " Does India, with 5,000 miles of coasts and with the prospects of Swaraj, not require anything in the nature of naval defence ? " Yes, it must be as clear as day to us, when we have an Army and when we have an Air Force, why should we not have a Navy ?

An Honourable Member : Have you an Army ?

Another Honourable Member : Have you an Air Force ?

Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar : The so-called nationalists of India have glibly said, to quote the late Colonel J. D. Crawford, " You cannot hand over Government to us because you have emasculated us ". Again, have not the same section of nationalists been crying against the arms and ammunitions protection Act ? The other day the Bengal Council tabled a resolution to raise a Bengal regiment. I welcome the idea of my friends in the Bengal Council and I hope that my Honourable friends from Bengal in this House will press upon the Government to raise a naval battalion instead of an infantry, because naval service is superior to army service. I would further support my Bengal friends if they ask, when the first warship is built, that it be named ' Bengal Tiger '.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar : A tiger is no good on the sea.

Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar : Sir, the opportunity has been given to us to make the future architects of India really he-men, if I may be allowed to use this word, and the proposal is meeting with all the jans and jots from different quarters. Are we not to this end so jealously guarding the frontier against Soviet and Afghan invasion ? Are we not exposed to the naval attacks of Japan when the commercial

interests of Japan are so clashing with those of our country? Japan is today like the pre-war Germany simply bubbling with a spirit of chauvinism.

Mr. B. Das : Japan will attack America first and not India.

Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar : Therefore, the question on the anvil is of the greatest importance, the more so because we are on the threshold of the Constitutional Reforms. We must have an Indian Navy entirely officered by Indians if we aspire self-government. Without defence there cannot be any responsible government.

Before I conclude, the Honourable the Army Secretary mentioned in his speech three aspects of the Bill, expense, Indianisation and recruitment, and constitutional question. As regards the constitutional question, I leave it to the experts, but as regards recruitment, I must join with my Honourable friend, Mr. Jadhav, in his remarks about advertisement. The Army Secretary said that out of 51 applications 13 have been taken. I still say that there is lack of advertisement. There is good material and we can get many youths to come and take advantage of these opportunities. I may say that so far as my part of the country is concerned, very few people know about the prospects of this naval service. If my Honourable friend takes proper steps to advertise widely then prominent youths will certainly come in and they will fill the annual vacancies.

Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal (Jullundur Division : Non-Muhamadan) : As they did in the Army.

Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar : Yes, as they did in the Army. My Honourable friend, Mr. Raju, said, why is this hurry, let the Reforms come and then we can have our Navy. I would just tell him that, if this Bill had been passed in 1928, we would have got not 14 but 60 officers in the Navy. If this Bill is passed even now, within five years we will have about 50 officers in the Navy.

Sir Hari Singh Gour : Do you say this on behalf of the Government? Shall we take this as an undertaking by the Army Secretary?

Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar : I am speaking on behalf of my own. My Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, spoke about the control of the Indian Navy. He said that so long as we have no control over the Indian Navy there is no use of passing this Bill, and he earnestly appealed to his friends, for God's sake do not give your vote. But I would ask him one question. There are three fighting forces, the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. The Air Force and the Army are already existing, and if he delays the passage of this Bill what will be his gain? He won't have his own Navy, but as we have an Army and as we have an Air Force, why should we not have an Indian Navy as soon as possible? He also said that the tax-payer of India pays the expense and they are raising the Navy for Imperial purposes. But my Honourable friend must remember that we are far behind in the matter of the Navy. Our Army is a first class Army in the world; in the Great War they have proved that they are not inferior to any soldiers in the world. As regards the Air Force, we have just raised it, and I am sure that it will prove as worthy as the Army. Then, why should we not have our own sailors who will prove to the world

[Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar.]

that India has as good sailors as she has soldiers? With these few words, I support this motion.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Twenty-Five Minutes to Three of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Twenty-Five Minutes to Three of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) in the Chair.

Mr. B. Das : Lest it should be misunderstood that, while the Deputy Leader of the Democratic Party was speaking, he was reflecting the views of the democrats in this House, I rise to oppose the motion which has been moved so ably by my Honourable friend, Colonel Lumby. My Honourable friend, Mr. Jadhav, who belongs to a martial community, and whose people are very much engaged as subordinate officials, not only in the Army, but also in the Indian Marine, has got a soft spot for the Indianisation of the Army and the Navy. Naturally, he has expressed his views on the point of Indianisation. But we are all opposed to the principle of the Bill, on the same ground which my Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, expressed in such vivid and glorious language. Sir, my Honourable friend, the Army Secretary, completed the picture that was left out by his predecessor, Mr. Tottenham. Mr. Tottenham mentioned everything, but he omitted to mention the considered view of the Government of India regarding the constitutional question. I listened most carefully to the carefully considered words which flowed from my Honourable friend, Colonel Lumby, about the constitutional aspect in regard to which, we on this side of the House have taken such strong exception. I find that my friend threw no new light nor could he explain away the suspicions or the points that have been raised by us, not only in the debate that took place last Session but also in that debate in which you took part in 1928. Sir, people talk of Indianisation. To me it matters little whether half a dozen Indian boys are buried in the service of the Indian Marine or buried in some shops in Delhi or Calcutta. I am not interested in seeing how they earn their living. It is not a national problem, nor is it a national issue. The problem is whether India is going to have any control over her Army or Navy, and the Army Secretary, my Honourable friend, the gallant Colonel, made it clear, although he wanted to throw a smoke screen, and said that there may be something hidden behind the report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee and the new Constitution Bill that will be introduced in the House of Commons. The question of the Army was made completely clear in the White Paper, and if I understand it aright the way of the gallant Colonel,—I mean the other Colonel, Sir Henry Gidney—he challenged us as the Opposition in this matter. My friend, Colonel Sir Henry Gidney's position is very peculiar, not only in this country, but on the floor of this House. He sits in the European Benches. Sir, I am grateful to my European friends. They seldom use the word opposition and make that distinction. They do identify themselves very often with us. My Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, who travelled from Bangalore to Bezwada and everywhere, received purses, and expressed his great gratitude to Sobrus and Jayakars for having pleaded for the Anglo-Indian Com-

munity before the Joint Parliamentary Committee and reserved a system of special education for the Anglo-Indian community. He is a statutory Indian, but we shall soon hear my Honourable friend, Mr. James, on the Navy Bill, and I do not think my old friend, Mr. James, will address us as the Opposition. I was saying that the Army Secretary did not throw any further light about the constitutional position of the future Army in India as regards control of this Legislature. He rather said that there will be a Minister who will be in charge of the Army, and why should we be suspicious of the Governor General. As I conceive the White Paper, the Governor General will have two souls, one soul will be responsible to the responsible ministers, and the other will be to the army counsellors and the ecclesiastical counsellors and may be the political counsellors. If, we, elected representatives, are in this House, then it will be our duty to oppose tooth and nail the dual soul of the Governor General. The Governor General will administer the Indian Marine and the Indian Army under the dictates of the Army Council in Britain. This Indian Army is a mercenary one. This Army is maintained for the British Government, for British Imperialism. It is no pleasure to me, if my Honourable friend, the gallant Captain Sher Muhammad Khan, becomes a Captain, or as he dreams to be, the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Army. It is no pleasure to me, because this Legislature and the nation will not be able to order the future Commander-in-Chief, Sher Muhammad Khan, to carry out certain military operation against a particular nation because the Army Council will order him to do something else.

It has been trotted out here that the Dominions have got navies and armies. Each Dominion might have a small navy and a small army. I call it an apology for an army when we consider the huge expenditure that we in India incur. I have got here the Defence Committee's Report, a committee of which my Honourable friends, Mr. Jadhav, Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliar and Colonel, (Gidney were members. Therein I find a statement giving the burden of military expenditure in different parts of the British Empire. Australia, which has got a receipt of 95 millions, both central and provincial, spends only 4.7 millions in net defence expenditure ; Canada, with a total receipts of 96 millions, spends only 2.7 millions. The Irish Free State, out of an income of 31 millions, spends 2.2 millions. New Zealand, out of 25 millions receipts, spends only .9 on the army. South Africa, with a Government receipt of 33 millions, spends only .8 million on their respective defence, and India, with Government receipts of £131 million, spends £41 million and this comes to 62 per cent. of the Central expenditure, the latter being £66 million, and becomes 31 per cent. of the net total Central and Provincial expenditure ; while in the case of the Dominions, they are all below ten per cent. Thus, in the case of Australia, cost of defence, is 5.8 per cent. in the case of Canada, it is 4.2 per cent. in the case of the Irish Free State it is 7.2 per cent., in the case of New Zealand, it is 3.9 per cent. and in the case of South Africa, it is 3.5 per cent. Yet, to hear Sir Henry Gidney saying that we must raise ourselves to the status of the Dominions, that we must have a Navy which will vie with the Dominion Governments, is absurd ; and I do hope my Honourable friend Colonel Lumby, will, when he speaks again, tell us what is the amount of expenditure of each of these Dominions in meeting the cost of their navies.

Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar : May I remind my Honourable friend that Canada has not a single enemy to contend with along the three thousand miles of her frontiers, while here in India, how many tribes we have got on our own frontiers ?

Mr. B. Das : Wait and see Canada joining hands with the United States of America ! Everybody knows what Canada is driving to ; and as for Australia, does not the British Navy guard Australia, is not Australia every day threatened by Japanese encroachment and encroachment from America ? But the British Navy guards it. Now we pay the British Navy a hundred thousand pounds, so it is the duty of the British Navy to guard us. I do not want to take a pride in the mere fact that there should be a so-called Indian Navy and in the fact that our boys can have some badges on their shoulders—" R. I. M. ". Does it flatter me to be a Member of this Legislature, which is at every stage flouted ?

Mr. F. E. James (Madras : European) : Does it flatter the Legislature ?

Mr. B. Das : How can it flatter the Legislature when, on every day, an irresponsible Government sits there and I cannot replace it, I cannot sit on the other side ? Does it flatter me or even Mr. James, the democrat of democrats ? No.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar : Would you like to sit on this side ?

Mr. B. Das : I would like to sit on the Front Benches, certainly, (Hear, hear), and I would like the Front Benchers to sit here and listen to our arguments on the other side (Applause).

Sir, my Honourable and gallant friend, the Army Secretary, voiced the feeling of the officers of the Indian Marine Service, and quoted a Captain of one of my Orissa ports, Captain Manfield. I very much sympathise with Captain Manfield but, while I sympathise with his little sorrows and little troubles, I have greater sympathies with my own sorrows and my own troubles. Sir, what we want here is complete control of the Army ; we want control of the Navy ; and while I was expecting in 1931, that I and my friends would occupy the other side, the Treasury Benches—and replace the front Benchers there, here in the year of grace 1934, I do not even visualize that in 1944 even, it will be possible for me to exchange places and to make this irresponsible Government responsible to the Legislature. So, Sir, when there is so much of disappointment to the nation, some people must suffer and, as we suffer, a few British officers when they accept service under Indians will have to accept them at a disadvantage, and knowing all that, if they accept service now, they will have to put up with it.

Sir, it was very sweet to hear from the Honourable the Army Secretary about the Washington Convention, which was dealt with by my Honourable friend, Mr. Sitaramaraju, so well, but I do wish to ask whether my Honourable friend, the Army Secretary, read the article in the *Statesman*, the second leader of this morning, where it shows the naval policy of the World Powers. The Washington Convention, whatever it may have been, was the pious idea of a pious lot of people who, after being chastised after the World War, thought they were settling down to peaceful habits and peaceful lives but, Sir, international diplomacy or

rather what is known as international bluff has failed ; so, although these Foreign Office diplomats have bluffed one another, and World Powers were building their armies and navies, when they were tired out, they again bluffed one another at Washington, Versailles and other places that there should be world peace and that they should reduce their armaments ; we know they cannot do that, and every day they are building more and more battleships and cruisers. Now they wanted to cripple Germany, but today Germany possesses an equal naval armament as any other foreign power possesses. (*An Honourable Member* : " Question ".) If you know German naval secrets and German ærial secrets, you will realize that Germany is doing her utmost.

Mr. S. C. Mitra : It may be in respect of the army—not the navy.

Mr. B. Das : But Germany is trying to come up to the standard of Japan and the United States.

I was referring to the Washington Convention. I think it was the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri who was there, and who had the supreme privilege as a great Liberal Leader of India, to put his signature, with those of the representatives of the World Powers, to a document whereby the British naval quota is controlled by the Washington Convention. Sir, it is not, I say, controlled, and I still maintain that. Of course unconsciously, my friend, the Army Secretary, has replied to the various charges I often laid against the Government of India and the British Government that through the Indian Army and the Indian Navy the British Government are creating a force by which they will meet the Eastern menace, whether it is from Japan or from America or any other power. So that charge has not been met, and, however, innocently, the Army Secretaries may speak that this is not the intention of the Army Council in England, we will not believe them. Sir, one point has been raised ; apart from the constitutional issue, the other issue is the expenditure that will have to be faced if, helpless as the Non-Official Members of this Legislature are, we give our sanction to this Bill for the creation of an Indian Navy. Sir, I shall now refer to Mr. Tottenham's speech wherein he said that, unless there is a popular demand, Government will not spend more money. Let me quote him.

" * * * Before the War, when the Royal Indian Marine was a non-combatant force, its cost amounted to about 68 lakhs of rupees a year.

The re-organised combatant force during the last three years or so has cost well under 65 lakhs, that is, less than what it cost before the War ; "

I thank the Army Secretary for having reduced this amount through the pressure of the Legislature and through causes of world depression. He further went on to say :

" and I think I can safely assure the House that there will be no large expansion or increase of expenditure on this force until and unless there is a popular demand for it. Personally, I think that a demand of that kind is bound to come sooner or later if India is to undertake her own naval defence."

It cannot come from this side. Of course, I find that my Honourable friend, Mr. Jadhav, has already made a demand like that this morning, but there are Captain Sher Muhammad Khans and Colonel Gidneys who will always make a demand for such things so that a few boys may be able to get jobs. My friend, Colonel Gidney, wants a further eight per cent. quota for the members of his community in the Indian Navy

[Mr. B. Das.]

when it will be created. I know what my Honourable friend, the Army Secretary, will do in the next Session. He will simply introduce a Bill and carry it through by the help of the majority which Government always commands, because of these Nominated Members or those elected Members who are as good as Nominated Members. They will always speak on behalf of India and support the Navy to show that there is a national demand in India for the expansion of the Navy. Therefore, we will have to foot the Bill of two crores. And what has been India's demand? India's demand is that the defence expenditure should be reduced to a minimum of 30 crores, if it can't be reduced further. Until that is done, we will be no party to sanction any more frantic ideas of naval expansion or army expansion, which will commit our successors into heavy expenditure. Sir, I wish to say one thing more. If Britain finds it necessary to discharge a certain obligation to Australia, to Canada and to South Africa, why should it not discharge similar obligations towards India, until we have full control of our own household. Even the Dominions met at Ottawa. They meet at the various Imperial and Economic Conferences and what do they tell to England? They almost tell Britain "go to hell; we have nothing to do with you; we will follow our own policy". Sir, South Africa has its trade representatives in Germany and other places. I would like to know from the Army Secretary, when he rises to speak, whether the British Parliament has amended the Constitution of South Africa or Canada or Australia to such an extent that they would have to provide Navy for the relief of the mother country when the mother country will be in a fix as not to be able to send battleships to the Eastern Waters. Certainly not. The Dominion Secretary will not have the courage to bring forward such measures in the House of Commons. But anything is possible for India, and the Whitehall Mughal, the Secretary of State for India, brought forward such a Bill. Sir, we know what is the attitude of the British people towards India when they can pass such a measure. If the British Empire is to be maintained, it is the duty of Britain to guard the coasts of the whole Empire. If "Emden" came and threw a few bombs or fired a few shots on Madras City, it was due to the inefficiency of the British Navy. It is certainly not due to any fault of India. And how much Britain spends on the Army and the Navy? She spends 115 millions. This is the figure which I have taken from the Simon Commission's report for the year 1928. It shows an increase of 48.9 per cent. on her pre-war expenditure, which was 77.2 millions, while India, which was spending in 1913, 22 millions, spent 44 millions in 1928, which means an increase of 100 per cent. So, there is no justification in asking this House to sanction any measure simply because it might enhance our reputation or, as my Honourable friend, Mr. James, pointed out in the previous debate, India would have the privilege and honour of flying a white ensign at one end of the steamer, and the flag of India at the other end, if she did have her own Navy. Sir, these things do not appeal to me, nor do they give any pleasure when I know that millions of rupees will be squeezed out of poor India to maintain an Indian Navy and which will be used to fire shots at us whenever we will show patriotic signs anywhere. My Honourable friend, the present Army Secretary, and also Mr. Tottenham, made it clear and gave us the assurance, that if Indian Navy will be

used by Britain, they will pay for it. They have paid for it occasionally, when the Indian Army has been sent to China and other places, but we do not want that sort of thing. It is against our national dignity and national honour that we should maintain an Army and Navy, which should be used by Britain, to augment her imperialistic policy and to oppress Asiatic nations. That is against the very principle and sentiment and religion of the Indian nation and of Indian patriots. Mr. Tottenham in his speech said that he had no sinister and ulterior motives behind the Bill. Nor have we on this side of the House any sinister or ulterior motive against Britain. We want to be friends, but unfortunately at every step the cloven hoof and the mailed fist is shown to us.

Mr. F. E. James : You cannot see the cloven hoof !

Mr. B. Das : It is concealed in the boots. Sir, how can we be friends ? They are always taking away something
3 P.M. from us and never give anything. How can we show any friendship to England when we know our fate under the new Constitution ? We are all grateful to the Honourable the Law Member for the very noble work that he did in the Joint Parliamentary Committee and, if he can open his lips and break the seal on his lips, he will reveal a different story, and he will be able to tell us that for 50 years nothing is coming to India, and for 50 years the British Army will remain in India as a mercenary army maintained at the cost of India and always ready to fire shots at the Indians. So, Sir, my appeal to my Honourable friend, the Army Secretary, is to withdraw this Bill. There is no urgency as his predecessor admitted. There is no urgency at all. If you want to take it by jingoistic methods, take every thing by force. We do not object, if it is taken by force. It is not taken with my sweet will. It is always taken, whether I am willing or not. If the Army Secretary and the British Government really want to have the sanction of the people of India, I throw them a challenge. Let them wait till the new Constitution comes into force, let there be a Federal Assembly here. There will not be any officials, but I know there will be a block of Princes, 125 people, sitting somewhere in that corner. They will be there but yet a majority of them will be Indians. There may be a sprinkling of European administrators from these Indian States. They will then apply their brain and their intellect to the problem, and when that time comes, and if we feel that Britain has been fair to us, we would like to be fair to Britain. (Applause.)

Honorary Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand (Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, I join my Honourable friend, Colonel Sir Henry Gidney, in congratulating the Honourable the Army Secretary on the very lucid statement that he has made, while presenting this motion before the House. The motion has been thoroughly discussed on both sides. Today and yesterday, we have heard a very learned and well delivered speech from the Honourable Member from Madras, Mr. Sitaramaraju, and the constitutional point has been very ably set-forth by my Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, and it seems to me now that the opposition is based or rather is influenced by the decision of the predecessor of this Assembly in 1929. The Bill, as was pointed out by Colonel Sir Henry Gidney, was thrown out by a majority of one vote

[Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand.]

only. May I submit for the information of this House that the mentality of those days was different from the mentality of these days. (Hear, hear.) Even if those very Members had been present here to-day, their view point would have been different. In those days, the opposition was, as has been pointed out by Sir Hari Singh Gour, "we will not have a Navy in name, but we will have a Navy in game". In other words, the position then was, that either we will have a full dose or no dose at all. But now the position is different as is apparent from the move that has been taken by the Congress.

Mr. B. Das : On behalf of the Congress, I may tell my Honourable friend that they will oppose tooth and nail such Bills.

Honorary Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand : As was pointed out so ably by my Honourable friend, Captain Sher Muhammad Khan, the Indian Navy is in its infancy and as was so ably explained to the House by Colonel Sir Henry Gidney, the Navy and the Army cannot be formed in the twinkling of an eye, and it takes years and years to develop the traditions that are necessary to form an army or a navy. I say the navy is in its infancy and we should not take up the position that we should have either a full-fledged navy today or we reject this. It will come to this. We take up the position that a calf should be killed simply because it is not a bull. In course of time, we will see this infant navy develop into what is before the mind's eye of the Opposition. So, I think the best position for us would be to accept what is laid before us and to look forward to the future Assembly that is coming with such vigour to ask for something more. My Honourable friend, Mr. B. Das, has brought in the question of expenditure, and he has pointed out the general proposition, as is his hobby, when he says: "we are not going to give more than 30 crores to the Army". On that point, I think, though it is not very relevant to this Bill, I have to say that if there is any department of the Government of India which has shown economy, it is the Army Department. Did we not see a big fall in the last years' budget and is not that the result of a very great economy in all the branches of the Army? In one respect,—and this is not the first time when I am saying this—the Army Department has given a lead in Indianisation. Indianisation is not of much use for the general tax-payer if the expenditure remains the same. In the Army Department, they have given us this lead, that while Indianising the Indian Army, they are reducing the expenditure in giving our Indian officers a lower scale of salary, than used to be given to their predecessors. I think, all should admit that, in the interest of the general tax-payer, Indianisation should mean that the Indians when occupying the places of Englishmen should get less salary. So when that mentality comes and when the Opposition moves that resolution and forces the present Government to give effect to this principle in the Civil Departments, then I say on the floor of the House, that I will be with the Opposition and I will vote for less salary to Indians.

Mr. B. Das : Five hundred rupees will be the maximum salary.

Honorary Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand : It is only in that way we can reduce the expenditure, not only of the Army, but of all other departments of administration. On merits, the Bill has not

been challenged. My Honourable friend, Mr. Raju, has very lucidly pointed out that, so far as the discipline sections are concerned, the Bill is based upon the discipline that is being observed in the English Navy and there is nothing to be said against it. With these few words, I congratulate the Army Secretary on having brought forward this Bill, and I support it.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar : Sir, the opposition to the Bill is not due to any lack of advocacy on the part of my Honourable friend, the Army Secretary. I must in fairness state that the Army Secretary has done his level best to put forward in a lucid speech before the Assembly a case for which he is not in the main responsible and the defects of which are not due to any laches on his part. If there is opposition on this side of the House to the Bill, it is due to circumstances over which the Army Secretary has no control, to the intervention of Parliament, and particularly to the unlucky speech of an Under Secretary of State who boasted in the name of the people of India that he had their support when such was not really the case. My Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, has explained in the course of a lengthy and brilliant speech that the opposition to this Bill is due to the fact that this House does not want to sanction the establishment of a Royal Indian Navy when it has not got the power to control either its financial position or its ultimate destiny. It may be, and the Army Secretary in the course of his speech has pointed it out, it may be that some Indians were willing, as a transitory measure in the new constitution, to have the defence services reserved in the hands of the Viceroy ; it may be that they were willing to do so, and the Army Secretary is perfectly justified in pointing out that if the defence services are reserved then your opposition to the Bill on the ground that you do not control the Indian Navy, which will be constituted in the future, is not quite well founded.

But apart from the position that Sir Hari Singh Gour has taken up, I should like to refer to another aspect of the case. It is no use taking one part of our demands and putting that prominently before the House when you are not prepared, your principals are not prepared, to take the whole of the case that we presented either at the Round Table Conference or before the Joint Parliamentary Committee. What is happening today ? Some Non-Official Members, who went from India to these Round Table Conferences or the Joint Parliamentary Committee, trying to get a practical solution of the problem, the very great problem which faces both countries with reference to the future constitution of the country, were prepared in certain eventualities, in certain contingencies and in certain circumstances that the defence services should be a reserved subject. You take hold of that demand and you say : " Here you are, you are yourselves willing to concede that defence should be a reserved subject in the future constitution ; and that being so, how comes it that you object now to an Indian Navy which, *ex hypothesi*, you are prepared to grant, is a reserved subject ? " But I say again, have you taken the other side of the picture ? Have you accepted all our recommendations with reference to other departments ? Have you accepted our recommendations with reference to finance ? Have you accepted our recommendations with reference to various safeguards ? The White Paper came out, and this House had a full discussion on it and by a majority this House resolved that the White Paper was thoroughly unacceptable to this House and to

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

the country and to public opinion in India, unless it was radically altered in many particulars. A deputation went out and delegates from this Assembly went out, prominent Leaders of Parties went before the Joint Parliamentary Committee, with the only hope that, by their advocacy or by their pointing out the practical issues that arise, by their pointing out the feeling in the country with reference to these issues, they will be able to modify some of the recommendations of the White Paper and get the Joint Select Committee to take a practical view of the case and modify those recommendations in favour of a greater and more popular advance so far as India and Indians were concerned. What is the present position? It does not require a prophet to say,—and I do not think any Member on the Non-Official side, European or Indian, elected or nominated, will deny it,—that the report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee is very likely to be a retrograde report, a report which will make the White Paper even worse than what it is. With that record, an absolutely certain record, if I may say so, from all the prognostications that have appeared in the papers, how can you come before us and say, “You have agreed to defence being a reserved subject, and, therefore, we bind you to the pound of flesh”? That is not fair, Sir. If you had accepted the other part of our case also, if you had widened the basis of reforms for this country, if you had accepted our proposals with reference to financial autonomy, if you had accepted our proposals even with reference to provincial legislatures and their powers over the provincial executives, if you had accepted even the diluted proposals with reference to this defence itself, granting for once that it was a reserved subject, those diluted proposals that I had the honour and the privilege of adumbrating before the Second Session of the Round Table Conference, and which had been so admirably summed up in the memorandum which the twelve Indian delegates had presented to the Joint Parliamentary Committee, then it was open to you in fairness to yourselves and in fairness to us to come forward and say: “Here is a matter which you have yourselves conceded is a reserved subject, and we have come to the logical expansion of this idea and now we place this Bill before you”. Further, I have no apology to tender for the attitude that my Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, and most of us are prepared to take on this Bill on this side of the House. I have no apology to tender. On the other hand, I feel that we are fully justified and thoroughly justified in taking up this attitude that, if we cannot have that part of the case which we presented to Parliament, we will not have that part of the case which suits Parliament and which suits the Government of the day. Now, that leads me to another question. The Army Secretary,—I am referring to Mr. Tottenham now,—gave an assurance in his speech, and that assurance, he said, was with the approval of the Secretary of State, in the following words:

“I am, therefore, authorised to announce that it is the intention to consult the Indian Legislature, so far as may be possible, whenever any question arises of lending the Indian Navy to the Admiralty for operations other than in the defence of India. I can assure them that we intend to carry out that pledge not only in the letter but in the spirit.”

Many Honourable Members cheered the Army Secretary, when that assurance was given. I see from the opinions collected here that many of the gentlemen who have advocated the passing of this measure have been influenced in their views by this assurance of the Army Secretary. Now, I ask a plain question and I ask those who have

been following movements in Great Britain today, specially within the last few months, to give me a plain answer. What is this assurance of the Secretary of State worth to us? Can any Honourable Member say that this assurance is final, that it will be honoured, that it is a pledge which will be redeemed? Why, Sir, representatives of the King-Emperor himself have given assurances standing on that dais there. What do Members of Parliament, of the House of Commons, say with reference to those assurances? Viceregal pledges are asked to be treated as scraps of paper. I have been in England and following public opinion there. I have listened to speeches, not made merely by opportunist politicians like Mr. Winston Churchill, but made by much more responsible members of the Conservative Party, by men and women who hold official positions in the Conservative Party of England. And what have they said? They say that, unless Parliament was prepared to endorse those pledges, no pledge of the Viceroy was worth anything at all, no pledge of the Secretary of State is worth anything at all. I remember addressing a gathering of Members of Parliament, men and women, who were interested on Indian questions, in Westminster Hall, a meeting which was arranged by the kindness of that extremely courteous gentleman whom you, Sir, know very well, Sir Howard D'Egville. And I said that time after time the promise has been held out to this country that Dominion Status should be its goal and that the British Government and the British Parliament will work to the attainment of that goal for India. Then I quoted chapter and verse, beginning with the famous declaration of the 20th August, 1917, going through the declaration of His Majesty King George V himself, the declaration of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and of successive Viceroys from that time. When I quoted all this to them, up came a Member, a very respected and honoured Member of the House of Commons, and high in the ranks of the Conservative Party, and said: "We are not bound by these declarations". Do you want the name of the gentleman or lady who said that? It was a lady, the Duchess of Atholl. (Laughter by Mr. F. E. James.) I do not know why my Honourable friend, Mr. James, laughed. And the gentlemen there said that Parliament alone is the ultimate arbiter in these matters; that all these pledges and promises were given without the authority of Parliament and were, therefore, not binding on Parliament; that Mr. Baldwin as the head of the Conservative Party had given a definite assurance to Conservative partymen in private conferences that they will have a clear hand, unhampered by any pledges whatsoever, to deal with the Indian question, and to do what they liked with reference to the India Bill, when it came before the House of Commons. If that is so, then I ask, what is the worth of these assurances given by any Secretary of State or given by any Viceroy? We have been repeatedly told, and it has been brought home to us time after time during the last few months,—and as Mr. Das said, my Honourable friend, the Law Member, if only he could have his lips unsealed for a moment, can bear me out when I say this,—that the great constitutional, practical and vital fact is that Parliament is the ultimate arbiter in these matters, and that pledges of any person, howsoever high he may be situated, are worth nothing before the ultimate decision of Parliament. Therefore, it seems to me that there is no use of placing these assurances before us; there is no use of quoting any Secretary of State. We had belief in these

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

things. We are a very simple people, Sir, and we Indians are naturally not suspicious. My Honourable friend talked of suspicion about this Bill. No, we start with the position that we will take everything at its face value. We are not a suspicious people,—our whole record speaks about it. If we were a suspicious people, we would have started our suspicion from the days when Sir Thomas Roe landed on these shores and said he had only come to trade with us. It is because we are not suspicious, it is because we have taken you at your face value, it is because we have accepted every sentiment that you have expressed from time to time and accepted every proposition that you have placed before us,—it is for those reasons that we find ourselves in the unenviable position in which we are today. We are not suspicious ; on the other hand the biggest and best of us, the greatest politicians from Mahatma Gandhi downwards, if I may say so, or upwards, if I may say so alternatively, all of us, have said from time to time, “ The Viceroy has said so. Lord Irwin said so, Lord Reading said so, Lord Chelmsford gave this pledge, Mr. Montagu gave that other pledge and Mr. Chamberlain gave this other pledge ”, and you find men after men, whether it is in the Congress or in the Liberal Party or in the Justice Party or anywhere else, getting up and quoting these authorities, and saying, “ Oh, the British Government will not go beyond these pledges and beyond these statements ”. Does that show suspicion on our part ? We have swallowed your statements even when some of you never meant what you said (Opposition Laughter) ; I am telling you, quite frankly, the position as it appears to me. What has been the result ? Our confidence is nearly gone, almost blasted by the agitation that is going on in your own country, by the speeches that have been made by responsible men, by the defence which your Secretaries of State have had to enter during the past few months. We do not know the result. You may turn round and say, “ Mr. Winston Churchill represents a very small minority : he has no official position in the country ”. We on the other hand take your big men to be very much bigger than they really are in your own country : that is perfectly true. Mr. Winston Churchill is a name to conjure with. I am sometimes extremely depressed when I see the nationalist Press in this country seriously taking Mr. Churchill's utterances and thinking that Mr. Churchill's utterances count for anything in your country. That is perfectly true ; but my countrymen go by the record. They cannot imagine that a gentleman, who has been for 20 years a Member of the Government in one capacity or another, who has held every important position in your country short of the Prime Ministership, that such a gentleman would be expressing irresponsible views. You taunt us with irresponsibility on every possible occasion and say : “ Here are a set of people who do not have any sense of responsibility ”. And now, we are bound to admit, that your greatest man, your Chancellor of the Exchequer, under whom my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, served for five years from 1924 to 1929, is the very quintessence of irresponsibility. (Opposition Laughter.) That must be your case when you want me to believe that this agitation means nothing. That must be your hypothesis if you want me seriously to think that all this agitation means nothing. But it does not. It means something more. Mr. Winston Churchill has succeeded and has succeeded to an extent to which he did not dream he would succeed. It is perfectly true that the extraordinary and extreme statements that he has made from time to time, the die-hard attitude that

he has taken up, may not be adopted by the Joint Select Committee, but I think, it does not require any very great intelligence to realise that, because of that extreme attitude, the Joint Parliamentary Committee has had its attitude shaped, modified and to a certain extent formed. I do not think it is beyond the wit of man to realise that if the Joint Select Committee is going to put forward reactionary proposals, as it is feared in this country it will, it is largely because this unheard of die-hard agitation has gone on in Great Britain and has brought about results already manifest in the attitude that the Joint Select Committee is understood to be taking. Therefore, I venture to state that after all, if we look with suspicion on this Bill, it is not altogether unfounded. Why, Sir, who has not looked with suspicion on this Bill? I call to my evidence to corroborate what I am saying, Sir Henry Gidney himself. What was his statement? That he looked with suspicion on this Bill and that he was only satisfied after the Army Secretary's speech that his suspicions were unfounded. Therefore, *prima facie* my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, started with the same suspicion that I started with with reference to this Bill....

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : On a point of personal explanation ; I never said that. What I said was, with all respect to the Honourable Member, that this Bill has been looked at with suspicion from all sides of the House. As I was in the centre of the House and was not sitting on any of the sides, no suspicion lurked in my mind.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar : My Honourable friend is evidently shaping his views according to the geographical position in which he finds himself in the Chamber....

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Honourable Member has no sides : he has only circumference. (Laughter.)

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : Thank you very much, Sir : I am not the only one here who is like that. But might I amplify your remarks, Sir? I have not only circumference, but longitude, latitude and magnitude.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar : We all know that Sir Henry Gidney is a very charming man and he does not put on any side at all. That is the position in which we find ourselves today. Then there is the second point which is not an irrelevant or unimportant point. Why should we not have a self-contained Bill? If we are to pass the Bill at all in this Legislature, why should we merely be driven to this course of adapting an Act passed by the English Parliament? Why should we not have a complete legislation passed by this House? Why is not this House trusted to do that? Can it not do it? Is there anything wonderful in the Naval Discipline Act that has been passed by Parliament? I have gone through these sections, as carefully as I can, and I find that as much intelligence is available in this House to pass the remaining sections, as was available in the House of Commons to pass these particular sections of the Naval Discipline Act. Why is it that we are asked to pass half the provisions alone and have to refer constantly to the British Act for implementing the provisions of this Act? My Honourable friend, the Army Secretary, quoted with great effect the opinion of an officer who hails from Orissa, the Province of my friend, Mr. B. Das,—the Port Officer, Orissa Ports—and he practically read the

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

whole of that opinion. But there was one portion which my Honourable friend, with a *naivete* that I do not usually associate with members of the Army, omitted to read. I shall make good that omission. This officer accepts the Bill as very good, it will encourage Indianisation ; it has been looked forward to by the officers of the Royal Indian Marine for years ; this officer particularly has himself been very much disgusted that in his lifetime this did not come into effect and he did not wear the uniform of the Royal Navy of England : all that he says. But there is only one criticism which he offers and that one criticism the Army Secretary has chosen to ignore. He says :

" I have only one criticism to offer regarding the Bill itself and that is its present form. As a simple sailor I should hate to have to unravel this confused mass of figures and inverted commas. Why cannot the Bill be printed plain and straightforward from beginning to end using exactly the wording of the Royal Navy Act, but with the corrections and alterations embodied in the very Act itself, instead of us proposed in the Bill now circulated ? To administer the Act in its present form will be extremely difficult. The Act is what I should describe as 'unseamanlike'."

And it is this unseamanlike performance that my friend, the Army Secretary, is presenting to the future Indian Royal Navy. I protest against that. I do not think it is necessary that this Bill should be in this truncated form, absolutely devoid of any sense if it is to be read by itself, but only making some sense if, with the greatest diligence and effort, you co-ordinate this Bill with the corresponding English Naval Discipline Act.

That leads me to another point on which I should like to have your ruling, Sir. When the Army Secretary spoke yesterday, I intervened with an interpellation and asked whether it would be possible in the Select Committee to take up any other section of the English Act which was not referred to in this Bill and to incorporate it in this Bill, either in its original form or in an amended form. The Army Secretary said that it would be perfectly open to the House to do so. Now, I should like to have your ruling, Sir, whether on this Bill it would be open to refer to sections which are not referred to in this Bill, but which are contained in the corresponding English Act and to suggest modifications and adaptations to those sections, or even to incorporate wholesale and bodily some of those sections in this Bill. It is an important matter, and if this House carries the motion that it should be referred to the Select Committee, my willingness to serve on the Select Committee will certainly depend upon the consideration whether I have a free hand to deal with the sections which are not in this Bill, or whether I should confine myself to alterations and amendments of the sections which the Army Secretary has chosen to bring forward as suitable for embodiment in this Bill.

May I have your ruling on this point, Sir ?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Chair would like to hear the Honourable the Law Member first.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar : As I understand the point, Sir, my Honourable friend is asking us as to whether he can refer to other sections of the British Army Act. When this matter goes up before the Select Committee, he can by way of an amendment, bring in any section from any Act. So why can't he refer to other sections of the Army Act relating to discipline ? Probably I have not followed my friend.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar : May I explain myself, Sir ? Ordinarily, if only a few sections of a big Act, an original Act, are affected by an amending Bill, then any amendment that is suggested in the Select Committee must relate only to those sections or to other sections which are consequential. Supposing you want to amend a particular section of the Code of Criminal Procedure, it certainly will not be open to me to take up some other section of the Criminal Procedure Code and say that that section requires an amendment, and, therefore, I should like an amendment to be made to that section. On the other hand, Sir, this Bill stands in a peculiar position. Section 66 says that the entire Naval Discipline Act can be amended by us, or modified by us, or as it says, adapted by us. Therefore, the whole of the British Naval Discipline Act is open before us, and it is for this Legislature to pick and choose whatever sections it likes out of it and suggest amendments. Now, in the peculiar form in which the Bill has been brought forward, I want to have the position cleared up, as to whether we are not at liberty to refer to other sections of the Naval Discipline Act of England and to suggest amendments.....

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Bill before the House is not an amending Bill. According to section 66 of the Government of India Act, the Indian Legislature is empowered to adapt the Naval Discipline Act of England, with such modifications to suit Indian conditions as the Indian Legislature may deem expedient. Therefore, when this Bill is before the Select Committee, it would be perfectly open to any Member in the Select Committee to ask for the incorporation of any section of the Naval Discipline Act, either wholesale or with such modifications as he wants to make. (Applause from the Nationalist Benches.)

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar : I am very grateful to the Chair for elucidating the position.

Now, Sir, I have only one or two more remarks to make with reference to this Bill. Supposing this Bill is thrown out, what happens ? Each individual Member has imagined, according to his own likes and dislikes, all sorts of dangers and disasters which will overtake the Royal Indian Marine. Somebody suggested that Indianization will not take place. Another Member said that the Royal Indian Marine will not be in existence. A third person said that " Emdens " will come and shower bullets upon us and play havoc in the country. I think the Honourable the Army Secretary must have been laughing up his sleeves all the time listening to these very relevant and intelligent speeches. Now, Sir, what will happen if this Bill is thrown out ? Will the pace of Indianization be less ? They have already accepted the rate of one to two, that is to say, there will be one Indian for every two English officers, and they will continue to be recruited to the Royal Indian Marine, instead of to the Royal Indian Navy. The name will be different. That is all. The service will continue ; our 60 lakhs will continue to be placed at the disposal of the Royal Indian Marine. The amount even can be increased if the Viceroy and the Government of India think that it should be increased, and Indianization will go on just as before. It is a combatant service now. It is prepared to take its part in any defensive operations it is called upon to undertake, and, therefore, there is no danger that either Indianization will stop or that the country will be showered with bullets from all sorts of imaginary enemy maritime countries. No, Sir, my friend, the Army Secretary, was more

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

cautious than that. He said that, somehow or other, he came to ascertain the views of these old gentlemen from Orissa,—and many of these old gentlemen who gave evidence came from Orissa (Laughter),—he has ascertained from these old gentlemen from Orissa, that Indians are not attracted to the Royal Indian Marine simply because it is not the Royal Indian Navy flying the White Ensign, but it is only called the Royal Indian Marine. On that point, I should like to have the opinion of my friend who represents the Congress opinion in Orissa, as to whether it is a fact, and whether Indian boys are not attracted to this service merely because the name is not changed. Sir, my friend, the gallant Captain, was more to the point, he was more correct, when he said that recruits are not coming to the Royal Indian Marine because of the inadequacy of advertisement on the subject, because it is not well-known that the service exists. As a matter of fact, many of us, before we came to this Legislature, were unaware that there was a Royal Indian Marine on a combatant basis, and that Indian boys could be recruited to it. It is perfectly true that the Public Service Commission sends out one of its occasional and elaborate advertisements. But publicity cannot be given on the same basis as the Indian Civil Service or the Indian Army; these things have received enough publicity, and that is why people are wide awake with regard to recruitment to the Army. So many Committees have been appointed beginning with the Skeen Committee, the Chetwood Committee and so on; the question has been debated at the Joint Parliamentary Committee, and also at various Sessions of the Round Table Conference, and the Indian public are wide awake to the fact that it is desirable to send young boys to the Army; but there has not been as much publicity in this country with regard to recruitment to the Royal Indian Marine, and perhaps even the Army Secretary will realise that this somewhat prolonged debate on a Bill which merely tries to repeat some of the sections of the Indian Naval Discipline Act will have done good in its own way, in that it would have given a certain amount of publicity to the existence of the Royal Indian Marine as a combatant force, to its future possibilities, and to the desirability of sending as many Indians as possible to this service as cadets. Therefore, even if we take the extreme step of rejecting this Bill, I can assure my Honourable and gallant friend, Sir Henry Gidney, that no such disaster will overtake either the members of his community or the members of my own community, that we shall be able to enrol our boys into the Royal Indian Marine, get the same pay, have practically the same status, be as useful in combating the raids of the "Emden" as on the reformed basis which my friend, the Army Secretary, has suggested, and that there will be no loss whatever to the country.

Now, Sir, one last point, and I shall have relieved the House of this tedium. It has been said that this Royal Indian Marine, converted even into the Royal Indian Navy, will be of such small dimensions that it will be practically negligible, and that all this talk of its being used outside Indian Waters, for purposes unconnected with Indian defence, is talk in the air, talk which does not mean anything at all, talk which does not take into consideration the actual realities of the situation. It is perfectly true that any armageddon such as we had from 1914 to 1918, a great European war, or if two great maritime powers like Japan and some other State,—I do not want to mention the name,—are involved, this small Navy will be of no use whatever; it will not be sufficient even to maintain the

defence of this coast line. It may have to get assistance from His Majesty's Navy. But the point of its being used outside Indian Waters is not exactly that. We do not suggest that in a great war this will be taken away. Probably when such a contingency arises, even the leaders of the Congress may be willing to stake whatever resources we have, so that the people and the country may be free from any disaster which will overtake a great war. But the sort of thing we are contemplating is quite different. Supposing there is some trouble to vested interests in Shanghai, and you want this Indian Navy to proceed there. That is a sort of difficulty which confronts us, if this Indian Navy is to be used for that purpose, without the sanction of the Legislature. It is there that India comes in conflict with friendly Asiatic powers without her own volition in the matter. Sir, at a conference which I recently attended, there was a good deal of discussion as to when a Dominion can be at war with any power with whom Great Britain is at war. There is a good deal of talk of indivisibility of sovereignty, that the King cannot declare war on behalf of one Dominion and peace on behalf of another Dominion. But, leaving aside the somewhat metaphysical question of the divisibility or indivisibility of sovereignty, I think it was fairly clear that so far as self-governing Dominions were concerned, their active volition must be there. Their express consent must be there if they should be drawn into active hostility with any power with which Great Britain is at war. We have asked repeatedly that the same condition shall prevail with reference to India, not that India is not willing to go to war with any country with which Great Britain is at war, but that, before any active hostility, before the theoretical hostility, which is established by the declaration of war by His Majesty King George, becomes a reality by active participation of the Dominions concerned, India should be in the same position and on the same level as any other Dominion; that is, its active consent through the Legislature of that country should be taken before it can participate in that war. That is the point of view from which many of my colleagues on this side of the House object to the Indian Navy being utilised without the consent of the Legislature in any active participation in any war.

I trust that I have made our position quite clear. We consider that this Bill is premature. We consider that the proper time, at which its consideration can be taken up, is after we exactly know the picture, to use a very hackneyed phrase, and we know exactly the Constitution which is going to be adopted for this country. We consider that it is only then that we will be in a better position to decide whether we should have an Indian Royal Navy or go on in the way in which we are going on now. If our political status is such that neighbouring countries and other Dominions would laugh at us, it does not matter whether the status of the Royal Indian Marine remains where it is now and is not enhanced to that of a Royal Indian Navy. We consider that with reference to the user of that navy there ought to be the active acquiescence of the Legislature of this country. We believe that in the unsettled state in which English public opinion finds itself today, with reference to the constitutional progress of this country, the assurances of Secretaries of State, however inclined we were in the past to abide by those assurances, are worth nothing to us and we should like to have assurances from the only body which is capable of giving those assurances if the interpretations of British statesmen are correct, the House of Commons itself. And in those circumstances, we have no alternative but to recommend to our

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

countrymen, and to recommend to those of my colleagues here on this side of the House who are prepared to hear the voice of reason and to utter forth the voice of public opinion,—we have no alternative but to recommend them to see, that this Bill is rejected. (Loud Applause.)

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar : Sir, I had no desire to speak on this Bill, but the insistent request of my Honourable friend. Mr. B. Das, and my Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar, and their question as to why I am keeping my lips closed, compels me to rise, because I do not want, by keeping silent, to be taken as agreeing to anything which has fallen from them.

{ [* * * * *]

As regards my Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar's request, who added that if I but open my lips, I could tell this House something about what happened in the Round Table Conferences. My Honourable friend is in a much better position than myself, but he knows and I know, and we all know to our humiliation and to our sorrow that, when he asks Colonel Lumby : " why don't you admit ' our case ' ? "—he knows and I know that " our case " is meaningless. So far as the people who were present at the Round Table Conference were concerned,—and my Honourable friend is referring to them—there is no such thing as " our case ", because there is no part of the case where there was unity. There was no part of the case which was not opposed by some sections. Just as a famous association has now said on something which I am not going to mention, " We shall neither accept nor reject "—why, because some section of the community wants it—that is exactly the position with reference to everything which was presented at the Round Table Conferences. Does not my Honourable friend know that, whatever is now being strongly objected to, a fairly considerable section wanted that very thing which has now been described as an evil to be inserted ? Whether it is the Governor's powers, whether it is the safeguard, I ask my Honourable friend to cast back his mind and to say if I am not right in saying that there was no " our case " and that on every part of the case there was terrible dis-sension. The Hindu case was not the Muslim case, the Muslim case was not the Sikh case, the case of the majorities was not that of the minorities, and so on. I do not forget for one second that the people who were outside, many of them, said : " Oh, those who have gone to the Round Table are a set of toadies, *jo-hookums* and selfish people who have gone there for the sake of titles, and so on ". They may be right, or they may be wrong, but the question which was put to me by Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar referred to " our case " which was presented there in England by the people who had gone for the Round Table and the Joint Select Committee. Take up any matter. Take, for instance, a thing which has been most objected to, that is the power.....

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt (Burdwan Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : On a point of order. May I know whether we are debating about the Round Table Conference and the Joint Parliamentary Committee's report or the Navy Bill ?

†This portion was expunged by the direction of the House—vide page 1463 of these debates, dated the 14th August, 1934.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Honourable the Law Member was challenged by more than one speaker to say what he observed at the Round Table Conference. The insinuation was that if he did not speak, there might be something uncomplimentary to some one or other. The Honourable the Law Member is on his defence.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt : My position is this. Is this the place where we can have challenges and counter-challenges ? It is on that point that I appeal to the President.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar : I shall not take up very much more time. Obviously my Honourable friend, Mr. Amar Nath Dutt, is not liking what is falling from me. If he does not like challenges and counter-challenges, why did he not object to those challenges to me being made ? Why did he not ask Mr. B. Das not to put forward such a challenge, and rise to a point of order. However, as I said, I do not propose, especially as some Members dislike being told the truth, to say anything more about the Round Table Conference. That is not relevant, but, Sir, you will excuse my saying so, from 11 to 4 o'clock, if you put down on a piece of paper what has been said today, if you find even .01 of that relevant, I shall be surprised.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal : Landholders) : It is for the Chair to decide whether it is relevant or not.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Honourable Member has already prefaced his speech by saying that he can make a joke. (Laughter.)

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar : I am obliged to the Chair for coming to my rescue, but, Sir, I may assure you, that I do not take my friend, Mr. Lahiri Chaudhury, seriously at any time. I have very little to add. I have been asked to open my lips. I have opened my lips. What has come out is not very palatable, but everybody knows the truth and nothing but the truth. Now, as regards the Bill (Laughter), I find I have made a bad mistake, because at least in one sentence I have referred to the Bill, while others have not even done that. (Laughter.)

Mr. S. C. Mitra : I had no intention to take part in this debate, after the very excellent speech of my Deputy Leader, Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar, but the speech of the Honourable the Law Member just now in which he twitted Mr. B. Das has forced me to say a word or two.

(At this stage, the Honourable the Law Member was seen leaving the House.)

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran : Non-Muhammadan) : He is making a hasty retreat. (Laughter.)

Mr. S. C. Mitra : I do not want to go into detail, I only want to say a few words about the remarks that he made about my friend, Mr. B. Das. The Honourable the Law Member is a new Member to this Legislature and so, I think, the House will not mind his little lapses or his jokes, however irrelevant they may

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

be. Sir, it is well-known to every student, who knows even the elementary principle of politics, how Party Systems prevail all over the civilised world. on what basis the Parties are formed, how the Party generally maps out and fixes the course of actions for the Members. On vital questions, individual Members, if and when they disagree, they generally resign from their Party, but so long as they are in the Party, they carry out the mandates of the Party. To belong to a Party is no slur. It may appear to be so to Members who have no knowledge of political science or the Parliamentary system that prevails the world over, but I think it cannot be a matter for ridicule or reflection on the conduct of my Honourable friend, Mr. B. Das, who is an old Member of this House. To be in a Party, and to generally follow its dictates, is no reflection on him ; it is not like carrying out Government orders blindly.

Sir, I like further to say that Orissa formed part of Bengal from time immemorial. We Bengalis were proud and we were anxious to keep the Oriyas with us in the same Province. We are not ashamed of having them. We never say, even in jokes, that the Oriyas are lacking in politeness or culture. Sir, I dissociate myself from what the Honourable the Law Member said. If he said that in a joke, I think it was an ill-mannered one.

Mr. B. Das : May I remind my Honourable friend that he started as a Munsif in one of the sub-divisions of Orissa, and that he often goes to the Puri temple to purify his soul in religious matters.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar : That is so. I started at Orissa and whatever defects my friends will find in me are due to my having been in Orissa. (Laughter.)

Mr. S. C. Mitra : It may be that lack of courtesy was imbibed early, but not from Orissa ; but I know, an eminent lawyer that he is, when he is in the wrong, he will begin abusing the opposing counsel, and in this spirit he has done his best to take Mr. Das to task. As regards the Bill itself, the point has been discussed at great length. I really wanted to know what was the principle of this Bill to which the House will be committed by this motion. If it is merely that there should be discipline in the Indian Navy, I think there is not the least doubt that nobody on this side of the House will object to that, but as I understand it, and the point has been exhaustively discussed by my friend, Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar, if we are here merely to register our views on some supplementary points, the main ground being covered by the British Act, then the House will naturally hesitate to record its vote without proper scrutiny. Your ruling, Sir, has now made that point clear that in the Select Committee we shall be at liberty to take any section of the main Act of the British Parliament and may alter it and adapt it to suit Indian conditions. Then some of our objections will be eliminated. In these circumstances, I shall not go into further detail at this stage.

Lieut.-Colonel A. F. B. Lumby (Army Secretary) : I am only a land-lubber, but I am rather inclined to agree with my Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar, that there is something unseaman-like about the form in which this Bill has had to be placed before the House. It is, however, based on the Bill by which the Naval Discipline Act was applied to the Australian Navy, and so India will not be in bad company if the House agrees to accept the Bill in spite of its form. Your

ruling, Sir, has made it clear that the whole of the Naval Discipline Act will be before the Select Committee, and that, as my Honourable friend, Mr. Mitra, has said, makes a very distinct difference. I am no constitutional lawyer and I could not, even if I tried, pick holes in my friend, Mr. Sitaramaraju's exposition of constitutional law, but I have no doubt that there must be a flaw somewhere in his argument, or else it would not have been possible to apply this Act to the Australian Navy.

I do not propose to go back into ancient history beyond 1928, and I am not prepared to start arguing whether we were wrong, or only tactless, to bring a Bill to create an Indian Navy before the House in those days without previous consultation. You, Sir, certainly considered that we were not only tactless, but wrong. My point, however, is that six years have passed since we took that action, whether it was tactless or wrong, and what we did then would no longer be a valid reason for opposing this Bill today, however valid a reason it may have been when the Bill was originally thrown out, largely, Sir, through your instrumentality.

In my speech yesterday, I tried to allay the suspicions of the House regarding expense and Indianization, and I said that I realized that the main objections, which this House felt to the Bill, lay in the constitutional position. I quoted the revised section 44A of the Government of India Act to show, that the amendments made to that Act in 1927, which will become operative if this Bill is passed, represent a very considerable advance from India's point of view. I would like to read that section again :

“ Any naval forces and vessels which may from time to time be raised and provided by the Governor General in Council shall be employed for the purposes of the Government of India alone.”

There was nothing of that kind in the Act of 1864, which gave His Majesty's Government complete power to take over the service in times of emergency. In addition, I referred to the intention of Government to consult the Legislature in cases where it was proposed to loan ships of the Indian Navy, to His Majesty's Government for purposes other than the defence of India. It was in what I said next that my Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar, did not perhaps quite catch my meaning. I went on to say that I had to deal with the probability that Defence under the new Constitution would be a reserved subject. I did not wish to imply that there was any suggestion of taking advantage of those Members of the Indian Legislature who went to the Round Table Conference and agreed to such a limitation ; I was merely stating a fact. And from that fact, I drew the inference that, there were only two alternatives before the House—either to stand still as regards the Navy, or to go forward. I said : “ Is it the desire of this House that the naval forces of this country should retain their present inferior status until Defence ceases to be a reserved subject, or should advantage be taken of the present opportunity of obtaining for them the full status of a Navy ? ” Sir, there is really no difference between the points of view of any of us, except in the matter of time. We all of us want the Indian Marine to become the Indian Navy ; it is merely a question of when this step should be taken. I urged the House to accept the second of my alternatives, and to take the present opportunity of giving the service the added status

[Lieut.-Colonel A. F. R. Lumby.]

of a Navy, largely because this step has got to be taken sooner or later, for it is the first step in building up the Indian Navy of the future. If it is not taken now, it will merely mean that the clock will be stopped for a number of years. For that reason, I personally feel very strongly that there is a great deal to be said for overlooking the undoubted constitutional disadvantages and accepting the fact that the passing of this Bill will give the Marine itself an increased status, and its personnel a benefit which they have been looking forward to for a long time and which will undoubtedly do good to the service as a whole. It is because I think that the passing of this Bill will be of advantage, not only to the service but also to India, that I say that I cannot accept my friend, Mr. Das's challenge to withdraw this motion. (Loud and Prolonged Cheers.)

Sir Abdur Rahim (Calcutta and Suburbs : Muhammadan Urban) : Sir, I wish to inform the House that Khan Bahadur H. M. Wilayatullah is not here (*Voices* : "Louder, please ; we cannot hear you"), and I should like to move that Maulvi Shafee Daoodi's name may be substituted for that of Mr. Wilayatullah.

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

"That in place of Khan Bahadur Wilayatullah's name, the name of Maulvi Shafee Daoodi be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

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

"That the Bill to provide for the application of the Naval Discipline Act to the Indian Navy be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Diwan Bahadur A. Rannaswami Mudaliar, Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi, Mr. D. K. Jahiri Chandburi, Mr. B. V. Jadhav, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, Kumar Guptaeshwar Prasad Singh, Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah, Sir Hari Singh Gour, Mr. S. G. Jog, Sir Leslie Hudson, Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar, Sir Abdullah-al-Mámün Suhrawardy, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney and the Mover, and that the number of members whose presence shall be necessary to constitute a meeting of the Committee shall be five."

The Assembly divided :

AYES—53.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
Ali, Mr. Hamid A.
Anklesaria, Mr. N. N.
Bagla, Lala Rameshwar Prasad.
Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
Bhore, The Honourable Sir Joseph.
Brij Kishore, Rai Bahadur Lala.
Buss, Mr. L. C.
Chatarji, Mr. J. M.
Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.
Dalal, Dr. R. D.
DeSouza, Dr. F. X.
Ghuznavi, Mr. A. H.
Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.
Grantham, Mr. S. G.

Morgan, Mr. G.
Mujundar, Sardar G. N.
Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya
Charan.
Nihal Singh, Sardar.
Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
Pandit, Rao Bahadur S. R.
Perry, Mr. E. W.
Rafuddin Ahmad, Khan Bahadur
Maulvi.
Raisman, Mr. A. J.
Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Ramakrishna, Mr. V.
Rau, Mr. P. R.
Richards, Mr. W. J. C.
Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.

Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
 Lockenhull, Mr. F. W.
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.
 James, Mr. F. E.
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur
 Sardar Sir.
 Kamaluddin Ahmad, Shams-ul-Ulema
 Mr.
 Lal Chand, Hony. Captain Rao Baha-
 dur Chaudhri.
 Lee, Mr. D. J. N.
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
 Lumby, Lieut.-Colonel A. F. R.
 Metcalfe, Mr. H. A. F.

Sarma, Mr. R. S.
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
 Scott, Mr. W. L.
 Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar, Captain.
 Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.
 Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripendra.
 Spence, Mr. G. H.
 Studd, Mr. E.
 Talib Mehdi Khan, Nawab Major Malik.
 Trivedi, Mr. C. M.
 Zakaullah Khan, Khan Bahadur Abu
 Abdullah Muhammad.
 Zyn-ud-din, Khan Bahadur Mir

NOES—34.

Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
 Abdur Rahim, Sir.
 Aggarwal, Mr. Jagan Nath.
 Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
 Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
 Bhuput Sing, Mr.
 Das, Mr. B.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Gour, Sir Hari Singh.
 Gunjal, Mr. N. R.
 Jog, Mr. S. G.
 Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
 Lalehand Navalrai, Mr.
 Liladhar Chaudhury, Seth.
 Mahapatra, Mr. Sitakanta.
 Mitra, Mr. S. C.
 Mody, Mr. H. P.

Mudaliar, Diwan Bahadur A. Rama-
 swami.
 Murtuza Saheb Bahadur, Maulvi Sayyid.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Pandian, Mr. B. Bajaram.
 Pandya, Mr. Vidya Sagar.
 Patil, Rao Bahadur B. L.
 Phookun, Mr. T. R.
 Rastogi, Rai Sahib Badri Lal.
 Reddi, Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna.
 Roy, Rai Bahadur Sukhraj.
 Sen, Mr. S. C.
 Shafee Daoodi, Maulvi Muhammad.
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
 Sitaramaraju, Mr. B.
 Thampan, Mr. K. P.
 Uppi Saheb Bahadur, Mr.
 Ziuiddin Ahmad, Dr.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 9th August, 1934.