

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SIND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

OFFICIAL REPORT

VOL. XVII-No. 6

WEDNESDAY, THE 3RD MARCH 1943.

**KARACHI
1943**

PAKISTAN RESOLUTION

Admission – Point of Order	... 2 - 23
Speaker's Ruling	... 3 - 07
Walk-out by Hindu Members	... 10
Discussion of	... 10-22
Division List re: voting	... 22-23

(PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS.)

THE SECRETARY: Private members' resolutions.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: Honourable Member Shaikh Abdul Majid.

SHAIKH ABDUL MAJID: Sir, I do not want to move the resolution standing in my name.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: Honourable Member Mr. G. M. Sayed.

Mr. G. M. SAYED: Sir, I do not want to move the first resolution which is the same as that of Honourable Member Shaikh Abdul Majid.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: Let him move his second resolution if he wants.

(PAKISTAN RESOLUTION)

Mr. G. M. SAYED: Yes, I want, to move the second resolution

Mr. DIALMAL DOULATRAM: Sir, private members' resolutions were fixed for 5th of March and they are being taken up to-day. I therefore request to know whether Government have agreed to that business being taken up to-day.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the House, if I remember aright, announced day before yesterday that this day has been allotted to non-official resolutions.

The Honourable SIR GHULAM HUSSAIN HIDAYATULLAH: Yes, Sir.

Mr. G.M. SAYED: Sir, I rise to move the following resolution:-

“This House recommends to Government to convey to His Majesty's Government through His Excellency the Viceroy, the sentiments and wishes of the Muslims of this Province that whereas Muslims of India are a separate nation possessing religion, philosophy, social customs, literature, traditions, political and economic theories of their own, quite different from those of the Hindus, they are justly entitled to the right, as a single, separate nation, to have independent national states of their own, carved out in the zones where they are in majority in the sub-continent of India.

“Wherefore they emphatically declare that no constitution shall be acceptable to them that will place the Muslims under a Central Government dominated by another nation, as in order to be able to play their part freely on their own distinct lines in the order of things to come, it is necessary for them to have independent National States of their own and hence any attempt to subject the Muslims of India under one Central Government is bound to result in Civil War with grave unhappy consequences.”

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: The resolution moved is:-

“This House recommends to Government to convey to His Majesty’s Government through His Excellency the Viceroy the sentiments and wishes of the Muslims of this Province that whereas Muslims of India are a separate nation possessing religion, philosophy, social customs, literature, traditions, political and economic theories of their own, quite different from those of the Hindus, they are justly entitled to the right, as a single, separate nation, to have independent national states of their own, carved out in the zones where they are in majority in the sub-continent of India.

“Wherefore they emphatically declare that no constitution shall be acceptable to them that will place the Muslims under a Central Government dominated by another nation, as in order to be able to play their part freely on their own distinct lines in the order of things to come, it is necessary for them to have independent National States of their own and hence any attempt to subject the Muslims of India under one Central Government is bound to result in Civil War with grave, unhappy consequences.”

Mr. NIHCALDAS C. VAZIRANI: Sir, I rise to a point of order. I submit that in the first place under rule 9I sub-para(a) and (d) this resolution is not admissible. I will read out the rule:-

“Subject to the restrictions contained in the rules, a member may move a resolution relating to a matter of general public interest:

Provided that no resolution shall be admissible which does not comply with the following conditions, namely:-

(a) it shall be clearly and precisely expressed and shall raise one definite issue;”

(b) and (c) are not relevant. I will read (d).

‘(d) it shall not relate to a matter which is not primarily the concern of the Provincial Government.”

Sir, I will first deal with sub-para (d). With due respect, I submit that this point admits of absolutely no controversy or doubt. Let us read the resolution itself.

The resolution says:-

“This House recommends to Government to convey to “His Majesty’s Government through His Excellency the Viceroy the sentiments and wishes of the Muslims of this province that whereas.”.

Now comes the operative part-

“Muslims of India are a separate nation possessing religion, philosophy, social customs, literature, traditions, political and economic theories of their own, quite different from those of the Hindus, they (Muslims of India) are justly entitled to the right, as a single, separate nation, to have independent National States of their own, carved out in the zones where they are in the majority in the sub-continent of India.

Wherefore they emphatically declare that no constitution shall be acceptable to them (Mussalmans of India) that will place the Muslims under a Central Government (not a Provincial Government) dominated by another nation, as in order to be able to play their part freely on their own distinct lines in the order of things to come, it is necessary for them to have independent National States of their own and hence any attempt to subject the Muslims of India under one Central Government is bound to result in Civil War with grave, unhappy consequences.”

So, Sir, as I said before, under part (a) of the rule there should be only one definite issue in the resolution. Either this resolution contains one definite issue, or it is a jumble of issues. If it is going to be held that it contains only one definite issue, then that one definite issue must be the last one, viz that the Muslims of India should not be compelled to be under one Central Government and if so compelled, it is bound to lead to Civil war with grave and unhappy consequences. It, however it is held that there are a number of issues, then on reading part (a) of the rule, it will be inadmissible under that rule. Therefore, if it is taken to mean that there is only one issue, viz: that the Muslims of India should not be compelled to remain under one Central Government, then I submit, Sir, if you read sub-paragraph (d) of rule (9I) which as I have pointed out is mandatory -and it says “provided that no resolution shall be admissible” the resolution will not be permissible. In fact this is not a case of ordinary discretion on the part of the Honourable the Speaker. He is bound to carry out the rule as it is made. The rule may be good, or it may be bad. But the rule, as it stands today before this House, has to be interpreted by the Honourable the Speaker according to the reasonable interpretation that can be placed on it. The rule is mandatory and is clear enough. By no stretch of imagination can these words “it shall not relate to a matter which is not the primary concern of the Provincial Government.” be interpreted differently. The resolution is very explicit, and it talks of a Central Government. It does not talk of the Provincial Government, and that is the issue in the case, viz: that the Muslims of India should not be compelled to remain under one Central Government because they have different religion, different traditions and so on. Therefore, I submit Sir, it cannot be said to be the concern of the Provincial Government. Even if it be said by some indirect method, by some sort of argument, “Oh, yes, it also relates to the Provincial Government. Oh, yes, our province is one of the provinces to be affected,” Directly or indirectly, by no stretch of imagination can it be said to be a question which is primarily the concern of the Provincial Government. The point at issue is whether the issue is the primary concern of the Provincial Government. The wordings being so express, I do not think, the mandatory provisions of rule 9I(d) can be violated. I have made my point quite clear and it calls for no further argument from me. To allow such a resolution as this before the Provincial Legislature, which is not only not the primary concern of the Provincial Government, but is definitely and expressly shown to be the only concern of the Central Government, will be clearly out of order.

If it is interpreted as containing one issue only, there are other points in it which will come up, viz: whether they are different nations, or whether they have different culture and so on. It also raises the question whether there should be separate provinces, or a separate Pakistan and so on. Then, Sir, not only will the objection under rule 9I(d) apply, but the objection under rule 9I(a) also will apply. Therefore, I think, Sir, the stand that may be taken by the mover of the resolution will be that it raises only one definite issue, and that definite issue, as I have submitted, is expressed in the concluding part of the resolution, viz: that the Muslims of India should not be compelled to remain under one Central Government, because they have different religion, different traditions and so on.

My point number two is this. You know it for a fact, Sir, that this is a contentious resolution, about which undoubtedly there is difference of opinion, not only in the whole of India.....

The Honourable HAJI M. H. GAZDAR: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member is raising a debate on the merits of the resolution. He cannot discuss the merits of the resolution at this stage.

Mr. NIHCHALDAS C. VAZIRANI: I am not discussing the merits. My Honourable friend should have patience. It is a contentious resolution, and therefore I submit, Sir.....

The Honourable HAJI M.H. GAZDAR: ... and therefore it cannot be legal? Is that a point of order?

Mr. NIHCHALDAS C. VAZIRANI: Therefore, I submit, Sir, at this time, when the other community, viz: the Hindu community has 50 percent, of its representatives in prison as security prisoners it is not fair to bring forward this resolution. No doubt, day before yesterday notice was given that it will be ante-dated. As a matter of fact the resolution had been fixed for the 5th.

Mr. G.M. SAYED: That is not a point of order, Sir.

Mr. NIHCHALDAS C. VAZIRANI: Let me conclude. Certain Members of the Muslim community who would have opposed this resolution, being nationally minded, are also absent today. There are thus two considerations. Firstly, whether it is right and proper to bring forward such a resolution at this stage, and whether it is not for the Honourable the Speaker to exercise his own discretion and not allow such a resolution to come forward, since it will amount to taking undue advantage of the present position of the minority communities. Such a precedent has taken place in the Assam Provincial Legislature, where the Honourable Speaker was bold enough to tell the Government party that if any contentious bills were brought before the House when the minority community was not represented in the House, he shall have to exercise his powers and adjourn the House. That is a point for you to consider, Sir. That is a matter, however, of discretion, but first part is, according to me, mandatory.

The Honourable SIR GHULAM HUSSAIN HIDAYAT-ULLAH: Sir, I have heard my Honourable friend on the opposite side with great interest. His first complaint was that the Opposition did not get sufficient notice that this resolution would be taken up today. It is only 3 days back, Sir, that I informed this Honourable House that resolutions would be taken up on the third, and not on the fifth, because most of the Honourable Members were anxious to return home for the holidays.

Now, Sir, I come to the objection that the resolution contains several issues. But the resolution really contains only one issue, viz: that the Muslims do not want to be under one Central Government. The question that then arises is, if you do not want to be under one Central Government, what then do you want? Therefore they say that they want to be a separate unit. This is merely explanatory. Naturally, when I say I do not want something, the next question, is what do I want then? Therefore, the resolution goes on to say that they do not want to be under one Central Government but to have independent states or units, whatever you may call them.

Now, Sir, my friend knew that it contained only one definite issue. But as he wanted to oppose this resolution, he says, if they wanted independent units that would mean two issues. May I tell him that if they say what they do not want they must also say what they do want. That is my reply to the objection. Mussalmans do not want to be under one Central Government, but want to be independent units.

Then my Honourable friend talked of the minority not being here and the Congressmen not being here. I do not think there was much love lost between him and the congress for whom he is feeling so sorry.

Then as regards national minded Muslims, I do not think there are many. I find only one, but I am doubtful about him also.

SHAIKH ABDUL MAJID: We are only nationalist Mussalmans.

The Honourable SIR GHULAM HUSSAIN HIDAYAT-ULLAH: The next objection is that a resolution can only refer to a matter which is the primary concern of the Provincial Government. I agree with him there. This matter does not primarily concern the Provincial Government. But in this Honourable House, Sir, you have very kindly admitted resolutions about independence, and several other matters, for example, the resolution of Miss Jethibai. It was because the House was aware that these resolutions were merely in the nature of recommendations and that the proceedings would be sent to the Central Government or other proper authority, my friend cannot blow hot and cold at the same time. When my Hindu friends and the Congress wanted to discuss the above resolutions my friend did not object. But when another community brings a similar resolution, he stands up to oppose. Sir I might point out that many resolutions not concerning the Provincial Government have been moved and debated here, and copies of the proceedings have been forwarded to the proper authority. Therefore, Sir, I do not think he is on sound ground when he opposes this resolution.

Mr. G. M. SAYED: Honourable the Premier has replied to the points raised by my Honourable friend Mr. Nihchaldas. Honourable Member Mr. Nihchaldas is an advocate. But I am sorry here he has not advocated for justice but only for a one-sided point. He raised the point that the matter in the resolution should be the primary concern of the Provincial Government. Our Leader has shown clearly that there have been previous instances when such resolutions have been discussed and my Honourable friend did not raise any objection. I want to point out that Muslims of the Province form the part of the Provincial Government. Are we not here to represent the Mussalmans of the province? Government is ours. We must voice our feelings. Is this not the primary concern of the Provincial Government? I will point out another instance. Recently the Bengal Assembly have passed the resolution for the unconditional release of Mahatma Gandhi. So recent a resolution, I do not know why he should forget. It seems he has purposely forgotten it.

Mr. DIALMAL DOULATRAM : Was any objection raised?

Mr. G. M. SAYED : He has also pointed out that it does not clearly raise one issue. Honourable the Premier has already pointed out that it is a definite issue. So I need not repeat the arguments. Honourable Mr. Nihchaldas appealed to you, Sir, that as Hindu members are outside the House so this is not the proper occasion when you should allow this resolution to be moved. Sir, here in the resolution it is said the sentiments and wishes of the Muslims of the Province of Sind may be conveyed to His Majesty's Government. Therefore Hindu members have nothing to do with it. I request that you should rule the point out of order.

The Honourable RAI SAHIB GOKALDAS MEWALDAS: I want to say only two words. The Honourable the Premier has said what has been the practice in the past when similar resolutions have been allowed or permitted. That may be the case during the past. But here we are to restrict such things and put limitations on things. You will realise that as the resolution stands now, it does not raise one issue, according to me.

The Honourable the Premier suggested that if Mussalmans of the Province do not want this, then they must suggest alternatives. If they suggest alternatives, it is all right. But you will see in the end that it is also said that it will lead to civil war. You will, Sir, realise that it is after all a Muslim League Ministry with Hindus in coalition. If there were certain threats, I think, it was the duty of the Honourable the Premier to have raised some objection to that.

It does not lead to one issue. There are at least four issues. The Honourable Member Mr. Sayed suggests that Mussalmans are as a whole one nation and that there should be separate states for them. They do not want to be under one Central Government. If that is not acceded to, there will be civil war. We have at present provincial autonomy under the Government of India Act which only provides that there will be one Central Government. We have, so far as we are concerned, separate provincial autonomy and we have to be guided by the Act of 1935. I, therefore, personally feel that there is more than one point involved in this resolution. Rule 9I is very definite and you have to give your ruling on that.

SHAIKH ABDUL MAJID : Sir, the point you have to decide is whether the resolution in the first place raises more than one definite issue. In my humble opinion if you read the resolution from beginning to end you will find that it raises one clear definite issue and that issue is the position of the Mussalmans of India in the future constitution of the country. I may draw your attention to the words “wherefore they emphatically declare” i.e., Sind Muslims emphatically declare that no constitution shall be acceptable to them that will place the Muslims under a Central Government dominated by another Nation.

So, the resolution raises one definite issue and that issue is as to what the Mussalmans of Sind think about the position of the Mussalmans of India in the future constitution of the country. I do not understand the Honourable Minister, Public Works Department, or the Honourable Member Mr. Nihchaldas by what stretch of imagination they can convert this one issue into a number of issues. The only issue raised is what the position of the Indian Mussalmans is going to be in the future constitution of the country. The Central Government or the provincial Government and all these are a part of that one definite issue. So, Sir, I submit that on that ground there is no point in the point of order raised by the Honourable Member Mr. Vazirani.

Then the second point which he dealt with at some length is about the fact whether it is the primary concern of the Provincial Government. Now that does not need any further argument from me because there are so many precedents.

KHAN BAHADUR A. K. GABOL: He has forgotten all about it.

SHAIKH ABDUL MAJID : I may, however, inform my Honourable friend Rai Sahib Gokaldas that I propose to move some amendments to this resolution in places, for example, like the safeguards for minorities and the words such as civil war, etc. I wanted to see you, Sir, personally in that connection, but unfortunately you came very late, and therefore I handed over my amendments to your secretary and after the Honourable the Mover of the resolution has spoken on this subject, I shall place my amendments before you. So, my Honourable friends who oppose this resolution need have no fear anywhere here or in any part of India. But in the light of the rules, specially rule 9I (a) of the Assembly Rules which has rather been advanced as an argument for not admitting this resolution, that rule, I submit, is in favour of admitting the

resolution. This resolution raises one issue of paramount importance so far as Mussalmans of Sind as well as the Mussalmans of India are concerned and so far as their future generations are concerned. That is the main issue and there is no other issue embodied in the resolution that has been moved by Honourable Member Mr. Sayed.

Mr. NIHCALDAS C. VAZIRANI: Sir, will you kindly permit me to reply to what the Honourable member Shaikh Abdul Majeed has said?

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: No.

Mr. NIHCALDAS C. VAZIRANI : That is all. I only wanted to seek your permission.

(SPEAKER RULING)

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: We have already wasted nearly three quarters of an hour and I think we should be mindfull about the precious time of the House. The point is simple and possibly I have decided many similar points in the past

Mr. DIALMAL DOULATRAM: Not when the objections were raised, as is the case here.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: The point is if there are inherent defects that are to be cured at one time or the other, they should be brought forward and I am really thankful to the Honourable Member Mr. Nihchaldas who has brought these points to my notice which I have carefully noted. We must once and for all make a decision as to what course we going to adopt in this House for the future.

Now, the Honourable member Mr. Nihchaldas has raised objection to the admissibility of this resolution on three grounds – off course two legal and the third moral.

Mr. NIHCALDAS C. VAZIRANI: They pertain to legality and propriety.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: Now, the Honourable Member has quoted rule 9I(a) of the Sind Legislative Assembly Rules under which he emphasised the mandatory nature of the rule. He laid particular emphasis on the following wordings of that rule –

“that the resolution shall raise one definite issue”

Now, I have to decide whether or not this resolution raises one definite issue. I am really thankful to my honourable friend Mr. Nihchaldas who has already supplied me with an argument and an answer.(Laughter). Possibly yes, because he himself definitely put it to me that the definite issue is that the Musslamans of India do not wish to remain under one Central Government. Because he has a legal brain he has made every thing very perceptible though to a layman it may not appeal. I feel no hesitation in admitting that he is a very keen and shrewd lawyer if you could but perceive the underlying issue raised by him to this resolution. But, unfortunately, it depends upon the capacity of the framer of the resolution. Therefore, I think that the definite issue underlying this resolution is that the Musslamans of India do not wish to live under one Central Government. That is all. That is the only definite issue. The other point raised by the Honourable Minister in charge of Public Works Department was “Then what about the argument that there should be separate independent states, etc.?” This is a mere consequence of that issue.

You can not make a resolution so inflexible that it will not admit of any corollary or explanation: because, supposing he had merely moved that Musslamans of India do not wish to remain under one Central Government. Then he must give certain indication as to why, what for and what will be the consequence of such an implication – not of course departing from raising one single issue in the resolution. The Honourable Member has got that experience and every one of us has got this experience. So I think the argument is not sustainable on that ground. Then particularly my friend Mr. Nihchaldas was more emphatic about part (d) of rule 9I and he has emphasised that the matter contained in this resolution does not raise an issue which could be said to be the primary concern of the Provincial Government. I was listening with very great interest whether there was any force in that argument advanced by him.

Now, if we have really to do something and be progressive and build traditions of a Parliamentary House, then we have to be liberal in our thoughts, in our actions, in our legislation and interpretations.

Mr. NIHCHALDAS C. VAZIRANI : Amend the rules.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: I may say that the rules could not be interpreted in a way as to hinder the progress of parliamentary constitution. Constitutions grow, traditions grow. I can quote instances from the great constitutions of the world including the constitution and the history of the House of Commons how constitutions grow. They cannot be iron cages or water-tight-compartments which have got no room to move or grow. As a matter of fact, in the Government of India Act that constitution is envisaged which contains a germ of self-evolution. It will be flexible and grow from time to time and it is therefore that the Presidents and the Speakers of various Legislatures in India have been permitting resolutions and motions concerning the future constitution of India. Constitution making is the burning question of the day and we have not yet arrived at a goal. We are yet marching forward putting forth our view points from various parts of the country and various sections and classes that inhabit this great sub-continent. It was, therefore, that my predecessor permitted a similar resolution moved by Miss Jethi Sipahimalani, the Deputy Speaker of this House, on the 3rd August 1937.

Mr. NIHCHALDAS C. VAZIRANI: This rule was made after words.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: My Honourable friend who is a great lawyer, did not seem to have raised any objection at that time.

Mr. NIHCHALDAS C. VAZIRANI: I had no objection as it was the common consent of the House-the entire House.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: But I do not know whether several Honourable Members of this House oppose this resolution. However, let me proceed to deal with the argument he has advanced.

True, the resolution does not refer to Provincial Government or acts of Provincial Government, nevertheless Provincial Government is the result of the Act of 1935. In a constitutional process Provincial Government is intertwined with the Central Government although unfortunately on account of circumstances beyond our control a Central Government contemplated under the Government of India Act of 1935 has not yet come into being. At a future date there is going to be a Federal Government and along with that, there will be Provincial Governments like the one we are running in Sind. We are one

homogeneous whole, and the Provinces are units that go to compose the Central Government, whether today or tomorrow. We are the representatives of the people, and the representatives of the people have elected the provincial Government which is autonomous. The Ministers are our representatives. We can throw them out or we can bring them in tomorrow. So it is by the desire of the people that their representatives occupy the benches here. Therefore it cannot be said that this matter could not be the concern of the Provincial Government. If there is any move which is going to affect the constitution of Provincial Governments, does it mean that this Provincial Government should have no voice or say in the matter? What are we here for? Supposing tomorrow a constitution is going to be imposed upon us taking away various subjects and placing them under the Central Government; will the representatives of the people of Sind agree to that? Surely not. We have been urging that even residuary powers should be vested in Provincial Governments, and that the Central Government should have only certain definite matters and subjects to administer. That being so, a Provincial Government has always got a voice in the constitution of the country and in the settlement of certain rights as between the Central Government and the Provincial Governments. So far as the making of a constitution is concerned, it is the fundamental concern of the Provincial Government. Therefore, I think the Honourable Member's argument has not convinced me to the extent to which I should be prepared to rule out the resolution under rule 9I(d) of the Assembly Rules, and I hold that it is certainly the concern of the Provincial Government so far as any proposal concerning the making of the constitution is concerned.

Then, the Honourable Member has appealed to me on moral grounds. I listened with great interest and great relief when my Honourable friends Mr. G.M. Sayed said that his resolution was intended to convey the views and sentiments of only the Mussalmans of Sind, and not of the entire population of Sind. This point did not come to my mind until he raised the issue. I think it is only the wish of the Mussalmans of Sind which is going to be conveyed to the Central Government by this resolution. The Honourable Member Mr. Nihchaldas may give his vote as he likes- I know he will vote against the resolution. Here I am only a channel to convey the wishes and desires of the Mussalmans of Sind. If the Mussalmans of Sind vote for it, then he should not grudge it. If the resolution had been so framed as to give the idea that the wishes and sentiments of the entire people of Sind were to be conveyed to the Central Government, then there would be some force in the objection. That is not so. Therefore both on legal and moral grounds, I rule the point out of order. (Ministerial cheers.)

(WALK OUT BY HINDU MEMBERS)

Mr. NIHCHALDAS C. VAZIRANI: Sir, with due respect, in view of the ruling of the Chair that the Hindus have no interest in the resolution and that it is only the wishes and sentiments of the Mussalmans of Sind that are to be conveyed through it, we the Hindus sitting on these benches leave the House.

(At this stage the Hindu Members – Messrs. Nihchaldas C. Vazirani, Dialmal Doulatram, Ghanumal Tarachand, Partabrai Khaisukhdas, Akhji Ratansing Sodho, Mukhi Gobindram and Rao Bahadur Hotchand Hiranand – walked out of the Assembly Hall.)

Mr. G. M. SAYED: Sir, in view of the importance of the resolution, I have noted down certain points with a view that there should be no misrepresentation, as I have generally found that on such occasions the outside public misrepresent the case placed by the Honourable Members in the Assembly, and then it is very difficult to go on replying to each and every person in the press and outside.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: The Honourable member can refer to his notes.

Mr. G. M. SAYED: Sir, in moving this resolution I am doing my duty as a representative of the Mussalmans of this Province to reiterate from the floor of this Honourable House their demand in common with the Mussalmans of India numbering no less than a hundred million of which the Sind Muslims form a part, the demand that has come to be known as Pakistan. It describes in a nutshell the inalienable right of the Muslim Nation for self-determination and seeks to safeguard their fundamental rights under the new order of things to come.

The world is on the threshold of a new era which promises equal opportunities, equal rights to every nation in the world and the long cherished dream of independent India is about to be realized – a dream for the early and full realisation whereof all Indians, Muslims and Hindus have sincerely worked, suffered and sacrificed.

Let me assure you, Sir, that the Muslim Nation of India who until the advent of the British rule had for full eight centuries been the ruling power is by tradition, by its psychological make-up and by its character, the champion of the cause of India's freedom and it has ever eagerly aspired for the achievement of this freedom with a burning zeal by no means less than the Hindus or any other nation of India.

The demand for Pakistan is based on the theory that Muslims are a separate nation as distinct from Hindus and that what is known as India is and was never one geographical unit.

I shall first deal with the geographical aspect of the question.

Great deal is being made of geographical position. To start with, calling India a country is a misnomer. England apart, Europe could be called a country from that point of view with much more justification. Yet Europe is a conglomeration of different nations who have not yet reached the stage of federation.

Taking in view the geographical position of this Province and Gujrat between which a whole desert intervenes that could not be traversed within 24 hours and position of France and Germany whose borders are coterminous and could be crossed over in 5 minutes, it becomes obvious how little those people understand who speak of the geographical position of India as a national unit.

India in fact is not a country at all but in every sense as good a continent as Europe, Africa or North and South America. The United States could easily argue that Mexico and Canada should by natural division be included in it. Brazil, Peru and Chile have no reason to be apart. Canadians and people of United States are not only the same people but speak the same language, have the same religion, dress in the same way, have the same social customs, enjoy the same literature, and inter-marry; in short, everything is common between them and they both are geographically one unit, yet Canada retains its integral national entity.

Likewise South American States which are parts of one geographical unit are inhabited by more or less one people of Spanish extraction, speaking almost the same language, dress in the same way, inter-marry and have very little to distinguish them one from the other, and yet they are evolving along their own

lines, getting more and more defined in separation and there is no sign or talk of amalgamation or federation amongst them.

There is no excuse for Siberia and China being separate either- Why should Siberia connect itself with the people living on the side of the Urals when they could be the natural part of China, ethnologically and otherwise?

So far the geographical argument does not carry us an inch further as far as nation forming is concerned. Let us now consider it from the meaning of the word 'Nation' itself. Nation arises from the root 'Natus' meaning born, originally pointing to the race connexion. It has been proved without doubt that Germanic and Keltic peoples belong to the same race, that France of Charlemagne included them both. We have already observed that geographically France and Germany should be one. We have found that racially they are the same people; linguistically, they belong to the same stock called Indo-Germanic or Indo-European. Could a democracy be formed by combining these two peoples? Will France submit to it or will the Germans?

I would not like you to lose sight of the fact that French literature was read and appreciated by Germans for 2 centuries and that it considerably conduced to the creation of their own literature. Also they are peoples that have been freely inter-marrying and there is very little in their social habits and ways of thought that could be called different. Nay, as French literature formed a national reading at one time in Germany, so German philosophy has been taught in French Universities for a century and yet again we ask, could they be governed by a democratical Government if they were thrown into a combination? The natural consequences will be swamping of 30 million French by 80 million Germans and France in a short time will begin to lose its individuality. Some people might consider this illustration of these two rival peoples as not sufficiently convincing. But they can be easily reminded of Holland and Belgium or Sweden and Norway. One glance at European history will show that national and democratic order did not make even in Europe for combinations and amalgamations but separation and individuation. It was not a pell mell union, it was not a spatial guxta-position but an organic unity at all points that was a basic condition of national and democratic Government. The utmost they have arrived at within themselves after a hundred years of national conception is not even socialistic Government – leave alone organic. The laws that nature has set on man and along which he alone can progress, can neither be hurried nor set at naught without destructive consequences. A man who aims at a fruit becoming yellow before it has matured to full size or aims at sweetness before it has become completely sour, is destroying the life of the fruit and will never achieve his purpose. Tension, however unpalatable, is a necessary condition of progress at a certain stage of evolution and can be avoided only at the peril of stagnation and death.

After this general survey of more or less homogeneous and geographically, socially, economically, religiously, politically one people and yet impossible either to unite or be governed as one national unit, let us revert to Indian conditions. I have already pointed out the impossibility of considering 2 provinces in India, say, like Sind and Gujrat, not to speak of Bengal, Central provinces, Madras etc. as one geographical unit. How do they stand linguistically? One can not possibly understand the other. But if we consider them religiously, one community refuses to have any social connection with the other. A Gujrati Brahmin not only dresses absolutely different to a Muslim, but would throw his food away as polluted if a Mussalman passed by and his shadow fell over his food. Question of inter-marriage between them does not arise. Entire

social separation is the only arrangement arrived at between the two communities by which they can peacefully exist at all side by side. Slightest approach to any further intercourse would cause pitched battles between the members of the communities as witness the record of communal riots that have broken out from time to time all over the country.

Naturally one would ask, what is the cause of that fundamental difference? That is not far to seek. In earlier times that which we call ideology today went under the name of religion. Entire society was built on and by that conception. Those communities like the Europeans that were more progressive and could assimilate and adapt to newer notions (brought about by the necessary law of evolution) could get over the fundamental differences quicker. The conservative communities on the other hand persisted in retaining their ancient institutions, defying the law of the revolution and taking pride in non-surrender to change, remaining strictly apart and despising assimilation and adaptation. The proof of that Hindu conservatism in India is furnished by the fact that Buddhism that was a natural evolutionary advance on Brahminism was successfully beaten out of India by the Brahminism and had to seek home on the Indian Frontiers viz: Ceylon, Burma, China, Tibet, etc. The Brahmins insist upto today that Gautama was a demon who came to destroy. In the strictest sense Brahminism was and must remain by the very nature of it a non-missionary religion. A Brahmin is born and not made. I might know all the “srutis” and “smritis” by heart and be an Aryan in the bargain, but can I become a Brahmin or even a Kshatriya? No. Only a sudra, and that also by grace and not by right! When a constitution of any race or community is so adamant there is no place for even a mechanical mixture, leaving alone an organic unity, without which a truly democratic national state cannot exist.

Now let us examine the two big nations, or communities as you may call them, namely, Hindus and Muslims, in India and see whether they can possibly form one nation. They differ from each other in every aspect of life. Their social customs are separate and different. Their literatures and even economical conception differ from each other.

While Muslim philosophy of life accepts man as a free agent untrammelled by limitations and handicaps in his march on the path of evolution, the Hindu philosophy is based on the theory of “Karma” making man’s life dependent upon and restricted by the supposed actions of previous life. The Muslims believe in equality and brotherhood of man, while Hindus take the diversity of the human beings as an article of their faith upon which is built their “caste system”, so much so that their greatest book the Bhagvad Gita lays it down that when the castes are confounded, then will the “Dharma” be lost !

Apart from the religious and philosophical differences, there are social barriers which in spite of their thousand years’ stay together the two nations have continued to retain. There is not only no inter-marriage, interdining and intercourse possible, but they keep scrupulously apart, even the shadow of a Muslim across the Brahmin’s path or food being supposed to pollute the Brahmin’s sacred person and wholesome food!

Similarly in the matter of their food, what is allowed to one is forbidden to the other, so that the difference is not only one of a class but a material, solid fact which is felt and lived every moment in the day-to-day life of the two communities.

Thus so long as Hindus remain as Hindus, there can be no possible basis of one nationality which according to the most authoritative sources implies a sense of kinship which is impossible and unpermissible under the Hindu philosophy. Renan, a great authority on the subject, says "Nationality is a subjective psychological feeling. It is a feeling of corporate sentiment of oneness which makes those that are charged with it feel that they are kith and kin. This feeling is a double edged feeling. It is at once a feeling of fellowship for those who are not one's own kith and kin. It is a longing to belong to one's own group and a longing not to belong to any other group.

It has been sometimes said that what really matters to the masses is the problem of bread and that as soon as the economic problem is solved, the communal-we would maintain the national-differences will vanish. But such a hope is only self-delusion.

The Honourable Dr. HEMANDAS R. WADHWANI: Sir, I rise to a point of order. My Honourable friend Mr. Ghulam Murtaza Shah is going into the merits of religion. I do not think he is relevant in this connection. He is attacking the Hindu religion pointing out the defects of the Hindu religion.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: He should avoid that.

Mr. G. M. SAYED : How can I avoid it? I want to show how we differ. I must show the differences between the two societies. The Ideologies of each other are different. I must quote how they are different. I am attacking no religion. I am not saying anything against them. I do not think anybody on earth will deny what I am saying. I am not doing injustice to other religions. I have great regard for other religions. I am only showing different ideologies.

The Honourable DR. HEMANDAS R. WADHWANI: He has been going into the merits of religions.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: Honourable Member should not compare the religions. He can compare social customs and economic theories.

Mr. G. M. SAYED: Sir, I was explaining the economic position and pointing out that Hindu philosophy has no room for labour; it is looked down upon by it. Money is worshipped as a deity and gambling including speculation, the bane of modern economy and usury which enable one to lead a luxurious life without having to labour for it, are not only permitted, but form part of Hindu ritual. Islam on the other hand not only acknowledges but actually sanctifies manual labour, forbids easy money-making such as usury.

The Honourable Dr. HEMANDAS R. WADHWANI: What are Pathans?

Mr. G. M. SAYED: They are not acting according to Islamic conceptions. Islam encourages division and fragmentation of property aiming at the ultimate destruction of all artificial class distinctions based on accidental differences of colour and race or wealth and property. Most of the greatest saints and scholars of Islam have been mechanics and tradesmen of all sorts-washermen, carpenters, cotton thrashers, weavers, yet they are all amongst the most respected scholars, honourable men in Islam. I may as well quote: (Here read some Arabic couplet). Labourer is a friend of God. Labour is the most accepted thing by God. That is how I am pointing out different ideologies.

The Honourable Dr. HEMANDAS R. WADHWANI: Outside Sind most of the labour is Hindu (Laughter).

Mr. G. M. SAYED: Thus if the ultimate object in the freedom of a democratic unit is the free, unrestricted growth of a nation on its own individualistic lines based on its culture, philosophy and traditions, not to speak of other accidental factors such as climatic, geographical, linguistic and racial characteristics, then Muslims and Hindus can never expect to attain that common growth as the growth of one precludes that of the other, the very basis of such growth being opposed one to the other. It is idle to expect that when the hero of one community is the tyrant of the other, when a historic victory of one is the shameful defeat of the other that in a United India, where the Hindus will by the strength of their numbers always command the lion's share in the Government of the country, Muslims will have any the slightest chance of attainment of their ideals.

I must further point out that democracy means rule of people. But these people must be homogeneous and not heterogeneous. There cannot be any Government unless it has got some common ideals before it, which are acceptable to all the people of the land. Now let us see whether a common ideal in a United India can ever be possible. It is quite clear that their ideals being different, Hindus and Muslims cannot run smoothly in the same direction with the result that there will not be democracy but there will be a rule of tyrant majority. Today we blame Hitler and other tyrant states for forcing their wills upon others and coerce the people to act against their free wills. What would be the differences between them and the people of India if unity was forced upon them? If 300 million people force 100 million people to be subordinate to them and follow the ideals of the 300 million people, quite contrary to the wishes and sentiments of the minority, what will be the result of such rule?

The two major communities are rivals for political power and rivalry between them is bound to continue so long as one is not completely absorbed by the other or they are not given separate national states. No power in the world can establish the necessary understanding between them, at the same time keeping them as Hindus and Muslims with one national unit. Their traditions have been built on each other's cost. The history of the last one thousand years is dotted with incidents which do not signify the same thing to them both. What one has recorded as its brilliant success, the other has registered as a wrong perpetrated against it.

Some people again argue that Muslim nationalists will not be self-sufficient economically and financially. That way no state in the world is entirely self dependent in every aspect of life and rich enough to satisfy its entire requirements. Whatever its economical position, no nation will be prepared to lose its independence and liberty for the sake of money and other luxuries of life. Can a bird prefer all sorts of food in a cage to the free rambling life in the woods where it often does not get sufficient food? Will Afghanistan lose its independence for the sake of the rich grains and other amenities of life in India? It is therefore idle to raise the bogey of economical insufficiency in respect of Pakistan States.

I hope better senses will prevail and our Hindu friends who claim to be so anxious about the independence of India will understand and realise that there is no other solution for the salvation of the country than the one embodied in the Lahore Resolution of the All-India Muslim League commonly known as Pakistan Resolution, if the problem of India is ever satisfactorily to be solved.

Sir, I cannot do better than wind up my speech by referring to a happy coincidence. Today when I move in this Honourable House this Pakistan resolution, that great Hindu leader Mr. Gandhi who has tried in the past for Hindu Muslim Unity will break his fast. It is our earnest hope that Mr. Gandhi will now more than ever become convinced that any attainment at artificial unity is foredoomed to failure. Independence of India, freedom from foreign domination, riddance of imperialistic rule can only be achieved when the Hindu Muslim question has been settled in an honourable manner to the satisfaction of the great Muslim Nation by conceding its Pakistan demand. It is therefore that I venture to hope that his inner light will reveal to him the imperative need to concede to the Muslim Nation the right of self-determination and thereby he will spare us all the tragedy that will inevitably happen leading to disastrous consequences if this fair demand of the Muslims is opposed and any constitution that does not confer this right upon Muslims is thrust upon us against our wishes.

SHAIKH ABDUL MAJID: Sir, I wish to move two amendments to the resolution moved by my friend Mr. G.M. Sayed. I do not know whether you will allow me to move these amendments at the same time, or after you have dealt with one.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: Which are the amendments?

SHAIKH ABDUL MAJID: Sir, I move my first amendment that in line 3 from the bottom, after the word "own" the words "with safeguards for minorities" should be added. My second amendment is this, viz: "Drop the words "Civil war with grave" in the last line, and substitute the word "disastrous".

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: The amendment moved is in line 3 from the bottom, after the word "own" the words "with safeguards for minorities" should be added. And in the last line the words "civil war with grave" should be substituted by the word "disastrous".

Mr. G. M. SAYED: I accept the amendment.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: Is the Honourable Member going to speak? I shall permit him if he wants to.

SHAIKH ABDUL MAJID: (In Sindhi) Sir, I support the resolution of my Honourable friend, as amended by me. I am sorry that my Honourable Hindu friends have thought it fit to walk out of this Honourable House. I would have been more pleased if they had been broad minded enough to give us at least a patient hearing. If the proposals were not acceptable to them, they could have remained neutral but there was no relevant reason for their leaving the House. It is since long that Indian National Congress and All India Muslim League and other organisations have expressed their ideas and views on the future constitution of India. The ideology behind this resolution has been placed before the country by the All India Muslim League. It was necessary to think a little over it and decide whether the resolution should be supported by the House. There was nothing new in it, which was Greek and Latin to the Honourable Hindu Members and that it so hit upon their hearts that they were compelled to leave this House or even the province of Sind. There was not a single point in it on which it was necessary for them to show displeasure. The question of future of India is a constitutional question. On such questions some of Honourable Members at times are over-powered by communalism. It pertains to a constitutional issue and we have to judge with patience, whether it would be possible to have federated union in India. I think it

cannot be possible unless there are independent units in India. If I may state in English, "Federation of Units, presupposes existence of independent Units in the country."

The main aim of this resolution is that the Muslims of India want reconstruction of those provinces and areas in which Muslims are in majority. Similar case should be of the other provinces of India in which Hindus are in majority. In this resolution there is nothing mentioned about those provinces, in which Hindus are in majority yet they are included in it. It will be applicable to the provinces in which Muslims are in majority as well as to those provinces in which Hindus are in majority. It is neither injustice to Hindus nor Muslims. It is a constitutional matter which is being decided for ever. These major communities then will have brotherly terms and connections either on compromise foundation or on the basis of treaty. This resolution does not aim at war but it is a method to check war. It has been said by Honourable friend Mr. G. M. Sayed that there should be self-determination and independence in the provinces on the lines of Soviet Units in Russia. The units have got the right of secession and there is such a clause permitting the right of units in the Russian constitution. Having regard to these points, it can be said that this resolution was only a constitutional question, and there was no real cause for my Honourable Hindu friends to leave the House.

It is not possible for Congress to solve the problem of India. Every country has its own problems. The problem of India can be solved with broad mind and liberal views; it is necessary for us to understand each other's view points and to arrive at settlement. My Honourable friend has referred to the Lahore Resolution, passed by All-India Muslim League, in which it was mentioned that safeguards should be guaranteed to minorities. The safeguards should relate to culture, religion, social customs and language. Therefore I thought it necessary to move this amendment. It is relevant to the Lahore Resolution, which is known as Pakistan Resolution. It is no exaggeration to say that my Honourable friend Mr. G. M. Sayed has rendered service to the whole of India by moving this resolution. From the time the Sind Assembly has come into existence, this is the first time that the opinion of the Muslims of Sind, in real sense, is being conveyed. If the principle of this resolution is accepted it can bring about compromise between Muslim League and Congress. Sir Strafford Cripps' proposals, which were not accepted by Congress, contained the same principle. Sir Strafford Cripps' proposal had four parts. One part was that after the war, there would be independent units. Those units may retain their sovereignty or may join an All India Union. The Congress Working Committee too passed a resolution declaring that no unit could be forced to accede in the Union if they preferred to stand out.

Honourable Mr. G. M. Sayed's resolution is similar to the proposal of Sir Strafford Cripps. Independent states should be formed, where Muslims are in majority. There is a clamour all over the world for New Order. Why not give some serious thought to the problem of a New Order for India? The principle of this resolution can help both the communities to come to terms. All-India Muslim League's resolution ushers in the possibility of such an understanding. It is no doubt that we do not wish to remain under any Central Government. In the Central Government there will be a permanent majority of one community. Though it is not the intention of Honourable the mover, yet it is possible that Congress and Muslim League may sit at one round table and while considering the internal and external affairs of the provinces and finances of India, can evolve an acceptable constitution. There are some problems affecting equally more than one province. For example Indus river dispute between Punjab and Sind Governments. An arbitrator

was appointed. After the matter was decided both the Governments have appealed to H. M. the King Emperor. It would have been more correct if both these Pakistan Provinces had appealed to the All-India Muslim League. We have to evolve a common machinery for the settlement of the inter-provincial disputes.

The province of Sind has got a sea coast. We may require a Navy to defend the coast line. That Navy would not guard Sind Province only but also other provinces, such as Punjab and N.W.F. Province. Many questions of that type would arise. We would be required to maintain Naval Force, Air Force and land Force. It is a matter for consideration why the expenditure should be borne by Sind alone. I do not deem it impossible that after the theoretical differences have ended, there might arise the necessity of having a central machinery for the settlement of inter-states disputes. For Sind it is more beneficial to agree to the proposal of Sir Strafford Cripps, which has not yet been withdrawn by the British Government. Every province possesses its own natural gifts and Sind has got Karachi as a natural gift. The revenue derived from customs only is eight to nine crores. Besides there are other incomes obtained from Income tax, Railway and Postal receipts which go to Central Government but we do not get any share from that revenue. At present it would be seen that our Government cannot introduce compulsory education for our children and we have no funds to make necessary arrangements for medical relief. The reason is its poor financial position, when major portion of the income is taken away by the Central Government. There is no need for us to maintain this white elephant of the Central Government from our revenues.

The Honourable Dr. HEMANDAS R.WADHWANI: Sir, while opposing the resolution of the Honourable Member Mr. G. M. Sayed, before I give my reasons for opposing the same, I congratulate the Honourable Member Shaikh Abdul Majid on arguing about the resolution on general and political grounds only. I am glad to note that he did not touch religion as did my Honourable friend Sayed Ghulam Martaza Shah. Of course every body has got his own point of view on general and political matters. There is always a difference of opinion so far as that aspect of the matter is concerned and I have no objection to that in the least. What I am sorry about is the attitude of the Honourable Member Mr. Sayed who tried to show the difference in the religions of Hindus and Muslims. He tried to touch all the bad points of the Hindu religion. They may be bad according to him and good according to others. There is always difference of opinion in that also. But I do not wish to pay him in the same coin in order to show the good points or the bad points of his religion for which I have got the greatest regard. I am a believer in the brotherhood of religions. God is one and I consider all the religions of the world as different roads leading to God. That is my own point of view. Muslim religion according to the Hindus may have its good or bad points. But according to me the aim of all the religions is the same. So I do not wish to touch the merits or the demerits of Hindu and Muslim religions. What I would therefore request the Honourable Member Mr. Sayed is that he should always touch such questions on general and political grounds only as my Honourable friend Shaikh Abdul Majid has done. Certainly we have no objection to that. As they are members of the Muslim League, surely they have got every right to follow Muslim League mandate. Similarly we are members of Hindu Mahasabha and we have every right to carry out our own policy and programme. Therefore they should not bring in the point of religion. That is what I strongly object to. I may repeat once again that I have got the greatest regard for Muslim religion and as a matter of fact all the religions of the world over. With these few remarks I oppose the resolution.

Mr. G. M. SAYED: Sir, I rise on a point of personal explanation. I have never pointed out the bad points of Hindu religion or the good points of Muslim religion. I have only shown the differences. I have got great respect for Hindu religion. My religion teaches me tolerance for all the religions of the world. That is the commandment of the Holy Prophet. We should not belittle any other religion. So it was far from my intention to say anything against Hindu religion. I only wanted to show the different conceptions of both ideologies and I assure my Honourable friend Dr. Hemandas that it was not with an object of showing that Hindu conception was bad and mine was good. It was merely to show how diametrically they were opposed to each other. That was my point.

Mr. MUHAMMAD USMAN SOOMRO: (In Sindhi.) Sir, the resolution introduced by Honourable Member Mr. G. M. Sayed created misunderstanding in my mind but it has been removed by the speech of Honourable Shaikh Abdul Majid. We have read the proposals of Sir Strafford Cripps. They were worthy proposals. According to them, every Province would have enjoyed its independence while joining union or remaining as a unit. It was ill-luck that the proposals were not accepted by Hindus, Muslims and Congress. Sir Strafford Cripps went back without any agreement. There is no question of Hindu or Muslim, every body would be eager to see the independence of Sind. That independence does not mean that our Sind Province should be combined with Baluchistan, Punjab or Pakistan or with other provinces. By doing so Sind would be put in dark, because majority would be theirs; similarly it was said by Honourable Shaikh Abdul Majid in his speech. The population of Punjab and Baluchistan is greater and if Sind is combined with them, it would suffer. It may take place that some deserts and frontiers might be put along with Sind, and be an unnecessary burden on it. The Sind province has got its own sufficient income and therefore it would be beneficial if it remains separate. Considering these points it can be said that the proposals of Sir Strafford Cripps are up to the mark and it would be better if they are accepted by Sind. Now the question remains, whether the provinces should join together. This should be decided at the time when a question pertaining to all the provinces arises, for example, the dispute of Indus Water. For such matters and quarrels a tribunal would be appointed. By this kind of independence Muslims as well as Hindus would be gainers. It would be the duty of majority to protect the rights of minority. If separated, every Province would feel its responsibility to meet the expenditure within its income. With these words I support the resolution.

The Honourable RAI SAHIB GOKALDAS MEWALDAS: Sir, I am glad to note that the Honourable Member. Mr. G. M. Sayed has removed the impression by assuring the Hindu community that he had no intention whatsoever to comment on Hindu religion. I would like to make a few remarks so far as the Pakistan system is concerned or whatever the Honourable Member Mr. G.M. Sayed himself has said. He said that there is a rule of the tyrant because of the majority community. So far as I can understand, he refers to the Hindu community. What is the case in Sind? The Hindus are not in the majority, but the Mussalmans are. Similarly in some other Provinces the Mussalmans are in the majority, and they want a separate province to be ruled or constituted by them. I think it is not a different way that he has suggested why Pakistan is needed. He has repeated the same story which, in his opinion, is being repeated in India. I do not know whether in other Provinces any resolution in the Legislative Assemblies or in the Central Assembly or the Council of State has been moved or carried. It only shows that this resolution in this Assembly is being moved on the assumption that this House has got the majority of the Mussalmans, and that they are sure that such a resolution will be carried. We personally do not mind if by their majority they

carry the resolution. But I must remind my Honourable friend that he is accusing the Hindus that they will rule the other provinces in India because they are in the majority. He wants the same thing to be repeated in our Province.

The second point is this. The war is at the doors of India. The question therefore is whether it would be advisable for India to be divided into States. If it is done, they may not be able to defend the country from the enemy attack at this time. If the states are divided, I do not think it would be possible to safeguard the interests of India. So far as the Indian demand goes, it is for Swaraj or independence for India. It is not for any individual province; it is not for any individual district; it is not for any individual taluka. From what the Honourable Member Mr. G.M. Sayed said, if that should be the principle accepted by the Muslim League on the assumption that they consider themselves a minority community in India, then they must realise that they are a majority community in Sind. Similarly in each district or in each taluka or in each town, the same thing might be repeated that they may be independent. I think it will be absolutely wrong in policy that the Province should be divided into independent districts, or independent taluka headquarters or independent divisions. It should remain as a whole, and the province should be attached as a whole to India.

Similarly, there is the question of Hindu-Muslim unity. I can understand that if there are some differences of opinion on the independence of India, they can certainly settle their disputes by all means. But it is absolutely difficult to imagine, Sir, that, if our province is separated, they would naturally want that it should be attached to the Punjab, and the Punjab to the Frontier, and the Frontier with Turkey or any other place, and so on. I do not know what would be the significance or consequence of this in the long run. If it is the idea of our Muslim League brothers that they must have separate Raj, separate division to rule, I can understand that significance. How is that possible to expect? Similarly I might also inform my Honourable friend Mr. G.M. Sayed what is the case in America. Negroes are there. They have got the same rights as others. Are they going to be separated on this account? If we look to the past history of Ireland, what was it? Ireland was divided.....

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: If they could help it.

The Honourable RAI SAHIB GOKALDAS MEWALDAS: Similarly Austria was attached with Germany some time back, and when it was separated, you could understand there was no independence. It is separate from Germany altogether. I quote these for the sake of examples. If we are separated from one province to another, from province to district, and so on I do not think it will be a good idea or suggestion for people to separate and lose their villages or towns or provinces. Nobody would be able to defend themselves. So far as the Hindus are concerned, they have got their religious pilgrimages everywhere in India. Similarly the Mussalmans have got their pilgrimages everywhere in India. If India is divided into parts, provinces or districts, how would it be possible to maintain that unity?

With these words, I would like to oppose the resolution.

Mrs. J. G. ALLANA: (In Sindhi) Sir, on behalf of the Muslim women of this province, I support this resolution. I assure the Honourable House that we are true to Muslim League and I desire that the Muslims of India may get Pakistan as soon as possible.

The Honourable KHAN BAHADUR M.A. KHUHRO: I have nothing much to add on a resolution of this kind. The Honourable the Mover of the Resolution Mr. G.M. Sayed has made the position entirely clear in a written speech he has made in this House, and he has fully explained the ideology of the Muslim League as adumbrated in the Resolution of the All-India Muslim League passed in Lahore in March 1940.

Now, there is a slight misunderstanding created by what Honourable Member Shaikh Sahib said, namely that as far as he was able to understand, the proposals of the British Government by Sir Strafford Cripps also accepted the principle of independence of individual provinces, what they called political units. Now, the difference between those proposals and the Muslim League ideology was, as was said by Mr. Jinnah in his presidential address at the Lahore session, last year, that the Muslim League demanded self-determination of Muslim nations as such—namely the Muslim community of the entire India. Though it may be said that the proposals of Sir Strafford Cripps go a great deal to meet the wishes of the Muslim League, they do not go cent per cent. They may be about 50 or 60 per cent. What we ask is that there should be acknowledged on the part of the British Government the right of complete self-determination of the Muslim nation. This has been sufficiently argued by the Honourable mover of the resolution.

Secondly, Honourable Member Shaikh Sahib showed, that there are sufficient grounds that the Muslims are a nation because they are politically, socially, religiously and for various other reasons that have been described by him independent and they have every just claim to self-determination.

I think, Sir, it would be difficult to say if Sind at this stage could stand by itself. Now there is the Western Zone comprising of Baluchistan, Frontier Province &c. Similarly there is the Eastern Zone comprising part of Assam, part of Bengal &c. Those zones compared to India as a whole are much less than the entire area or the entire population of the Indian sub-continent. The Muslim League does not say that the Hindus should be deprived of independence. The Muslim League stands for independence. The League says: Let Hindus have independence in their own areas and the Muslims where they are in majority should have similar independence. Therefore I do not understand the argument of my Honourable friend Rai Sahib Gokaldas. Sind and other provinces under the provincial autonomy are already independent. The Honourable Minister knows it. Only in certain respects they are dependent on the Central Government, But we want complete independence of the Central Government, complete freedom under the new dispensation of things. The point that because Sind will be a separate independent province, therefore each taluka, each district, each village will claim to be independent is ridiculous. Punjab is a separate province, so also the North West Frontier & c. Therefore the principle of independence is acknowledged that they are separate units and these provinces can maintain themselves. The only question remains about the Military, Air Force and Navy. These are Central subjects. These things can be discussed at a Round Table Conference where representatives of the Congress, the Mahasabha and all prominent bodies will be present and they will come to an amicable understanding. There is no serious objection to the resolution as such and I hope the House will accept it unanimously or by a majority.

The Honourable SIR GHULAM HUSSAIN HIDAYATULLAH: Sir, I would suggest that a copy of the proceedings of this debate may be forwarded to the proper authorities. I have nothing more to say.

Mr. G. M. SAYED: I wish to reply to one or two points raised by Honourable Rai Sahib Gokaldas Mewaldas. Let Hindus have $3/4^{\text{th}}$ share and Muslims $1/4^{\text{th}}$. We do not grudge that they should have their share. He said that if there was a proposal for independence of Sind only, then it was a different matter. But he has a fear that to-morrow we might even join with Turkey. Why should he say so? It will depend upon both of us. If they are able to influence us and if we are able to remain aloof, why should we join Turkey? Why has Turkey not joined Afghanistan or Persia? They are independent Muslim countries free to federate but still they have not joined. History has proved it. I cannot promise what will be decided in the future. It is left to the wishes of the people of the Province.

Another point is of defence. How is Afghanistan defending itself; how is Persia defending itself; how is Iraq defending itself? Our province is richer than Afghanistan; it has got much more population than several of these small states in the world. Why can we not defend ourselves, when other smaller nations can defend themselves?

The Honourable Rai Sahib GOKALDAS MEWALDAS: He does not realise that they are ruling nations.

Mr. M. H. GAZDAR: We want to be a ruling nation.

Mr. G. M. SAYED: Then come to the geographical units. We have Canada and United States of America. They are independent nations and they do not unite. Take the instance of Mexico. It is an independent nation and does not want to unite. Each and every nation wants independence and no nation wants to be dependent on the other. Therefore that argument does not stand.

With these words I resume my seat.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: Now I put the resolution.
(Question put and agreed to.)

The Honourable Dr. HEMANDAS R. WADHWANI: Sir, I want a division.

THE HONOURABLE THE SPEAKER: I allow the division.

Tellers will be:-

Mr. Fraser,
Mir Ghulam Ali,
Mr. Muhammad Usman Soomro,
Seth Lolulmal.

Mr. Muhammad Usman Soomro to pair with Mr. Fraser for the "Ayes" and Seth Lolulmal to pair with Mir Ghulam Ali for the "Noes".

RESULT OF DIVISION ON PAKISTAN RESOLUTION.

AYES.

NOES.

01. SHAIKH ABDUL MAJID
02. KHAN BAHADUR ALLAH BAKHSH K. GABOL
03. KHAN BAHADUR HAJI AMIR ALI LAHORI.
04. MR. ARBAB TOGACHI.
05. MIR BANDEHALI KHAN TALPUR.
06. MIR GHULAM ALI KHAN TALPUR.
07. HONOURABLE SIR GHULAM HUSSAIN HIDAYATULLAH.
08. KHAN BAHADUR GHULAM MUHAMMAD ISRAN.
09. SAYED GHULAM MURTAZA SHAH.
10. KHAN BAHADUR SAYED GHULAM NABI SHAH.
11. HONOURABLE PIR ILLAHI BAKHSH NAWAZ ALI.
12. NAWAB HAJI JAM JAN MUHAMMAD.
13. MRS. JENUBAI G. ALLANA.
14. S.B. SARDAR KAISER KHAN.
15. SYED MUHAMMAD ALI SHAH
16. HONOURABLE KHAN BAHADUR M. A. KHUHRO.
17. HONOURABLE HAJI MUHAMMAD HASHIM GAZDAR.
18. MR. MUHAMMAD USMAN SOOMRO.
19. MR. MUHAMMAD YUSIF CHANDIO.
20. SAYED NUR MUHAMMAD SHAH.
21. RAIS RASUL BAKHSH KHAN UNER.
22. MR. ALI GOHAR KHAN MEHAR.
23. MR. SHAMSUDDIN KHAN BARAKZAI
24. KHAN SAHIB SOHRAB KHAN SARKI.

01. THE HONOURABLE RAI SAHIB GOKALDAS MEWALDAS
02. THE HONOURABLE DR. HEMANDAS R. WADHWAN
03. MR. LOLUMAL R. MOTWANI.

There are 24 for the **Ayes**, and 3 for the **Noes**. So the resolution is carried.