

COUNCIL OF STATE.

Friday, the 23rd September, 1921.

The Council met in the Council Chamber at Eleven of the Clock. The Honourable the President was in the Chair.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: We will now resume the adjourned
11 A.M. debate on the Honourable Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas' Resolution.

*RESOLUTION *RE* EQUALITY OF STATUS FOR INDIANS IN EAST AFRICA.—*contd.*

The HONOURABLE MR. ANNAMALAI CHETTIYAR: Sir, I rise to
11-2 A.M. support this Resolution. The Imperial Cabinet has passed a Resolution recognising the equality of status of Indians in the Empire, South Africa being the solitary exception. Sir, His Excellency's speech the other day has given us strong hopes of obtaining recognition of this principle even in South Africa and its interpretation so as to satisfy Indian pride and patriotism. Sir, I do not think it would be out of place to quote one or two sentences from His Excellency's speech. His Excellency said: "But it establishes beyond all question, and authoritatively, by the conclusions of the Premiers assembled at the Imperial Conference, with one dissentient, the equal status of Indians in the Empire." Secondly, the attitude of His Majesty's government and their recognition of this principle will mean that it will be applied in other parts of the Empire which are not under dominion government and notably in East Africa." Well, Sir, if England and her Imperial statesmen give effect to this Resolution of the Imperial Cabinet in practice, then the problem of Indians in Kenya is automatically solved. But there seem to be some difficulties. The opposition comes from the selfish ambition of a small number of people whose shortsightedness in matters of Imperial policy is much to be regretted. Indians were there in the colony long before the Europeans ever thought of colonising it. Here is an impartial letter, Sir, from the pen of Sir Harry Johnston, one of the oldest pioneers of the colony, to the London "*Times*," reproduced in "*New India*" of the 16th of this month which I received yesterday morning. I shall not take more than two minutes to read this. Sir Harry Johnston says:

'As a much earlier pioneer in East Africa than Sir Northrup McMillan, I must protest against the matter of his letter to you on the rights of Natives of India—an integral portion of the British Empire—to participate in the settlement, development and commerce of East Africa, or of any other portion of Africa under the British Flag. As recorded by Sir Richard Burton, the first person of non-African race and birth to enter the Kingdom of Uganda was a native of British India. Indians traded with East Africa soon after the commencement of the Christian era. The presence of large numbers of British Indians on

* "This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council to take immediately all necessary steps to secure effect being given to the policy of equality of status for Indians in the East African Colonies and Protectorates in every respect as laid down in the Government of India Despatch on the subject."

[Mr. Annamalai Chettiyar.]

the Zanzibar Islands and coasts was 100, 80, 70, 50 years ago the main excuse and justification for British interference with those regions, and without the help, the bravery and discipline of Indian soldiers I doubt whether we should easily have got the better of Arab hostility, have suppressed slavery or the slave trade, or have acquired the magnificent Empire over East Africa that we now possess. The participation of Indians of all classes with us in the conquest from the slave traders, the survey, the opening up of the discoveries in botany and zoology of East Africa from Abyssinia and Zanzibar down to Natal, has been too noteworthy to be overlooked by the European immigrants into the British possession so ridiculously misnamed "Kenya." The British white men have been the leaders in East African enterprise, and they have been loyally backed up, laboured for, fought for, by thousands of Blackmen. But the intermediary role played by the Indian sepoy, non-commissioned officer, surveyor, clerk, surgeon, botanical collector, trader and horticulturist in all East Africa from the Zambesi to the Somaliland, has been far too important and loyal to be overlooked in the callous way characteristic of the thousand recent white settlers in the hinterland of Mombasa. The injustice of their attitude, the excess of their influence, revolts me, who strove before they were born to open up East Africa to knowledge by the help of Indian troops, Indian doctors and Indian clerks.'

Sir, the Honourable Members of this House would like to know the credentials of the author of this letter. "*New India*" gives the following comment :—

'Sir Harry, readers may perhaps be aware, has unique and indisputable claims for pronouncing on the exact contribution of Indians to the opening up of Kenya, and in general of East Africa. His career as explorer, Consul, and Commissioner in the various parts of Africa dates from 1882-1883, and as Special Commissioner, Commander-in-Chief and Consul-General of Uganda, as also of leader of several expeditions to the Nyasaland territory and Tanganyika, he has been in touch with East Africa from very early times.'

This, Sir, clearly goes to substantiate our contention that the Indians were there long before the Europeans went there, and the Indians were responsible to a very great extent for the present progress and prosperity of the Colony. Sir, the fear that the eight thousand European settlers will be swamped by the Indians is groundless. If the two millions of the natives of East Africa cannot swamp them, there is no earthly reason why the thirty thousand Indians should. Common sense dictates and justice demand that the Indians should not be treated as helots within the Empire. Truly none are so blind as those who will not see. Even Sir Valentine Chirol, who cannot be said to have any great Indian leanings, deploras the shortsightedness of those who refuse equal citizenship to Indians.

Sir, since the Colony is directly under the Imperial authority and the Secretary of State for the Colonies has admitted that no racial discrimination can be permitted in such territories, it is up to it to show now that it means what it says by granting full rights of citizenship to Indians in Kenya. Sir, if Imperial citizenship is to be a reality, if India is to continue to be the brightest jewel in the British Crown, if the growing national self-consciousness of the Indians is to be respected, there could be no two opinions on this matter of the equality of the status of Indians within the Empire. It is the acid test which will show the strength and sincerity or otherwise of Imperial statesmen.

The HONOURABLE DIWAN BAHADUR V. RAMABHADRA NAIDU : Sir, with regard to this important Resolution I have to make an appeal to my Honourable friends. We all well know that this is a matter in which we Indians are deeply interested. Let every Indian Member have his say on the subject. Let us not apply closure to this subject and bring it abruptly without full-dress debate. The Honourable Mr. Lalubhai

Samaldas has, in clear terms, stated how our Indians are treated in South Africa. Everybody is aware that the European settlers in East Africa have been carrying on a propaganda of hatred against the Indian emigrants.

We have heard of what our representatives in the Imperial Conference held in London had talked about equality of citizenship to Indians all over the Empire. Yet the conditions of the Indians in East Africa are simply deplorable. Although the strength of the Indians is more than thrice the number of European settlers there, yet the Indians are not allowed to have any voice in the administration of the country.

It is the Indians that redeemed parts of the country from primitive savagery before the beginning of British rule. Had it not been for the free sacrifice of the lives of our Indian soldiers in the recent great war, the British army could not have beaten the Germans.

The late lamented Mr. Gokhale even went to Africa to bring about friendly feelings between the Indians and the European settlers. The Indian Government also sent Sir, Benjamin Robertson all to no effect. We understand that the European settlers recently evoked the help of their women in the campaign against the Indians. Thus they hope to play on the fraternal sentiments of their people "at Home." The Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies was approached by them to consider their supposed untenable position. Not content with this they have cabled to Her Imperial Majesty the Queen-Empress. They are dead against the granting of equality of status to Indians.

We, the Indians in India, devoutly wish for the dawn of a future when there shall be equality of rights and friendly feelings between European and Indian settlers, and it is our duty to implore the Government to use their influence to their utmost and bring about the desired effect.

We all remember the earnest exhortation made by the Honourable Sardar Jogendra Singh the other day to preserve our self-respect in not accepting the Resolution about the Rhodes Scholarship on account of the bad treatment we have at the hands of white settlers in East Africa. Although many of us did not join him then and share his views fully, yet let us to-day vote in a body in favour of the Resolution and make our protest effectively heard in Great Britain.

The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA: Sir, the Honourable
11-17 A.M. Mover, in commending his Resolution for the acceptance of the Council, made yesterday a very forceful speech. It was so pregnant with facts and interesting details, that I am sure it must have carried conviction to the minds of every individual Member of this Council, be he Indian or European, and that they will accord to the Resolution their hearty approval and sympathy. The status of Indians in the Empire, and notably in South and East Africa, is becoming very acute every day. At the present moment there is a bitter controversy raging over the recommendation made in the report of the Joint Select Committee on Indian affairs, the majority of whom have very strongly supported the contention of the Government of India that Indian settlers in the Colony of Kenya must be accorded equal status with the white settlers. Indians rely on the British sense of justice,

[Mr. Phiroze C. Sethna.]

and the doctrine that all subjects in the Empire are free and equal; the white settlers appear to rely on what they call the rights of the self-governing Colonies.

Kenya, Sir, as the Honourable Mover has told us, is the modern name for what was known till recently as British East Africa. Kenya has a population of 2 million natives and only 8,000 European settlers and as many as 30,000 Indians. The opposition from the white settlers to granting equal status to Indians is based on two grounds. In the first place, they say that the white settlers are entitled to special consideration, because the British white population were invited to East Africa to colonise that territory on the supposition that it would always remain a white man's colony. This statement necessarily requires to be supported by documentary evidence, but so far, no such evidence has been adduced. On the contrary, Professor Keith of the Edinburgh University, who was one of the majority signatories to the report, disputes the statement and inquires what authority there is for making such a statement. He asserts that no such invitation was ever extended by the Imperial Government, and he points out that the Imperial Government, and the Imperial Government alone, could hold forth such a prospect. This, therefore, disposes of the argument that they are entitled to special consideration.

Their next contention is, that if equal status is granted to Indian settlers, on account of their numbers they would absorb the whole government of the Colony and convert the Colony into an Indian dependency. They go further and say that such a result will prove very disastrous in the interests of the native population.

It is difficult to conceive how the granting of equal status to Indians, as is proposed, would enable Indians to convert a British Colony into an Indian dependency. As regards their solicitude for the welfare of the natives whose interests they say will be greatly jeopardised, this is a pretence that can be called by no other name than "wicked moonshine" and is a covert attempt to advance their own selfish ends and further to brand the Indians as an inferior race.

Previous speakers have pointed out that Indian settlers have lived in the land for a far longer period than the British have done. In fact, history proves that Indians went to East Africa even before the English came to India. Not only have Indians been in the country for a longer time, but their stake in the country is large and they have made many sacrifices. It is hardly fair, therefore, to deny equal status which the Imperial Government is prepared to extend to them. It has been said that the Indians there will not be able to mix with the native population. Indians certainly understand the natives much better and can mix more freely with them than the white settlers can ever expect to do. Therefore, if equal status is granted to the Indians, they will help the natives, with whom they have lived in perfect amity for years and years to improve their lot and will help them in every possible way.

Sir, in this connection, India has reason to be grateful to Lord Chelmsford's Government for the very able Despatch which they forwarded to the Home Government last year; and we sincerely trust that His Excellency Lord Reading's Government will not rest content until they have obtained for, at least, the Indian settlers in Kenya, if not in South Africa, an equal status with

the European settlers. Reference has been made to the Resolution which was passed about two months ago by the Imperial Conference which acknowledges the principle of the right of citizenship in perfect equality to all British subjects lawfully residing in any part of the Empire. I know that exception has been made in the case of the region of South Africa, but Honourable Members are aware that Kenya is not included in that region.

The Honourable Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas gave us yesterday extracts from that very interesting book entitled "My African Journey" written by the Right Honourable Winston Churchill. Those extracts were indeed very telling. Amongst them there was one sentence which I will take the opportunity of quoting again. It runs as follows :

'Is it possible for any Government with a scrap of respect for honest dealings between man and man to embark upon a policy of deliberately squeezing out the native of India from the region in which he has established himself under every security of good faith?'

The Honourable the Mover stopped at this point, but the next sentence to my mind is more pertinent and I take leave to quote it :

'Most of all we ask—is such a policy possible to the Government which bears sway over 300 millions of our Indian Empire?'

Now, Sir, by the irony of fate the Right Honourable Winston Churchill is to-day the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Let us hope that he will live up to his professions and that he will, in his capacity as Secretary of State for the Colonies, endeavour to get the Home Government to see that the Indian settlers in Kenya do get equal status, and if Mr. Churchill succeeds in doing so, although he will be doing no more than meting out even-handed justice, yet we Indians will be ready to give him the credit of having rendered a signal service to this country.

10 The HONOURABLE MAHARAJA SOSHI KANTA ACHARIYYA
11-26 A.M. CHAUDHURI, OF MYMENSINGH: Sir, I beg to support this Resolution which has been so ably moved by the Honourable Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas, and I gratefully acknowledge the anxiety which the Government have shown in urging the claims of Indians in East Africa. The proceedings of the Imperial Conference in reference to this question show that the claims of Indians to a right of equal status with others in Kenya have been vigorously advocated. Certain Members of that Conference formed themselves into a very able Committee for the discussion of that question, and a Resolution was adopted recognising this right, and it is now up to our statesmen to see that the claims of Indians are not disregarded by the few European settlers in Kenya. This kind of race hatred and race discrimination only supplies fuel to the fire of the present political movement which is going on in India, and it is to be hoped that the Government of India will do all that lies in their power to do away with this kind of race feeling.

With these few words, Sir, I support the Resolution that is now before the House.

11-28 A.M. The HONOURABLE Sir B. C. MITTER: Sir, I beg to support the Resolution which has been moved by the Honourable Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas, and, at the outset, I wish to congratulate my friend on the industry, the research and the moderation with which he has presented his case to the House. I also beg to tender my sincere thanks to Lord Chelmsford and his Colleagues, and wish to express my appreciation for the very gallant

[Sir B. C. Mitter.]

fight which they had put up to vindicate the great principles of Right and Justice in connection with the important problem that is engaging the attention of the House to-day. I have no doubt that His Excellency Lord Reading, fresh from that great palladium of justice which has given more prestige to the English nation than anything else, will bring those high principles of justice into the solution of the present problem, and that His Excellency, with the help of his Colleagues, will continue the efforts of Lord Chelmsford and his Government and press our claims for equality of treatment with unflagging zeal and pertinacity till our efforts are crowned with success.

Sir, while I agree with most of what the Honourable Mover has said, there is one point on which I am afraid I cannot agree. He has suggested that, as a last resort, the Government of this particular Colony might be handed over to the Indian Government, and he has quoted the high authority of one of India's greatest statesmen, namely, Mr. Gokhale, in support of this claim.

Sir, there has been a great change in the public and political conditions of both India and East Africa since Mr. Gokhale made the suggestion. We have now been put on the road to responsible government. It hardly lies in our mouth, under these circumstances, to say that we shall control the government of a country which does not send its representatives to our Legislature.

Sir, I venture to submit, at the same time, that the solution suggested by Lord Milner in his Despatch is wholly inadequate. We are thankful to His Lordship for acknowledging the principles of justice and equal status upon which he desired to base his decisions. He said that the test must be the test of equality, but, Sir, when having laid down that test, he suggests the remedies, it is difficult to see how those remedies conform to those high principles which His Lordship enunciates as the basis of his judgment.

Now, Sir, it is proposed, that the Legislative Council of Kenya will consist of 18 nominated officials, 11 elected Europeans and 2 elected Indians. I know, and the House knows, that roughly the native population in East Africa is 2 millions, Indians 30,000 and Europeans 8,000. We also know that the Europeans contribute, in the most important municipality, 70,000 in taxation, while the Indians contribute 1,20,000 and the Africans 10,000. Lord Milner proposes to add only 2 Indian elected representatives to the Legislative Council where there was none. Sir, with these facts before us, how can we say that the proposal which is to be found in the Despatch of Lord Milner is a just or equitable proposal? It is said that as the Government is retaining the majority in its hands, it does not matter whether the Indians get 2 votes or more than 2 votes. May I ask, Sir, to put this matter the other way about? Where then is the objection to give 2 votes to Europeans and 11 to Indians. You have only to state the case, and it will be clear as the mid-day sun that there is no substance in that contention. Sir, while we all gratefully admit the high principles which His Lordship lays down, one cannot forget that in judging a statesman we judge him not by the principles which he enunciates, but the manner in which he translates those principles into action. Sir, I think I have said enough to show that the proposed representation on the Legislative Council is wholly inadequate and unjust. Now,

when I come to the question of municipal representation I find it is far worse, because up till now there has been no representation of Indians in the important municipality of Nairobi. The safeguard of official majority is wanting there. We know that the proposed suggestion is that there should be only 3 Indians on that Council, leaving a huge majority to non-official Europeans. Sir, with such a condition of things, how can you expect that the Indian quarters would be sanitary? If the Indians do not have a proper representation on the municipalities, it should not be wondered at that more money is spent upon European quarters. It is hardly fair to give Indians such a small voice in their civic affairs and then to say: 'You live in an insanitary way.' I submit, Sir, that we cannot possibly accept the suggestion of segregation that has been put forward. Sir, a peculiar reason has been given that social convenience demands it. Sir, is there any town in Africa where more Europeans live than in Calcutta or Bombay? Do not the Europeans and Indians live in these cities in perfect peace and amity? Has segregation been ever necessary or suggested in these cases? No doubt, Indians will naturally flock to one particular quarter—so will the Europeans. But I say, Sir, it hurts the national pride of the Indians to be told that they live in an unclean way and that they must be segregated. It puts upon them the stamp of racial inferiority which they cannot possibly tolerate. The result of segregation, Sir, will be that the Indians will go to the wall.

Sir, then there is the acquisition of land. Now, it is said that the Indians ought not to have land in the uplands. The question is not such a big one as it seems at first sight, because, after 1908, all the available lands there have practically been distributed. The practical question that arises is whether, in a case of transfer, Indians are eligible to be transferees or not. No doubt in 1915 an Ordinance was passed whereby the consent of the Governor was made necessary for the transfer of land belonging to an individual of one race to an individual of another race, and instructions, I understand, have been given that, when the transfer is made to Indians, that transfer will not be acknowledged. Now, Sir, there is absolutely no justification for this. It is inequitable, it is opposed to economic principles, and, in the long run, cannot be of any real service to those Europeans who desire to transfer their lands. The fiat has now gone forth from the Imperial Conference that, at least in the countries administered by the British, there shall always be equality of rights. In view of this, the Ordinance in question ought not to be on the Statute-book any longer. Sir, we have had the matter considered by English statesmen sitting on the Parliamentary Joint Committee. Their Report is in our favour. It reaffirms equality of status. It says that the representation of Indians in the Legislative Council and on the municipal bodies is at present inadequate, and gives its verdict in clear terms against segregation. It affirms that a case has been made out for further inquiry into the acquisition of land. Sir, even these well-considered recommendations are taken exception to. Violent agitation seems to have been started by the Europeans in East Africa, and we find their cause espoused by influential Englishmen in England. We read the other day in the columns of the *Times* a contribution signed by some very influential Englishmen which says in effect that East Africa is a white man's colony and can never, and should never, be allowed to pass under the political domination of Asiatics. At present, the Government will continue to have a majority on the Legislative Council. That is done with a view to safeguard the interests of the natives of Africa. If that is the argument which has influenced Lord Milner's course of action, it is an argument which we can well ask him to adopt

[Sir B. C. Mitter.]

in the case of Indians also. How can it pass, therefore, into the hands of Asiatics. The Government will always have a controlling voice. In the next place, the suggestion of the Government of India is not that it should pass into the hands of the natives of India. All that is claimed, is equality of status. Rules and regulations will no doubt have to be made, properly safeguarding the interests of all the communities, but what we do take exception to, is the claim that it must remain a white man's colony.

Now, Sir, may I ask, what is the underlying basis of that assertion? I put it to the House, is not the logical consequence of that that true British civilisation is not based upon ethical considerations but upon racial grounds? I am confident that the better mind of England will give a most emphatic denial to such an assertion. Sir, it has been said that the case of Indians in East Africa is regarded as the acid test of the sincerity of the protestations of statesmen and politicians of the value to an Indian of British citizenship. Mr. Gandhi in his frantic campaign of non-co-operation insinuates that the professions of equality are mere shams. Sir, all India is awaiting the solution of this East African problem with bated breath, and any kind of solution which suggests partisanship will, I venture to submit, deal a staggering blow to the prestige of His Majesty's Government and extinguish the high hopes that animate to-day millions of His Majesty's loyal and peaceful subjects.

Sir, the great bulk of the Indian people to-day believes in the inherent sense of justice of the British nation. Englishmen have always made enormous sacrifices in men and money, to vindicate the principles of justice and equality; and they have given practical proof of the sincerity of their assertion by putting us now on the road to responsible government. They have thereby furnished incontrovertible evidence of their good faith. When South Africa lay bleeding at her feet, what was it that England did? She dealt out justice to her. Rebellious foes were converted into her staunchest friends. To that principle of justice, I appeal again. The present agitation of the Europeans in East Africa is directed against those very principles. They have threatened, if necessary, to use force. I ask, is the people of England, is the great Parliament of England, going to be bullied or threatened by anybody, or are they not going to stand by those eternal principles of justice and right, and decide equitably, honestly, fairly, as between man and man? The Europeans are a practical people. Our European colleagues are working together with us with the greatest cordiality. Sir, I venture to prophesy that history will repeat itself in East Africa. The Indians have a doughty champion in the Government of India; they have a liberal-minded statesman at the helm of affairs in England. I ask them, with all the emphasis I can command, not to emulate the European settlers in East Africa in their truculence and in their threats, but to pursue the peaceful and constitutional methods which have set their countrymen in this country on the path towards the realisation of self-government.

Sir, in conclusion, I hope the protests of the Government of India and the united voice of the Indian Legislature—for I hope there will be no dissentient voice—will raise the mist that seems to have hitherto hung over the Colonial Office. I sincerely trust that the present Colonial Secretary, who, we know, has expressed generous sympathies towards Indians in East Africa, will have the courage to carry the judgment of the Imperial Conference into execution, a judgment which declares that in almost all the countries where the British

flag flies there shall be no discrimination between His Majesty's subjects, and I hope he will be able to frame just and equitable rules and regulations suited no doubt to the local conditions of the country, bearing in mind the principle laid down by the Imperial Conference, as will enable Indians and Europeans, both subjects of His Imperial Majesty, to live in peace, in amity, in concord and in happiness, and thereby solve one of those delicate and Imperial problems that well-nigh threaten to affect the harmony and peace of the great British Empire.

Sir, with these words, I support this Resolution.

The HONOURABLE COLONEL SIR UMAR HAYAT KHAN: Sir, I think the Government of India is already doing its very best in the matter and I do not think, even if this Resolution had not come forward, that they would not have done what was in their power. At the same time this Resolution does show that Indians feel all that has been set forth by previous speakers and that we are not asleep in the matter.

11-49 A.M.

So much has been said on the case by the Honourable Mover, that I think it is useless to go into details, because I have noticed that most of the other Members who have spoken have been repeating most of the points already raised.

Sir, when India launched in the War and Indian soldiers began to fight, I know that they all had great hopes that after the war they would get something, that they would get some place in Mesopotamia or in Africa or somewhere else; that was the idea, but I am very sorry to say that all their expectations of getting a place have hitherto not been realised. I am not sorry about Mesopotamia, because I think it is a place which has gone to its rightful people. But what about East Africa? Every one had an idea that we would get it, because it was really conquered by Indians. I remember, Sir, when I was going to Flanders at the very beginning of the operations, a brigade was detailed to start from Karachi for East Africa. All know how much they suffered. The country was not then considered good enough for Europeans, and it was for this reason that Indians were sent to conquer it. Now that they have done so, it looks as if, when conquered, it had become a very nice country and that it is much more suitable for Europeans than for Indians. I think, Sir, that some of the colonists there say that the Indians have got no right there. Since we have been the first there, I think, instead of asking for equal rights, the Indians in this colony, since they have taken the greatest part in its development, and since their numbers are greater, they ought to dictate their terms just as others are now dictating theirs, to them. I think it is very moderate to begin with that we should get more than the Europeans; but if that is not proper, let us get at least equal status.

If only you consider, Sir, how many Indian troops were in the country and how many English troops were there, if you go on that principle, we will be quite content. After all, we have done our very best. But these are arguments which do not carry sufficient weight.

There is a saying *Bakhal-i-Hindúash Bakusham Samarqand-o-Bukhara ra* which means, a man who do not possess Bokhara or Samarkand bestowed it on a person saying go "and take it." How is it to be taken? that is the difficulty. We have been saying that it is our right and so on, but when people do not listen then comes the difficulty. There was a bania, Sir, whose cow was killed by a lion; and he got out his book and said "Now, by what right have

[Colonel Sir Umar Hayat Khan.]
 you gone and killed my cow?" The lion growled, and the bania said "Oh, it is all right." That is the only thing to do.

One allegation against the Indians is, that they live cheaply and others cannot. Is it to be understood that by civilisation is meant that a man who spends most is more civilised than the man who spends least? I think if we spend less all the rest of the money goes to the State and is used for good purposes. So, I think, Sir, we should at any rate get our share there, in return for the services that India and Indian soldiers have rendered; many of them lie buried in the ground over there, and I say they should get their rights of equal citizenship.

The HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY: Sir, I also feel that I would be remiss in my duty to my constituency if I did not extend my hearty support and co-operation to this Resolution. The Honourable Mr. Samaldas has rendered a great service to the country in placing this Resolution before the Council and giving it an opportunity of expressing its opinion in unequivocal language on the present position in East Africa. The admirable manner in which my friend, Mr. Samaldas, has dealt with the question and the great restraint with which he has placed the case in support of the Indian settlers in East Africa, makes my task easier and, therefore, I do not propose to traverse over the same ground again. This Resolution simply affirms the great principles laid down by Lord Chelmsford in his famous Despatch of the 21st October 1920, and I have not the slightest doubt that the Government now will accept this Resolution in conformity with that Despatch; but there is one important matter to be said in this connection. I hope Government will not allow the case to rest at this stage. Speeches in this Council endorsing the view of the Government of India as an excellent thing, but they will not attain the great object in view. We all know that the Indian settlers in East Africa have a good case. They went there and settled down years ago. They have acquired inherent and vested rights; the rights have been legalised, which these European settlers now wish to deprive them of. There are three main grievances of these unfortunate people which have been dealt with in this Council. They refer to their claim for equal electorate, equal franchise, to the freedom of moving in the town and acquiring rights over property and land in open competition with Europeans there. Nobody could possibly say that these demands are unjust and cannot lawfully be supported. But what is the Government of India now going to do to further their claims? I shall not be satisfied with the mere acceptance of this Resolution by the Government of India. The Joint Committee that was appointed have, as the Honourable Mr. Samaldas has pointed out, whittled down the suggestions and proposals made in the famous Despatch to which I and other Honourable Members have already referred. There is one important suggestion which they have made, and that is, the appointment of a Royal Commission. I think this Council should urge on the Government of India not to sit quiet at this stage, but to persist in their righteous demand, to insist upon the Government at Home to appoint a Royal Commission which will go out to Kenya and inquire into the grievances of our Indian settlers there and see what justice can be done in the matter. It must also be borne in mind in this connection that the Kenya Protectorate is now a Crown Colony. It is under the Imperial Government and under the administrative control of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and directly under the control of the Imperial

Parliament. The Imperial Parliament, if it wishes, can bring a great deal of pressure, moral pressure, to bear upon these European settlers and upon the Government of that Protectorate to yield to the reasonable and just demands of our countrymen, and I hope something in this direction will be done. It is also a matter of congratulation that our sister body, the Legislative Assembly, yesterday have voted the supply of a grant for the appointment of a High Commissioner for India in that Protectorate. This will enable the trade interests of Indian settlers to be scrupulously watched and safeguarded. I also understand in this connection that an official of my Province, whose capabilities are great and who is of pro-Indian sympathies, has been selected for this exalted office. I have no doubt we are now moving in the right direction, and I request the Government of India to leave no stone unturned in the matter of seeing that justice is being done to Indian settlers in the Kenya Protectorate.

The HONOURABLE MAHARAJA SIR MANINDRA CHANDRA NANDY :
11-59 A.M. Mr. President, I have very great pleasure in supporting the Resolution which has been moved by my friend, the Honourable Lalubhai Samaldas. The position of Indians in East Africa, particularly in Kenya, is really the key to the position of the Indians in all the self-governing Dominions of the British Empire, and, so long as our position in this Colony is not set right, there is very little chance of our acquiring equal citizenship in other parts of the Empire. I quite admit that the Conference of the Premiers of the Dominions in London last summer did its very best to put us into a position of equal status throughout the Empire, excepting in the case of the South African Union. Sir, it is only in South and Eastern Africa that the Indian problem is a living issue, for, in these two parts of the Empire, there is a large Indian population whose labours come into competition with those of their white population. With a new angle of vision, and with the broader statesmanship of to-day, I hope labour competition will not be allowed to interfere with the establishment of equal citizenship for Indians in all parts of the British Empire.

Sir, I hope this Council will excuse me if I go into a bit of the history of this complicated question. It is nearly 300 years that the Indians began to emigrate into East Africa, and it has been recognised by English authorities that the Indian emigrants have been the pioneers of civilisation, trade and agriculture in that part of the world, and they were the first to establish a link between the Indian Ocean and the interior of Africa, and that it was by their labour that a railway was constructed from the coast to the lake Victoria Nyanza. It is universally recognised that the Indians have made Kenya or Eastern Africa what it is to-day. To-day, Kenya has nearly 30,000 Indians, while its European population does not exceed more than 8,000.....

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : I would point out this debate has gone on for a long time and, in the circumstances, I would ask the Honourable Maharaja, as far as possible, to avoid dealing with arguments which have already been set forth at considerable length.

The HONOURABLE MAHARAJA SIR MANINDRA CHANDRA NANDY :
Yet, it is strange that, for the benefit of this small community, grave injustices have been inflicted on the larger Indian community. In July 1920, a new constitution created the Kenya Colony, out of Eastern Africa, with the status of a Crown Colony, the object of which was to confine the Indians, as far as possible, to the low-lands around Mombassa and to reserve the delectable uplands around Nairobi for European settlement or, in other words, to give legal validity to

[Sir. Manindra Chandra Nandy.]

the differences between the races started in 1902. This territorial division for racial purposes on the ground of 'sanitation' is the beginning of the present trouble and unrest among the Indian emigrants in East Africa. The Segregation of Races Rules and the Town Planning Scheme Ordinance, initiated in 1919 in consequence of a report made by Professor Simpson more than eight years ago, have practically condemned the Indians to the position of mere helots. That is not all. The Indians in Kenya cannot buy lands nor go about wherever they please; they are practically excluded from the legal and medical professions, and, lastly, they have hardly any educational facilities; and though they are as many as 3 to 1, they have the right to send only two representatives to the Council, while the European minority can send as many as 11. This position seems to be most galling, and this racial segregation wounds the Indians in their pride and honour, especially because it is so shamelessly based on 'sanitary grounds.' Lord Chelmsford, in 1920, enunciated the principle that, in a Crown Colony or Protectorate, Indian subjects ought not to be given a lower status than any other British subjects, but Lord Milner unfortunately did not act up to it. That is the position that we are all anxious to secure for Indian emigrants in that part of the British Empire, and justice and equity support our claim. With that view, I have very great pleasure in supporting the Honourable Lalubhai Samaldas' Resolution.

The HONOURABLE MR. G. S. KHAPARDE : Sir, when about two years ago, Sir Benjamin Robertson who was then Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces, was appointed to proceed to Africa to inquire into questions affecting Indians there, I moved a Resolution in the Old Legislative Council—which I am very glad to say was accepted by Government asking that questions relating to all Indians there be referred to him. Then numerous communications and reports were issued by Government relating to those questions, and the conclusions which the Government of India came to on questions I raised were communicated to him and acted upon. Now those conclusions were urged, I believe, on non-historical grounds and it is in this connection that I wish to show Honourable Members an analogy and that analogy is in regard to our Joint Hindu Family System about which every body knows. In our system of Joint Hindu Family it was originally the head of the family who ruled the house—generally the father—but there came a time when his sons grew up to be responsible persons and he was compelled to admit them into his counsels, and they had a voice then in settling family matters. Now, this is the point in the analogy which the British Government has reached because it has not only Great Britain but all its Colonies and I look upon those Colonies as the sons. All those sons should be brought together and included in the counsels of the Head of the family—the British Government—and they should have a voice in determining questions relating to the welfare of the family. I want to hear the Colonies spoken of as British Africa, British Australia and British India and so on, because it will show that they all belong to one united family.

Unfortunately a question has cropped up as to White Africa, next I suppose we shall hear of Brown Africa—a Black Africa. If you will refer back again to my analogy in regard to the Hindu Joint Family System, what do you find? You will find that we do not inquire into all the why's and wherefore's of different things. One member of the family may have thousands of

rupees coming in every month from his profession ; his brother may remain at home to look after the property and estates and yet another brother may have no money at all, what does it matter ? They do not question each other as to why one should have this and another that, the wealth or whatever is possessed is divided equally into shares, so that all members of the family are happy and contented.

I humbly submit that historical considerations of this kind are important and worthy of consideration, but they must be subordinated to the necessities of the present situation.

We have heard statements in regard to people entering Africa. It does not matter one jot who entered first or who entered last, who carried a sword or who went in with only a pen or the identity of the idler who remained at home and wrote poems. Everything should be done in accordance with the law of equality. When settling family disputes, I have found it useful to apply this law to my clients. I should never say to a client " who does all the work " or " who does no work," " who spends all the money." No I should say : " kindly find out what the property is and divide it equally." These considerations and principles do not apply only to family disputes, but they apply generally. I should not hesitate to apply them to any question—even international questions. It would have been better in the past, when people settled in a country, for them to have partitioned their land off in equal shares. A lot of trouble would have been avoided. This reminds me of the question referred to by my Honourable friend Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas regarding a dispute about some highlands. In this case, equity is equality, and those highlands should have been divided equally amongst the persons concerned. If a highway was required by all means have it, there surely would be no objection.

The word " partnership " has been mentioned often enough. I do not like that word. It is not a nice word as it is based on contract, and contract means three persons with a judge between them.

I want to see a union of British independent nations. Or if you like to call it, a union of free nations, or some such phrase. The phrase " partnership " will have to be dropped ; all considerations of history will have to be dropped, and those other things which make for differences will have to be dropped. We must look upon ourselves as free people who have voluntarily put all their belongings together, and we want to share them together, and, as far as possible, meet the convenience of each by limiting our own rights by the rights of others and the rights of others by our own rights. In that way a solution should be reached. I am sure that, if all these disputes and all these troubles were looked at from this angle of vision, namely, regarding it as one family, the solution would prove easy. With these words I have great pleasure in supporting the proposition put forward by my Honourable friend Mr. Lalubhai.

The HONOURABLE MR. B. N. SARMA : Sir, if I did not intervene in the debate earlier, it was because a desire was expressed that the mind of the country should be expressed through its chosen representatives in this House in order that the hands of the Government may be strengthened, if need be, in securing the rights of Indians in British East Africa. The Resolution asks that the Government should take immediately all necessary steps for the purpose of giving effect to the recommendations made in the Despatch of 20th October. We stand by that Despatch. There

12-12 P.M.

[Mr. B. N. Sarma.]

is no need to add to or subtract from it. We have been taking all the necessary steps to see that effect is given to it. We are not asleep. Negotiations are going on between the Colonial Office and the India Office representing us, and I may assure Honourable Members that we have every reason to hope that a satisfactory solution would be arrived at and announced, ere long. Under these circumstances, it is unnecessary for me to enter into a critical examination as to the accuracy or inaccuracy of particular facts, figures or arguments advanced by various Members in support of this Resolution. The Government of India have for a long time been unwilling to agree to any limitation on the right of British Indians to emigrate to any part of the British Empire. But, in order to promote the solidarity of the Empire, to prevent as far as possible friction, and racial or economic jealousy (or misunderstanding) and amicable settlement thereof, though they have agreed to limitations being placed upon this unrestricted right for which they have contended for very long, a Resolution has been carried by which it has been tacitly understood—expressly understood, I might say—that in so far as British Indians have lawfully migrated to any part of the British Empire, they shall be treated on perfectly equal terms with the rest of His Majesty's subjects, and that the Government of India and the Dominions in general should agree to the principle that each component part should have freedom to determine as to what the composition of its population should be. I am glad to say that this principle has been re-enunciated and accepted at the recent Imperial Conference. It has been recognised, except to a very limited extent—and even here we are not hopeless that soon different counsels will prevail—that Indians shall be treated as entitled to an equal status in every part of His Majesty's Dominions. Now, with reference to Kenya or British East Africa, I believe there would not be any very great difficulty, although I have no warrant for announcing any decision, in the way of the Government's proposals with regard to franchise, general and municipal, freedom to live in any part of the country, freedom in regard to trade and other important and essential matters being accepted on the lines on which both the Government and the people of this country desire to see a settlement. Honourable Members, I am glad, have adopted a moderate tone in the debate and have not expressed the keenness of their resentment or any bitterness of feeling towards particular sections. I may assure Honourable Members that expression of resentment, and unnecessary warmth, would only handicap us in our struggle to secure better treatment and recognition of equality for Indians in all parts of the Empire. Moderation would never be misunderstood as being tantamount to weakness, and we must also realise to a certain extent that, whatever may have been the reasons for it, disappointment is felt by some of our fellow European subjects, and that the fault did not always lie on one side. If there has been bitterness of feeling expressed by Europeans, bitterness of feeling has been expressed by Indians also. But it is useless to enlarge upon this passing phase of the struggle, because I feel sure that, when the British Empire has resolved upon a particular course of action as it has in the Imperial Conference, there cannot be, and there will not be, any deviation from that accepted principle. Honourable Members have stated that in matters of franchise, Indians have not been treated fairly. I have already alluded to the fact that we have reason to hope that on the essential question of franchise, both general as well as municipal, there would be no distinction

between any portion of His Majesty's subjects ; and with regard to segregation, asking Indians to settle down in particular localities, and so on, I do not think any such distinction would be allowed. I may also point out, if it were necessary to do so, that there is no reason for alarm on either side. We are not dealing with the question of a self-governing Dominion. We are dealing with the question of a British Colony where, as far as we can foresee, there must be a large official majority ; that is, that the Government of British Africa must be subject to the paramount will of the British Parliament. If that be so, then the British interests would and could never be sacrificed. British rights would always be respected and there would be no danger of any lower type of civilisation being allowed to have its sway in that land. Therefore, it seems to me that it is a trifle premature for any alarm being felt by our fellow European British subjects on this score. Nor is there any necessity for any great alarm on the part of the Indian public either. Inasmuch as the essential control of the Colony must remain subject to the will of the British Parliament, it ought not to make any very great difference whether the franchise immediately secures proportionate number or not. Still, I think, we are on the right road in asking for a wider franchise, and we shall never deviate from the demand for perfect equality in respect of electoral qualification and in respect of every other essential matter, and I do not think it does count at all as to whether the Indians go in sufficiently large numbers on an equal franchise into the Legislative Councils or the Municipal Councils, although it may be possible that, in the not distant future, their numbers will increase to adequately and justly represent their interests. Allusion has been made again to the Highlands. I would ask my Indian friends to remember that, whatever may have been the reasons for it, and whether the reasons are perfectly justifiable or not, a large section of the European population there seem to consider that a pledge has been given that certain rights of theirs would be protected in the Highlands, and I am sure that everyone would agree that no Government would like to have its honesty impugned or an accusation made against it that it has violated its pledges, and, as has been pointed out by Sir B. C. Mitter, inasmuch as practically the whole land is stated to have been parcelled out, it is not a practical question to go into the genesis of the policy or the course of conduct which led the European community to understand it to be a pledge from which the Government should never deviate. The Government of India have in their Despatch never asked that any pledge should be broken, but have urged, and I think rightly, that there is no necessity for any embargo being placed upon free transfers, and I will only suggest one argument for the consideration of those who may hold a different view, namely, that it does not seem right or dignified that any community which is so self-reliant, so freedom-loving and so assertive as the British, should ask for protection which seems to be the peculiar privilege of the weak and of helpless minorities. I do not think the British settlers will suffer by free transfer being allowed. I know that we tried this experiment of *Varnashrama* in ancient India or perhaps in mediæval India, and I would ask those that now believe in it in Africa to read Indian history with some advantage and profit to themselves. None of these problems seems to be a new problem. We have tried the experiment and we have arrived at the conclusion that it does not pay. Still, I think Honourable Members will realise that the Government are in some difficulty and would have to take the European community with them as far as possible and to see that their sense of fair play and justice is not rudely shocked. I need not say anything more on it but that the Government of India are

[Mr. B. N. Sarma.]

still of the same opinion as was expressed on this subject in their Despatch. I think the suggestion that the Colonial Office, if they are not equal to the task, might hand over the government to the India Office was meant more to indicate a feeling of irritation of the community expressed by the Honourable the Mover who has been scrupulously moderate in his tone, I must acknowledge, than a practical proposition advanced for serious consideration, and the arguments against it have been so well set forth by Sir B. C. Mitter that I need hardly allude to them again. The Honourable Sir Umar Hayat Khan expressed disappointment that the hopes that were raised that some part of Africa would be reserved for the soldiers or for Indians generally, have been disappointed. I do not think that on this subject there is any justification for any disappointment being felt. With regard to German East Africa, now known as Tanganyika, which is a territory administered under a mandate, people of all nationalities within the British Empire have absolutely equal rights, and consequently it would not be open to His Majesty's Government to show any favouritism to any section of the community. But we were asked as to whether any tracts therein should be reserved for Indians. An inquiry was set on foot and it was found that the country was absolutely unsuited for colonisation by small farmers, and the climate, the surroundings, the money and the labour necessary render only large farming and large estates possible at present. Consequently the colonisation scheme which at one time was hoped would be possible could not be embarked upon. Even, apart from that, it was felt that if any portion should be reserved for Indians other people would have an equal right to say: "Now that you have asked for some reservation you have no right to be treated on an absolutely equal footing elsewhere. The moment you ask for reservation and special rights other communities would have equal claims to differentiation and special reservation. Therefore, the Government of India felt that they will be perfectly right in asking for absolute equality of status, for absolute equality of opportunity of perfect freedom of action and for no favour, and in this respect they are supported, I believe, by the Indian National Congress. And I am sure the people of India are behind the Government in asking that throughout His Majesty's Dominions Indians do not want any favour, do not seek any favour, but only ask for fair play, freedom and absolute equality of opportunities. And I think therefore that, in view of the facts I have explained, the Honourable Sir Umar Hayat Khan will realise that there is no reason to be dissatisfied, either with the action of the Government of India, or His Majesty's Government in this respect; and the fact that His Majesty's Government have respected the wishes of the Indian people and the Indian Government in ratifying at the Imperial Conference the principle of equality of status for which we have been fighting, is clearly indicative that our struggle in that behalf has not been in vain.

I hope, therefore, that I have said enough to convince the Honourable Members of this House that the Government are alive to the importance of this subject; that they will do all that lies in their power that may be humanly possible to defend the cause of the Indian community, and that they are fully conscious that the people in East Africa, as well as His Majesty's Government, are fully aware of the fact that behind this policy of the Government are the people arrayed in solid phalanx. We may, therefore, hope for an early, reasonable, moderate and satisfactory solution of this difficult question. I may say that the Government are willing to accept the Resolution,

The HONOURABLE SARDAR JOGENDRA SINGH : Sir, I simply want to congratulate the Government of India on the bold stand that they have taken for Indian rights in their Despatch which was submitted to the Secretary of State. A precedent was set by Lord Hardinge who publicly declared himself as the defender of Indian rights. I am glad to see our Government to-day takes the same stand that Indian rights everywhere shall be respected and enforced by the Government of India as far as it lies in their power. It hurts one to hear of the white man, the black man and the brown man. We all belong to the same household. The British Empire is growing into a circle of self-governing Dominions. As British citizens we belong to one great Empire working for human happiness and human freedom. The new economic forces that are coming into existence are working towards a greater unity and that is why I am a declared free trader, because free trade will link us together, and we shall feel that in this great Empire we can freely interchange each other's produce and attain a large prosperity. The very easy way which the Honourable Mr. Khaparde suggested of taking the British Empire as a huge Hindu joint family, I think is a very nice one indeed, if the British people were willing to admit us into that kind of partnership. We would profit by it indeed. The sleeping partner in a big business has the best of everything, and I think the British people hardly realised, when they invited us to be partners in this great household, that a Hindu in India was to stand up and say: "I am going to have all the advantages and take as little responsibility as possible." You see, the head of a Hindu family is very often a long-suffering man. He has to provide for so many people who do not work. Is India going to be such a partner?

I shall not take up the time of the House, but with one more word I shall conclude. The telling speech which the Honourable Sir Umar Hayat Khan delivered, showed the sacrifices made by our Indian soldiers in East Africa. I hope the British people in East Africa will not forget the debt they owe to the dead and keep faith with them. Sir Theodore Morrison, who was a Member of the Secretary of State's Council, wrote a book in which he actually promised the handing over of East Africa to the Indians, and that is the pledge by which we stand to-day.

The HONOURABLE MR. LALUBHAI SAMALDAS : Sir, I should just like to say a few words.....

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : I would remind the Honourable Member that this debate has gone to a great length and ask him to be as brief as possible.

The HONOURABLE MR. LALUBHAI SAMALDAS : Sir, I am very grateful to Honourable Members for the way in which they have supported me, and I am also grateful to Government for having accepted this Resolution. I have only one word to say in justification of what fell from the Honourable Sir Umar Hayat Khan. The Honourable Member on behalf of Government has replied about German East Africa, but he has not replied about or referred to British East Africa, where, as I say, 1,500 farms of millions of acres have been given to British soldiers, and not a single acre has been given to Indian soldiers. If anybody is responsible for that remark it is not the Honourable Sir Umar Hayat Khan, I will take the responsibility for it.

[Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas.]

I am very thankful to Government for the way in which they have accepted my Resolution, and I hope that they will succeed in getting the Secretary of State for the Colonies to accede to our requests.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The question is that the following Resolution be adopted :

‘This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council to take immediately all necessary steps to secure effect being given to the policy of equality of status for Indians in the East African Colonies and Protectorates in every respect as laid down in the Government of India Despatch on the subject.’

The Resolution was adopted.

RESOLUTION *re* UNIFORM SYSTEM OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

The HONOURABLE DR. GANGANATH JHA : Sir, I rise to move the following Resolution :
12-37 P.M.

‘This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that the time has now arrived for securing by legislation the use of a uniform system of weights and measures throughout British India.’

I do not know, Sir, if, in the face of Act XXXI of 1871, it is necessary to have recourse to further legislation. I am advised that that Act contains all the legislation that is necessary in the case, and that all that the Government of India has got to do, is to declare that the time has arrived for enforcing the provisions of that Act. But, not being a lawyer, Sir, I do not know if that view is correct. Therefore, I retain the words ‘securing by legislation.’

Sir, this subject has got a history behind it. So early as 1870, a Bill for regulating the weights and measures of British India was introduced into the Imperial Council by Colonel Strachey. Even then a discussion on the subject had gone on for over 30 years, and I shall not be wrong if I quote here what Colonel Strachey said with regard to the difficulties prevailing in the country at that time. He said :

Throughout India the old standard of weight seems almost universally to have been the current coin of the locality, and the multiplicity of coinage has been, and is still, accompanied by an equal or even greater multiplicity of weights. Not only do the weights vary from province to province, but from town to town, and even within the same town or rural district. Different weights are used in various trades in the sale of different commodities and in wholesale and retail transactions.’

(At this stage the Honourable the President vacated the Chair, which was occupied by the Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha.)

I shall not quote any extensive extracts but will add to what was said then by Colonel Strachey that the condition of things now prevalent in India, even though now we have a single coinage is not better than what it was 50 years ago. In the same town of Benares we have got a number of seers ranging from the standard seer of 80 rupees, to 85, 86 and even 87 rupees. In the same province, in Gorakhpur, I understand, there is a seer of 128 rupees. In Bengal, the Calcutta bazar seer is 80 rupees, the Serampore seer is 80 rupees, the Hughli seer is 82 rupees. Coming to the United Provinces again, the Lucknow seer is 96 rupees and so also in parts of Allahabad. In certain places

in Bihar, especially in the villages, we have seers ranging from 48 rupees to 88 rupees, and in the villages I know this is a constant source of dispute and of fraud committed by traders on the poor villagers who do not understand the various weights. The worst sinner perhaps in this respect is the Bombay Presidency where they have a seer of Rs. 28. If a man from North India were to go to Bombay and send his servant to the bazar to buy half a seer or quarter of a seer of food, thinking of the North India seer, he would have to go hungry. This has happened in more than one case. That it is a source of fraudulent transactions was admitted by Colonel Strachey so long ago as 1870, and a Bill was passed on the 1st April 1870, regulating weights and measures; but this Bill, for some reason or other which I have not been able to trace, for certain objections, it is stated in one of the proceedings, taken by the Secretary of State against certain details, did not receive the necessary assent; and then Colonel Strachey brought in another Bill in an amended form, omitting the parts to which objection had been taken, and this was finally passed on the 30th October 1871, and is now called the Indian Weights and Measures of Capacity Act. But this enactment, I am told, is purely permissive and it has never been enforced. It was not enforced at the time because it was thought that it was premature to enforce it. It was then thought premature to make people turn from the habits to which they had been accustomed for a long time; but now I do not feel the slightest hesitation in saying that people have become accustomed to the standard seer and that they would all welcome any action taken by the Government in this connection. The only persons perhaps who may object to it would be the dishonest petty traders who make capital out of this diversity. Seeing that there is such diversity from province to province, it is possible that there may be some difficulties in forcing the same standard on all the provinces; though I do not apprehend any such difficulties, because in all railways, in all Government transactions, I believe standard weights are always laid stress upon and no difficulty is felt; but if there be any insuperable difficulties in laying down one system at the present time throughout the country, I hope that time will not be lost and that steps will be taken to secure uniformity at least from province to province. I have been told by some friends that this is a matter in which the Government need not interfere and that the matter will adjust itself. But I have the authority of our ancient law-giver, Manu, in saying that the regulation of weights and measures is one of the principal duties of the Government. It is declared by him among the principal duties of the King that "all weights and measures should be duly fixed and that they should be re-examined every six months;" whereas it is only after fifty years that I am requesting the Government to look into the matter.

The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA: Sir, in a country as vast as India, where there prevail so many religions and where so many dozens of languages are spoken, it is nothing unusual to expect that there should be quite a number of systems of weights and measures. But while, Sir, it is almost impossible that the country should profess one religion and talk one language, I think it would be helping very greatly the best interests of the country if legislation could be introduced whereby a uniform system of weights and measures could be adopted all over the country. Sir, there has been a great increase of communications in India during the last fifty years; there has been the spread of commerce and industry and the different systems of weights and measures does cause very serious confusion and incon-

[Mr. Phiroze C. Sethna.]

venience. It is not that either the Central Government or the Provincial Governments have been idle over the question ; the matter has received their attention on different occasions. The latest was in 1912-13 when a Committee was appointed which published a most elaborate report making certain recommendations ; but even these recommendations have not been given effect to throughout the country.

Now, Sir, this Committee was of opinion that, judging from the weight of evidence before them, the country would be prepared to accept a uniform system of weights and measures, provided there was not too radical a change, and the Committee observed that they considered uniformity, subject to this proviso, to be both advisable and necessary. The Committee were however divided in opinion whether they should recommend the metric system or some system which perhaps would suit the country better and with which they were more familiar. One of the Members of the Committee, Mr. Campbell, from Madras, was strongly in favour of the metric system, but the other two Members, namely, the Chairman, Mr. Silbred, and Mr. Rustomji Faridoonji, were strongly in favour of a uniform system which was more in conformity with what prevailed in the country. Their argument was that in the first place the metric system in spite of repeated efforts in the House of Commons had not been introduced in the United Kingdom. Further, that if the metric system were adopted here, the number of transactions which we would have with countries which have adopted the metric system would be comparatively very few ; in fact as against one such transaction, they say that there will be ten thousand transactions in this country in which such uniformity could not be of the least advantage and for which mere internal uniformity would be sufficient. They, therefore, suggested that we should adopt the seer which is used all over the country by the different railways, a seer of 80 tolas and 40 seers to the maund, which 40 seers or one maund would be equal to 82 2-7 lbs. This system of weights is adopted by every railway in the country, and therefore the people, while they use many other systems, are certainly familiar with the railway system ; and if Government want to make a move towards uniformity they cannot do better than introduce this system. I say this system is known all through India, though I must admit that in Burma the railway weights are different and not as in this country.

The Committee point out that if persuasive methods are adopted by those in authority they certainly would be able to effect a very rapid change in a short time, and the Committee particularly refer to the good work done in the Bombay Presidency by one Collector in particular. My Honourable friend, the Mover, referred to Bombay as being the greatest sinner in respect of the number of different standards of weights and measures that they have. I quite agree with him ; and yet in Eastern Khandesh, where these many different systems did prevail, the Collector, Mr. Simcox, by his personal influence was able to introduce the railway system to the exclusion of all others with great success. This is what the Committee says :

' Standard weights and measures based on the rules in Eastern Khandesh should be prescribed by Government for the whole Presidency. From Mr. Simcox's report it will be seen that in the course of three years people of Eastern Khandesh were gradually induced to adopt throughout the district uniform weights and measures of capacity.'

(At this stage the Honourable Sir Dinshaw Wacha vacated the Chair and the Honourable the President resumed it.)

Prior to the appointment of the Committee of the Government of India, there was a local Committee appointed by the Government of Bombay presided over by Mr. Orr, and there is reference in the Government of India's Report to Mr. Orr's Committee as follows :—

Mr. Orr's Committee found that his (Mr. Simcox's) action was so highly appreciated by the people of Eastern Khandesh, that Mr. Simcox had no difficulty in enforcing the use of his standard weights and measures to the exclusion of all others, by his own personal influence and without the aid of legislation.'

While, therefore, I acknowledge there is considerable difficulty in the matter, yet if Government will persuade every Collector to try and reconcile the people to a uniform system and give them a sufficient time to do it in, and thereafter introduce legislation, I think a step will be taken in the direction which will prove as time goes on of very great benefit to the commerce of this country.

The HONOURABLE SIR E. J. HOLBERTON : Sir, as has been pointed out by several speakers, legislation has actually been passed on these subjects in the past, but it has only been permissive legislation, and it has not been brought into active operation. There is no question that the Government intend carrying out any executive orders on the matter. I fancy that, when the question has been considered, it has been generally the voices of the big merchants in the big towns that have been heard ; but if legislation on the subject of weights and measures is introduced, it will presumably become necessary for everyone of the various Provinces of this Empire to use a similar scale and any other scale or system which may have been in use in the past will become positively illegal. I can speak with some authority with reference to my own province, and I can tell you that the vast majority of people up-country do not understand the English language and any system of weights and measures which is introduced would, I think, be extraordinarily difficult to apply in the case of uneducated people. If you wander about up there in the jungles and villages, you will find that there are recognised systems imposed and weighing is done by tokens of various sizes and various weights all founded more or less on the weight of so many rupees. Even, in Burma, it is found quite impossible to check all these weights, and I fancy that the people are perfectly satisfied with their present system. Another objection which seems to me must come forward with reference to my own province, is that the standard of India, whatever its varying weights may be, is the seer. A seer is unknown to us in Burma. We deal in *visses* or as the Burmese call them *pathethas*. Surely, it would be unjust to found any system of weights and measures for the whole of the Empire on a system which has been founded on the seer. Far worse would it be at the present stage of education to found any system on an English or Continental method as the Metric system. I do hope that this House will remember the reasons which caused the Government of India—as we shall hear explained presently—to take no action on the past, and to dash in and impose on the population which is uneducated a uniform system of weights and measures which would undoubtedly entail great hardship, would be unwise, and would make them, through no fault of their own, liable to criminal prosecution for using weights not in exact accordance with the rules laid down.

The HONOURABLE SARDAR JOGENDRA SINGH : Mr. President, the objection of my Honourable friend Sir Edgar Holberton to the Resolution moved by the Honourable Dr. Ganganath Jha arises from the fear that the people in the villages will not be able to understand

[Sardar Jogendra Singh.]

standard weights and measures, and that in Burma the people use *visses* or *pathethas*; while in our country the "seer" predominates. He went on to say that it was the voice only of the big merchants in the large towns which was raised for a change and that the villagers were quite happy and contented with the various weights and measures which they used.

I wish to say, Sir, from my own experience in various Provinces of India that it is the villagers who really suffer under the present system because they have varying weights—there is no uniformity and they never know the real market price of their produce. You will find that the *Bania* who buys the villagers' produce uses his own weights and which very often vary from village to village. In any case the villager is unable to find out the real price of his produce and what should he get for it. The Railway maund is the standard in large markets, and even now the law requires that village weights and measures ought to bear a fixed relation to the Railway maund. Only it is impossible to check pieces of stone which the village merchant uses though he is liable to be prosecuted for using wrong weights.

Therefore, Sir, I strongly support the Resolution moved by my friend the Honourable Dr. Ganganath Jha for the sake of the village people whose ignorance is so often exploited by small traders.

There is no reason why we should change the names with which we are familiar. The easiest way would be to approximate the maund, and the seer, the chattak and the tola to a metric system working up to a metric ton, but retaining maund and seer, etc., as heretofore. Such a scheme was advocated by Mr. Padshah in the Sugar Committee's report.

In the interests of the ignorant villagers, such a system, if introduced, would be of great benefit, and would enable them to know what the real rates in the big markets were, and when they sell their produce they would know at what rate they should sell their produce.

I therefore strongly support Dr. Ganganath Jha's Resolution, and I think the Government would be well advised if they pass some sort of legislation regarding weights and measures. The argument that in India different religions exist and so varying weights and measures are not without their interest cannot stand, because all over the world the tendency is to use metric measures.

THE HONOURABLE COLONEL SIR UMAR HAYAT KHAN : Sir, in regard to my own Province the Punjab, I may say that the weight of one seer is equal to the weight of 80 rupees and there are 40 seers to a maund. I think it has been said by the Government and all the people know that the difficulty arises where a *Bania* has two measures—one with which to sell and the other for the purpose of buying.....

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Those remarks hardly arise on the Resolution.

THE HONOURABLE COLONEL SIR UMAR HAYAT KHAN : Yes, Sir, but this sort of thing will go on. Deputy Commissioners have power to check it but it is not often checked. That is corruption which it is difficult to check, but the power is there and it is vested in the Deputy Commissioner.

These practices go on in the Punjab, but there is a bigger question which is that these practices are prevalent all over India, and I should like to know whether there is going to be a standard set of weights and measures, and whether they are going to be uniform or not. And I think it is absolutely desirable that there should be one, and for that I strongly support the Resolution.

The HONOURABLE MR. V. G. KALE: Sir, there are two things which have come out clearly from the discussion which has already taken place on this Resolution. The first is, the serious inconvenience that is caused by the multiplicity of weights and measures that we have in this country and the consequent urgent necessity of having a uniform standard of weights and measures, and secondly, the extreme difficulty that will be encountered in inducing ignorant people, ignorant ryots and others to accept the new standard of weights and measures that may be adopted by legislation. I think the best course that will have to be followed will be to reconcile these two. There is no doubt about the facts of the inconvenience that exists at the present moment on account of the prevalent system of multiplicity of weights and measures. But at the same time I have no doubt that there will be at the outset a lot of misunderstanding, misrepresentation and also discontent among ignorant people, and there will be an outcry as there was an outcry at one time in England. 'Give us back our eleven days'; 'Give us back our old weights; Give us our Seers and Maunds,' that would be the cry which would be heard on all sides. Because people have long been accustomed to certain weights and measures, they think that they should not be deprived of them. Therefore, a sort of educative propaganda will have to be carried on for some time, and if it is done by officials and non-officials, and if the people are convinced that they will derive an advantage from the reform which is going to be introduced, then, and then only, they will take kindly to the innovation that will be introduced. In the past troubles have arisen in a number of such cases. If a new market place is erected for the sale of vegetables, people would not go there. In the city of Poona there have been troubles bordering on actual riots in this connection. The Reay market was erected and people were being induced to go from the old place which was a dirty place to the new market. They would not however go. They were at length prevailed upon to go to the new place and now they soon found themselves very happy in the new place. Similarly, new measures have been adopted with regard to the sale of milk. There was a lot of discontent in that connection also. But bit by bit, gradually, the advantage of the reform has been brought home to the minds of the people. If we proceed in this fashion, then, and then only, it will be possible for us to introduce the change and by mere legislation nothing can be effected. There must be this educative propaganda. Even enlightened merchants and others in Bombay have not adopted the standard time yet when standard time has been adopted everywhere else.

(An Honourable Member: It is a matter of self-respect.)

If it is a matter of self-respect with the people of Bombay that they do not adopt it, how can they expect poor people, ignorant ryots and others to adopt the standard weights and measures? If the difficulty is there with enlightened men, still more will be the difficulty felt with ignorant and superstitious people. Therefore we have to walk warily in adopting this reform, and must first of all try to educate public opinion in the market.

The HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY : Sir, though I
 1-5 P.M. acknowledge that there is a great deal of common sense in what
 my Honourable friend Dr. Ganganath Jha has said this
 morning in support of his Resolution, I think we are beset with difficulties of
 such an insuperable character that any general legislation which is contem-
 plated by the Resolution would be wholly impracticable. I share the apprehen-
 sions which my friend the Honourable Mr. Kale has so pithily put before this
 Council. In the first instance, if you wish to undertake legislation on the
 subject and desire to adopt a measure of general application, educational
 propaganda of a very wide character, as suggested by the Honourable Mr. Kale,
 will be required. I am perfectly aware, and I agree with my Honourable
 friend Sardar Jogendra Singh, that a great deal of fraud is being practised
 under the present system of weights and measures. But my fear is
 that if you have one system throughout a big Continent like India, the
 fraud will be on a much larger scale than what is being practised at
 present, because all classes of people will be unaware of the new system and
 will take time to understand the altered system of weights and measures, and
 there will be serious difficulty in actual practice. It is true, as my learned
 friend has pointed out, that the great law-giver, Manu, has said that it is
 the duty of Government to legislate in the matter of weights and measures.
 The great law-giver enjoins on Government the duty of revising weights and
 measures every six months. But my friend will perhaps agree that in the
 time of Manu the volume of trade was not so great as it is now. The
 volume of trade and business which is now going on is of a vast character,
 and I do not think that if Manu had lived in the present generation, he would
 have put forward the doctrine which has been referred to by my Honourable
 Friend. I, however, think that some sort of move must be made in this
 connection. My Honourable Friend, Mr. Sethna, has very rightly pointed out
 the steps taken in Khandesh by the Collector to introduce in his own district
 a uniform system which was readily taken up by various merchants and
 successfully put into operation there. If similar steps are taken in various
 districts at first, and the system gradually legalised and brought into operation,
 it would be all well and good. I also think that if any legislation is to be
 undertaken, the Provinces must arrange for their own legislation. It would
 be easier in the provinces to settle weights and measures and standardize them
 than to standardize for the whole of India. If a beginning is first made in
 the provinces by the introduction of provincial legislation, and if the altered
 system of weights and measures is worked for a certain period of time
 successfully, then legislation on a larger scale operating all over India may be
 safely undertaken. Though I fully, therefore, sympathise with the object of
 the Resolution, I fear that the time has not arrived for a general legislation
 of this sort, and therefore, I shall be regretfully compelled to vote against this
 proposition.

The HONOURABLE MR. H. A. F. LINDSAY : Sir, the re-
 1-9 P.M. commendations of the Honourable Mover are of
 the widest interest and importance to India, in fact
 to almost every householder in this country. They, therefore, merit
 the closest analysis before Honourable Members pass judgment upon
 them. The analyses given so far follow two main lines. In the first place,
 there has been support to the proposal for legislation. In the second, there has
 been an expression of opinion in favour of slower progress. With the general

principle underlying the Honourable Member's Resolution, I am sure the House will cordially agree. The inconvenience, the opportunities for dishonesty, the general retardation of trade, caused by the incongruity of weights and measures throughout the country, are well known to all. If only some system could be devised by which all the anomalous weights at present in force could be standardized at a single blow, all would be well. But, Sir, can legislation effect this result ?

This is the standpoint from which we have to criticise this motion. What would be the result if legislation is imposed ? To be effective, Sir, it must be precise. That is to say, it must operate from a precise date with precise provisions and penalties. From a certain date to be given all the existing anomalies are to be set aside, existing weights and measures are to be rendered illegal and a certain Government standard is to be set up which may or may not be known in each particular area to which it applies. We should have to have a distribution of Government standard weights and measures. Would that distribution be made at Government expense or at the expense of the individual who is to use them ? That is one of the first questions that has to be answered. If at Government expense, the amount of money required would be considerable. If our existing weights and measures in all their varieties are to be rendered at once illegal, surely the harm that will be caused by that act will be considerable. The hardships to numerous traders, petty shopkeepers, in fact almost every householder in India, if he found that his existing weights had been condemned and that he would be liable to a penalty for using weights which he had been accustomed to for generations past, would be very great.

What then is the alternative ? I should like to remind the House of an expression used by my Honourable friend, Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy during yesterday's debate on the Sugar Resolution, to the effect that we must proceed slowly and cautiously, by orderly development and not by radical change. That, Sir, must be our method in dealing with the present Resolution ; and, if so, what are the best lines on which to proceed ? The Weights and Measures Committee examined three different systems. The first was what is known as the railway system, the seer of 80 tolas and the maund of 40 seers. The second was the British system, and the third the metric system. They voted by a majority in favour of the railway system. Local Governments have since been consulted and have also voted almost unanimously in favour of the railway system. Burma stood out as Burma has its own system and wishes to proceed on its own lines. The basis of the railway system is the seer of 80 tolas, and the tola itself corresponds to the weight of the rupee. It is therefore a system which is likely to be convenient to everybody to whom it applies. There is a simple check ready to all. I suggest, Sir, that it should be left to Local Governments to take such measures as they themselves think convenient to introduce this standard weight. Honourable Members who have spoken before me have made a suggestion. They pointed out that much could be done by way of publicity work, by education in schools and also by municipal action.

What I have said so far refers only to weights. The question of measures is more complicated. The dry and liquid measures apply chiefly to retail transactions, and it is very doubtful whether it is worth the considerable difficulty involved in trying to standardise them. The need for uniformity is

[Mr. H. A. F. Lindsay.]

not so great as in the case of weights. I would suggest, therefore, that measures of capacity and area be omitted from consideration for the present...

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : I do not follow the Honourable Member. Is he suggesting a modification of the Resolution ?

The HONOURABLE MR. H. A. F. LINDSAY : I am just proposing it.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The Amendment should have been handed in before in that case.

The HONOURABLE MR. H. A. F. LINDSAY : With your permission, Sir, I shall now do so.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : A copy of the Amendment should be handed in to the Secretary. The Honourable Member may however proceed with his speech.

The HONOURABLE MR. H. A. F. LINDSAY : May I put in the Amendment ?

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : It should be handed in at the table. Honourable Members may like to see.

The HONOURABLE MR. H. A. F. LINDSAY : To summarise what I have already said, I think Honourable Members will agree that Burma should be left out of consideration for the present. Secondly, I think they will agree that the examination of this question should be confined simply to weights, and that measures should be left out of consideration altogether for the present, and thirdly.....

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : Order, order. I have received a copy of what purports to be an Amendment, of which no notice has been given to Honourable Members, and which is even now not in a form in which I can put it to the Council. It is extremely undesirable that Government at any rate should not follow the correct procedure regarding the handing in and moving of Amendments. In this case the Honourable Member should have handed in his Amendment before he commenced his speech, or at any rate have been prepared with a type-written copy. I trust that this practice will not be followed in future. In the meantime, I think the Honourable Member had better proceed with his speech.

The HONOURABLE MR. H. A. F. LINDSAY : I apologise, Sir. The three points which I trust the House will accept are, firstly, the exclusion of Burma, secondly, the exclusion of measures from consideration. I hope they will also agree to the third and most important of all, namely, the adoption of the railway system of weights. I have already given the arguments in favour of that system and I trust it will commend itself to the House. The procedure, then, would be for the Government of India to express themselves in favour of the adoption of the railway system of weights. They would also have to place certain standard weights probably in the Presidency-towns, and it would be left then to Local Governments to introduce these standards according to their individual conditions, and to take such steps as they choose to bring these standards to the notice of municipalities and business-men throughout the various Provinces,

The HONOURABLE SARDAR JOGENDRA SINGH : Sir, may I speak on the points raised by the Honourable Mr. Lindsay ?

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The Amendment is not yet before the House.

The HONOURABLE MR. LALUBHAI SAMALDAS : I have only to add one word to what fell from the Honourable Member. He, I believe, suggests that the railway weights should be accepted. May I beg to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that the Indian Cotton Committee considered this question very carefully and came to the unanimous conclusion that that system cannot be adopted and ought not to be adopted.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The objection to the procedure which has been adopted is manifest. We are now kept waiting whilst the Amendment is being put into shape. There is no Amendment before the Council, and therefore there can be no debate upon it now while apparently the House has exhausted itself on the general question.

(After a wait of a few minutes)

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The original question was that :

'This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that the time has now arrived for securing by legislation the use of a uniform system of weights and measures throughout British India.'

Since that question was proposed an Amendment has been moved by the Honourable Mr. Lindsay in the following terms :

'That for the words "the time has now arrived" down to the end of the Resolution, the following words be substituted "the Government of India should declare themselves in favour of the ultimate adoption in India, excluding Burma, of a uniform system of weights based on the scale now in use on the railways".'

That question is now open to debate by the House.

The HONOURABLE DR. GANGANATH JHA : In order to save time, I am ready to accept the Amendment proposed by the Honourable Mr. Lindsay, and agree to its being substituted in favour of my Resolution, because the railway system of weights is a system which would not be suddenly sprung upon the ignorant people. The railway seer and maund is actually known among the ignorant people as the *pucca* seer and the *pucca* maund, that is to say, the real seer and the real maund, and if those seers and maunds are introduced there would be nothing new sprung upon them.

The HONOURABLE MR. LALUBHAI SAMALDAS : I have not got the Amendment with me, but I would like the words "railway system" to be dropped. I would be inclined to accept the words "a uniform system of weights." I do not want the Council to be committed to one system. Let them make a detailed inquiry and see which system would suit the country best. It is, as you said, Sir, that this thing has been put rather abruptly to us whether the railway system is to be adopted and very few of us have had the time to consider whether the railway system will work or not. I therefore suggest that these words be dropped.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : To the Amendment proposed by the Honourable Mr. Lindsay a further Amendment has been proposed by the

[The President.]

Honourable Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas, namely, that in the Amendment the words "based on the scale now in use on the railways" should be omitted. That Amendment is now open to debate by the House.

1-33 P.M. The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA : Sir, I rise to speak against the Amendment of the Honourable Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas. The Honourable Member suggests that Government should appoint a Committee to consider which system of weights should be adopted as a uniform system. My Honourable friend forgets that a Committee sat for more than a year. It has published a most elaborate report, and, after going through the evidence of scores of witnesses and after consulting all the Provincial Governments, they came to the conclusion that, if any uniform system were to be adopted, the best uniform system for the country would be the railway system.

I think, therefore, Sir, that it would be a waste of time to have another Committee appointed, and I would therefore strongly support the Amendment of the Honourable Mr. Lindsay.

1-35 P.M. The HONOURABLE MR. H. A. F. LINDSAY : Sir, I trust that this Amendment will not be accepted by the House. The whole question has been thoroughly threshed out. The original Weights and Measures Committee was appointed in 1913-14, and, as the Honourable Mr. Sethna has pointed out, Local Governments have been very fully consulted and have given very careful consideration to the question. I think that, in these circumstances, the adoption of the railway system of weights is almost inevitable.

The Honourable Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas' Amendment was rejected.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The debate can now proceed on the Amendment as proposed by the Honourable Mr. Lindsay.

1-37 P.M. The HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY : Sir, I support the Honourable Mr. Lindsay's Amendment. I think that Amendment proceeds on the lines of least resistance. I am not enamoured by the proposed Amendment, but I think that, if any system is to be adopted, we shall find by adopting the Honourable Mr. Lindsay's Amendment that we will be able to attain our object. I think that the present railway system of weights is very well known to many people and that they will be willing to adopt it in preference to any other system.

1-39 P.M. The HONOURABLE SARDAR JOGENDRA SINGH : Sir, I do not see that the Honourable Mr. Lindsay's Amendment introduces anything new. The railway system of weights, so far as it goes, is already accepted, and the recommendation as proposed by him, if accepted by this House now, would hardly make any change whatsoever.

There is another point which I feel I must bring to the notice of this House, namely, that we are not taking into consideration whether it will cause discontent or whether it will excite attention. The question before the House is, whether it is right and just to have a fixed standard of weights and measures in the country, and, if it is so, we ought to have it in the right kind of way. I should like the Honourable Mr. Lindsay, when he is replying, to point out what progress has been made since the recommendations of the Committee were made. If no progress has been made, that is merely another way to postpone action. Railway weights and measures are obtaining

all over the country already, but the question is, is it going to be enforced in the villages; is the trader going to be asked to use it? There is no question of using any public funds in adopting new weights. What is needed is legislative sanction, so that every one is compelled to use them. If this House thinks it is preferable to use inaccurate stone weights, it lies with this House to reject the Resolution moved by the Honourable Dr. Ganganath Jha, but if this House thinks it is necessary to have standard weights and measures, it would be as well to express a decided opinion in favour of the change.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The question is that in the Resolution as moved by Dr. Ganganath Jha, for the words "the time has now arrived" down to the end of the Resolution, the following words be substituted:—"The Government of India should declare themselves in favour of the ultimate adoption in India, excluding Burma, of a uniform system of weights based on the scale now in use on the railways."

The Amendment was adopted.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The question now is that the Resolution, which runs as follows:

'That this Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that the Government of India should declare themselves in favour of the ultimate adoption in India, excluding Burma, of a uniform system of weights based on the scale now in use on the railways.'

be adopted.

The Resolution, as amended, was adopted.

The Council then adjourned till Saturday, the 24th instant, at 11 O'clock.
