

# THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY.

VOL. III., No. 52.]

POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1921.

[ANNUAL SUBSN. Rs 6

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ... ..	613
<b>ARTICLES:—</b>	
Students and Non-Co-operation ... ..	615
Civil Liberty in America ... ..	617
<b>SPECIAL ARTICLES:—</b>	
Ministers' Salaries. By K. G. Limsaye, M. A., LL. B.	618
Stability of Exchange. By C. S. Deole, B. A.	619
Indian Economic Conference. By A Delegate	620
<b>REVIEWS:—</b>	
Indian Railway Series No. 1 ... ..	621
Non-Co-operation: Its Pros and Cons ... ..	621
<b>CORRESPONDENCE:—</b>	
Students and Spinning. By A. G. Mehta	621
Entertainment to Mr. Paranjpye ... ..	621
<b>SELECTION:—</b>	
Non-Co-operation ... ..	622

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

AS a ruthless, if logical, outcome of the spirit that has brought about the change in the Congress creed and engendered the policy of non-co-operation, the British Congress Committee has been abolished and with it the paper *India*, the last number of which was published on January 14. A few days' midwinter madness has been sufficient to wipe out of existence an institution to build up which it took the devoted labours of over a quarter of a century of some of the noblest souls that have ever served India. W. C. Bannerjee, A. O. Hume, Dadabhoi Naoroji, the fathers of the Indian National Congress, and Sir William Wedderburn—it is a consolation to think that these have been spared the sorrow of witnessing the death of their dear offspring. It is touching to recall the great sacrifices that Sir William Wedderburn made year after year to keep the flag of the Congress flying in the capital of the Empire, the quiet heroism with which he fought for the Indian cause in the midst of disheartening adversities. It was the privilege of several members of the Servants of India Society, including Mr. Gokhale himself, to help Sir William in a humble capacity by canvassing for several years subscribers for the paper *India*. Not very long ago the late Mr. Tilak valued the work of the British Congress Committee and its organ *India* so highly as to direct all his influence to get them under the control of his party. And to-day his followers have become a party to their destruction under the hypnotic in-

fluence of a virtual dictator. Such is the vanity of human wishes or the fickleness of human nature, as one may choose to call it. To the followers of the old Congress and its ideals there is some satisfaction in the thought that ere the British Congress Committee and its journal were abolished, India was well on its way to realize self-government and acquire an honorable place in the British Empire.

\* \* \*

PERHAPS some people would like to know how Messrs. Satyamurti, Rangaswami Aiyangar and other Madras congressmen, who accepted the Nagpur resolution on non-co-operation, are reconciling themselves to their Fellowship of the Madras University—that is, supposing they have cared to think over the matter. It should be quite easy for them, and for our part we can think of several ways in which it could be reconciled. Firstly, the Nagpur Congress deliberately dropped the injunction contained in the Calcutta resolution to give up honorary offices. It was done obviously to meet such cases. No doubt there is the contingency of their being called upon to renounce their Fellowship by the Congress or its All-India Committee at some future time; but when the occasion arises it will be time enough to think. Meanwhile they can surely be trusted to rise equal to it. Secondly, there is no direct reference to fellowships of universities and even to universities in the non-co-operation resolution. Thirdly, that part of the non-co-operation resolution which refers to colleges, and indirectly to universities, applies only to students and not to members of the senate. Fourthly, the Nagpur Congress has given a clear direction to managers of schools and colleges to nationalise them. The senate of a university is its managing body. It is therefore the duty of congressmen to be on it and so work as to nationalise the whole of university education. Do you call it a wretched Moderate argument, say that the Moderates also want to so work institutions as to nationalise them? But then, you see, nothing that Moderates do can nationalise a thing. It is only Nationalists that can nationalise anything.

\* \* \*

MR. RAJAGOPALACHARIAR as Secretary of the Congress and an authoritative exponent of non-co-operation has directed non-co-operators in the Madras Presidency to contest municipal and local board elections and not to boycott them like the

council elections. His ground is that through municipal councils and local boards, primary education could be nationalised. It passes our comprehension how so acute and sincere a politician as Mr. Rajagopalachariar is reputed to be, can make a distinction between municipal councils and legislative councils in this respect. How can he hope to nationalise schools through the municipalities? They are getting 'tainted' aid from the State and are under its 'wicked' control. A municipality may do away with the financial aid of the State by enhancing its own rates, though it is very problematical whether the rate-payers would agree to it even if called upon to do so in the holy name of non-co-operation. But even then the control and supervision of Government would remain, which cannot be changed unless the Municipal Act itself is amended by the Legislative Council. Thus without legislative action no change towards nationalization would be possible. But if by nationalization is meant complete independence of Government, then it would be equally unattainable through municipal and legislative councils. It would have to be attained by quite independent means. One cannot therefore understand how if the one is taboo, the other is not.

\* \* \*

MR. GANDHI also makes a similar distinction between the municipal council and the legislative council; but on a different ground from that of Mr. Rajagopalachariar. A correspondent asked Mr. Gandhi: 'If the Government is wicked and unjust, as we believe, is it consistent and logical that we shall refuse to co-operate with it in legislative councils, courts etc. but should continue to co-operate with it in municipalities?' Mr. Gandhi's reply is: "the municipalities do not consolidate the power of the Government as do the Councils. Once we admit the wickedness of the Government system, we must admit the necessity of doing nothing to strengthen that system. I will not dispute the necessity even of dissociating ourselves from municipalities. And any councillor is free to retire, or court disbandment, if they feel that they are helping the present system. The Congress resolution is an indication of how far the nation as a whole should or could go. But there can be no limit put upon individual renunciation." Why Mr. Gandhi thinks that the power of the Government is not consolidated by municipalities while he thinks it is consolidated by legislative councils, we cannot understand. His making it a matter of individual opinion appears to be quite arbitrary. The average dweller in the municipality is certainly intelligent enough to associate the police, education, lights, water and other municipal conveniences with the Government from which alone the municipality derives its powers of taxation and expenditure. But he also says that he does not dispute the necessity of dissociating from municipalities. If he thus admits the necessity, how can he leave it to individual opinion?

\* \* \*

WHAT is tainted money? According to Mr. Gandhi, the money paid by the people to the Government in the shape of taxes, becomes tainted when used by the latter to consolidate their power. Though all grants made by Government have that character, the Congress has recommended for the present only the boycott of educational institutions, because, according to Mr. Gandhi, the power of Government is consolidated to a special degree through educational institutions. In formulating this theory of 'taint' he has overlooked a very important fact. The Government consolidate their power much more by coining money and enforcing its currency than by spending it on various useful purposes. A scrap of paper acquires a money value by bearing the stamp of Government. Similarly a bit of metal gets an extraordinary value by being put through the Government mint. If one thing consolidates the power and prestige of Government more than anything else, it is the acceptance of these artificial values by the people. If Mr. Gandhi really wants to save his followers from the most corrupting influence of a wicked Government, he should call money tainted at the very source and not by the purpose for which a grant is intended. In fact how can a non-co-operator ignore the very stamp of 'taint' that stares him in the face?

\* \* \*

THE starting of an association at Patna under the leadership of Mr. Hasan Imam, who presided over the Bombay special session of the Congress, and of similar associations elsewhere to counteract the movement of non-co-operation is an unmistakable sign of the country's willingness to return to sense. The decision to keep the Patna League distinct and separate from the National Liberal Federation of India may confer upon it some advantages in Behar. We shall, however, consider the workers that have gathered under Mr. Hasan Imam's banner to be of us so long as the lines of their work are similar to ours. As we have said on a former occasion, our registers will never show our strength. Other associations with a more decisive identification with the Liberal party have made or are about to make their appearance at different places. The Dhulia Liberals have published a manifesto, calling upon all well-wishers of the country to range themselves on the side of law and order and the establishment of a Liberal League there will before long become an accomplished fact. The Liberal forces at Satara have also organised themselves by the formation of a league which will be affiliated to the Western India National Liberal Association at Bombay, and under the leadership of Rao Bahadur Kale who has just resigned his public prosecutorship to take a more earnest part in public affairs, they seem to have before them a career of great usefulness.

\* \* \*

THE agrarian troubles of the United Provinces do not seem to have ended yet. Now and then

reports of fresh disturbances and unfortunate cases of shooting are being reported. It is generally conceded that the ryots have legitimate grievances, to enquire into which, it is rumoured, Government are shortly going to appoint a committee. That ex-convicts and other bad characters are exploiting the ryots and misguiding them in various ways for their own ends, also seems clear. It does not surprise us at all that these bad characters have used Mr. Gandhi's name with the ignorant villagers to misguide them. Such things were expected and pressed upon Mr. Gandhi as a danger besetting his satyagraha and non-co-operation campaigns. The U. P. Government have given their own version of the facts and have made out that except in one case firing because absolutely necessary and was resorted to only when inevitable. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and some others left several days ago for the scene of the disturbances, but they have not yet published any facts or results of their enquiry. The public therefore are unable to form a correct independent judgment. But a sad feature noticeable in all such regrettable incidents—whether they are the Kisans of the U. P., the Kallars of Madura or the mill-hands of Bombay or Madras—is that the police seem to resort to firing somewhat too readily, creating the impression on one's mind that human life was held here very cheap. Would the British police—we don't mean Irish—have used bullets under such circumstances? It is time that our Governments enjoined a higher standard of humanity and a greater degree of forbearance on our police. At any rate we should be justified in expecting our ministers to do what lies in their power.

\* \* \*

DR. MANN speaking the other day before a London gathering of temperance reformers showed a correct appreciation of the problem of Indian temperance when he described it as a financial one. The people of India are teetotallers by nature and all their religious injunctions enjoin complete non-co-operation with drink in any form. They would be only too glad to stop the drink traffic by means of local option or even of total prohibition, if no other considerations had added to the complications of the problem. Such a course of action was not going to cause inconvenience to anybody, if the class of legitimate consumers which is entirely foreign to Indian society and is a microscopic minority is left out of account. The solution of the problem lies in the finding out of alternative sources of revenue to replace our receipts on account of excise. It is also clear that any fresh sources that it may be decided to tap to this end must not touch the rural population, which has more than its fair share of the burden of taxation to bear. "The imposition of death duties and the taxation of land values in the neighbourhood of growing towns," as suggested by Dr. Mann, will probably go a long way in making a solution of this problem a matter of practical politics.

## STUDENTS AND NON-CO-OPERATION.

THE tide of non-co-operation among students in the form of boy-cotting aided educational institutions which began to rise some months ago and attacked Aligarh with all its force and Benares with less impetuosity, ebbed away somewhat rapidly and before the Congress met at Nagpur was almost at its lowest point. But that congregation has acted like another moon and the tide is again rising, the tidal wave rushing this time up some creeks with a destructive velocity and volume that was unknown before. When Mr. Muhammad Ali led his attack against Aligarh and Mr. Gandhi tried to pull down the Benares University, the Nationalist leaders of Bengal, and Mr. C. R. Das more prominently than others, warned the students of the dangers of non-co-operation and reminded them of some of the very costly lessons which the *Swadeshi* agitation days had taught. Bengal consequently remained unaffected, to the agreeable surprise of a good many people all over the country. Only a few days before the Nagpur Congress met, Mr. Das and Dr. Múnje were greeted with hisses by the extremist students of Nagpur. But the few days of the Christmas week seem to have brought about a complete change in him. The unbeliever became an apostle as if by a miracle. The vivid memories of the *Swadeshi* days are now remembered no more. Always a favourite with students—a very generous supporter of the poor among whom he has always been—he has succeeded in drawing away thousands of them from their colleges. It would perhaps be difficult to find a parallel to his influence over students anywhere in the world. After hearing of his remarkable successes, Messrs. Gandhi, Muhammad Ali, Shaukat Ali and others tried to do similar things in Bombay. A meeting which is reported to have been attended by about fifteen thousand students was harangued in the right approved manner and Mr. Shaukat Ali tried to imitate Mr. Das's manner. "What is the use of speaking to colleges you? You are no good. You don't give up your and do as I tell you" said Mr. Das and it told upon his audience. Similar words addressed by Mr. Shaukat Ali fell flat on the Bombay students and out of the audience of fifteen thousand only one responded to the call. The next day a few more joined him, but on the whole the result has been such that the students of Bombay deserve to be heartily congratulated on their level-headedness.

The student situation in Calcutta is very serious. We do not think any one with a sense of responsibility would minimise it. But we do not think it is such as to make one despair. We do not think the students have withdrawn themselves from schools and colleges out of an understanding or appreciation of the doctrine of non-co-operation as applied to Indian politics or of the moral philosophy of Mr. Gandhi. They appear to have merely obeyed Mr. Das's call out of their affection for him. If we had

thought there was conviction behind their attitude we should have thought the situation hopeless. The Calcutta students have indeed been guilty of excesses which have already alarmed some people. They have altogether ignored the reference to conscience made by the Nagpur resolution and have adopted picketing, obstruction, lying down in front of doors and other objectionable methods. To call them non-violent because no physical injury is inflicted on the victims is a misuse of language. Preventing a man from doing his duty or exercising a legitimate right, by catching hold of his arms or lying down in numbers in front of him, is as violent as simple imprisonment or deportation. It is establishing tyranny in the name of liberty. Strongly as these excesses are to be deprecated, we do not, however, think that the students are so much to blame for them as their leaders. The Bengali students have always been a very generous, if somewhat too emotional, and trustful lot who have shown themselves capable of the highest sacrifice and the finest emotion. It is the very excellence of their qualities that has made them the victims of unscrupulous persons or misguided patriots. It is indeed pathetic how easily they allow themselves to be led by some people. A small incident in the present strike is quite to the point. Some students were lying down before the gates of a college and were deaf to all arguments, physical or moral till a note from Mr. Das arrived telling them that as non co-operators their bodies were holy and therefore not to be allowed to be trampled upon, and immediately they gave up that posture. Such credulity is amazing when found among persons seeking university education. But there it is as a fact and it ought to increase the sense of responsibility in those who have power over them. What need cause uneasiness to any one is not the excesses committed by the students but the absence of an unequivocal disapproval of them by the leaders of the non-co-operation movement and its organs. So far as we are aware, it is only the Calcutta paper, the *Servant*, that has condemned these obstructive methods and neither Mr. Gandhi nor Mr. Das, though we are sure they do not approve of them.

On the whole we feel warranted in taking an optimistic view of the situation on account of the inherent weakness of the non-co-operation cause, particularly in its application to students. Very soon they will begin to see that their generosity of nature and immaturity of mind are exploited to support a cause which grown up men either reject or shrink from supporting; that while direct appeals are made to them for sacrifice, the parents of children under sixteen and persons in the legal and other professions are let off easily. They will also see how their leaders are shifting their grounds and changing the hopes held out by them. At first it was given out that paralyzing a wicked Government was the main object of the non-co-operation movement. Mr. Gandhi, whose ideas frequently change, now tells us that it is only a

secondary object, the primary one being self-purification. Purification for what sins and when committed? Is it the sin inherent in human nature, accounted for variously as committed in a former birth or by an original ancestor like Adam? If it is some such thing, then it is true of all times and all countries and not peculiar to the present Government in this country. Or is it the sin of the Government for which we are asked to undergo vicarious self-suffering? Such a doctrine coming from Mr. Gandhi should not surprise anyone, for in South Africa he inflicted suffering on himself on several occasions for others' breaking the vows of passive resistance. We do not believe that our students will be prepared to undergo such vicarious suffering. If they are told that self-purification means only self-protection from contamination they will see that in a hundred ways the contamination is taking place and the fancied purity is impossible. At one time the starting of taint-free institutions for the benefit of the non-co-operating students used to receive prominence. Mr. Muhammad Ali found it necessary to declare himself the principal of a new 'university' at Aligarh and his generous brother to promise a munificent grant of a crore of rupees. Now the starting of national colleges and schools is made a secondary matter, service of the country being emphasised. It is short time service, just for a year, we are told. But what kind of service is it to be? If Mr. Gandhi's idea should prevail the students who come out of their schools and colleges should take the spinning wheel, spin for the nation and remove India's chronic poverty. We submit that the longest yarns which our non-co-operating students could spin over a whole year will not in the least affect the poverty of our country. At a modest estimate nearly fifty per cent. of the population of the country would be under the poverty line, while all the college students put together would be only about a couple of lakhs, and surely most of them will not non-co-operate. The yarn produced by a single mill and now exported to China or Japan would be more than a year's combined output of all the non-co-operating students. By doing more useful work they would be serving the country better. We are sure that after a few days' spinning they will recognise it themselves. They will also see that the millennium promised to come at the end of the year or in nine months, will be elusive like all millenniums in the history of the world. We should not be surprised if, before the millennium is due, we are told one day that *Swaraj* means self-rule or rule of the self, that it is a religious and moral ideal and has nothing to do with politics. Though the students and some of their elders are under a sort of hypnotic spell at present and unable to think for themselves, we are sure that their normal faculties will soon assert themselves and they will see the futility and absurdity of non-co-operation. It is this faith that makes us take an optimistic view of what is indeed a serious situation.

### CIVIL LIBERTY IN AMERICA.

Some people base their opposition to the Government of India Act, 1919, on the ground that it fails to secure the Indian people in the enjoyment of their rights of freedom of speech, of freedom of meeting and of freedom of movement by not containing a clear declaration of rights. It seems to be the view of such people that a declaration of rights would make a repetition of the Punjab impossible in the future, would put a stop once and for all to deportations and imprisonments without trial, and would make arrests and house searches without warrants an event of the dead past. We have repeatedly exposed the hollowness of such a supposition on the strength of certain happenings in America and have held the view that a mere declaration of rights unaccompanied by a development in the political consciousness of the people was not going to carry us very far. The U. S. of America with perhaps the most perfect constitution the world has yet seen, have not been able to prevent calculated inroads on the civil liberty enjoyed by her citizens. In our issue of December 16 last, we published some extracts from the report of a committee of eminent attorneys made after full inquiry. The following further extracts from the same report illustrate the manner in which house searches are carried out in America even at the present moment and how the horrors of the old lynch law are repeated in open day-light under official auspices with a view to extort confessions from people under suspicion:—

#### HARTFORD JAIL SITUATION.

In Bridgeport, Conn., on November 8, 1919 various workmen had come together to discuss ways and means for buying an automobile to be employed for instruction purposes. The meeting was raided and 63 men arrested without warrants by agents of the Department of Justice and taken to the police station. A day or two later, 16 of these were released. The remaining 47, after being held three days in the police station, where they slept on iron bunks without cover or mattress, and where they were fed on little or nothing, were transferred by the Department of Justice to the Hartford Jail. Other persons who were arrested in this way or who had applied at the Hartford Jail for permission to see their friends, were also taken up and confined to jail. There were finally 97 men held for deportation. Most of them were questioned by Department of Justice agents; some were beaten or threatened with hanging or suffocation in order to obtain answers from them. Warrants of arrest for these men were requested and obtained from the Department of Labour by the Department of Justice. Most of the 97 prisoners remained in practically solitary confinement until the end of April, that is, for five months. When the facts finally came to the attention of Mr. Louis F. Post, Assistant Secretary of Labour, he ordered all the men to be transferred to the Immigrant Station at Deer Island, Boston.

During these five months the prisoners were allowed no reading matter; were kept alone in their cells except for occasional visits from the Department of Justice agents or hearings before Department of Labour Inspectors; were refused in some cases knowledge of the charges against them; were refused, in some cases, knowledge of the amount of bail under which they were held; were allowed only 2 to 5 minutes a day to wash their face and hands at a sink outside their cells, and 5 minutes once a month to wash their bodies in a tub, were given practically no exercise, and were fed with foul and insufficient food.

In the Hartford jail there exist four punishment rooms, all alike, unventilated and utterly dark, size 4 feet 3 inches by 8 feet 10 inches, with solid concrete floors, no furniture of any kind, and placed over the pump room of the boiler so that the temperature in them becomes unbearably high. A number of the supposed anarchist or Communist prisoners, probably ten to fifteen, were confined in these rooms for periods of 36 to 60 hours. During their imprisonment in the suffocating heat without air, they were given one glass of water and one slice of bread every 12 hours. Some of them on being released had to be revived before they could be carried to their cells; one man who was in only 36 hours was able to get to his cell unaided.

These Hartford prisoners were practically buried alive for five months, being even denied the privilege of seeing their relatives or friends, who made constant attempts to communicate with them. Only after a lawyer had finally succeeded in gaining access to the jail, were the conditions at all ameliorated and the men ultimately moved to Deer Island. That there were no substantial charges against at least ten of them is shown by the fact that after being held in 10,000 bail for two months and a half, those ten were released without bail on January 24th. It seems probable that at least a majority had no political views of any special nature, but were simply workmen of Russian nationality speaking little or no English.

The foregoing statement, with many details, is evidenced by the statements of Isaac Shorr of the New York bar, who represented these men, by an impartial expert investigator who was sent to the jail, and personal interviews with some of the men.

#### RAID ON RUSSIAN PEOPLE'S HOUSE.

On November 7, 1919, the most violent of six raids by agents of the Department of Justice and the New York Bomb Squad, was made upon the Russian People's House, 133 East 15th Street, New York City, in search of supposed anarchists and anarchistic literature.

The executive committee of the Federated Unions of Russian Workers occupied an office in the building, which was confined to one room. The other rooms were used principally as educational class-rooms, except a small restaurant or cafeteria.



At the time of the raid Department agents had a few warrants for the arrest of supposed offenders. They went through the building, and broke up and destroyed most of the furniture in the place, including desks and typewriting machines. They "beat up" the persons in the place, amounting to several hundred, with black-jacks and stair rails; broke up all the classes then in session and herded the students to the stairways, beating them as they went, shoving them from the landing on to the stairway so that many fell and rolled down the stairs and were trampled upon by those who were shoved after them.

After this raid several hundred prisoners were taken to the office of the Department of Justice at 13 Park Row and there put through the third degree of inquisition. Less than one-fifth of them were held for deportation charges and all the remainder were released to go about their business as being innocent of any wrong-doing.

Many of the persons assaulted suffered serious wounds, and one man who was taken to Ellis Island was in a terrible condition. The manner in which these acts were committed caused a mass meeting of protest to be held the following evening (Nov. 8) at Madison Square Garden, presided over by Dudley Field Malone.

All these facts were immediately put before the Attorney-General in detail, in a respectful letter written to him by Isaac Shorr, of the New York bar, on behalf of the persons so arrested. Mr. Shorr asked to be informed whether the acts of the Department's agents had been committed by the authority of the Department, and, if not, that the Department institute an investigation to fix the responsibility.

### MINISTERS' SALARIES.

LIKE most of the recommendations of the Joint Select Committee on the Government of India Bill, 1919, their suggestion to the legislative councils 'that it was reasonable for the ministers of the provincial government domiciled in India to be paid on a lower scale of remuneration than the European members' should gain the general assent of all Liberals in India. How strongly public opinion is in favour of fixing a lower salary for ministers than that of executive councillors, is apparent from the fact that notices of resolutions recommending the fixing of something between Rs. 1000 and Rs. 3500 have been given so far in all the provinces except the Punjab. The advocates of this measure do not intend to resort to it as a constitutional device for getting rid of an unpopular ministry. The demand is based purely on financial and moral grounds. This aspect, it is hoped, will be remembered by the members of the various legislative councils, when the question comes up before them for disposal. It will certainly be more graceful for the ministers to propose of their own accord a reasonable salary which they can accept consistently with the maintenance of their status and position and the

pressure on public finances. It appears that in some provinces ministers do not favour the proposed lowering of their salaries, which they seem to think is bound to lower their status. In the discussion on the resolutions, this view is bound to be advanced with all the arguments in support of it, but it is to be hoped that the ministers will not treat it as a vote of censure on them, if their view fails to find adequate support among the members of the legislative councils. The resolutions are not meant to question the leadership of or the confidence in the ministers, but only to give an early opportunity to the legislatures to demonstrate their resolve to practise the greatest economy in fixing the salaries of public servants without loss of efficiency.

Among the arguments advanced against this proposal, the objection raised by the *Tribune* and the *Leader* that such a differentiation will necessarily entail a differentiation in the matter of status and position, both in the eyes of the civil service and other cognate services and of the public generally, is the one that most strongly appeals to some people. But a little reflexion will show that the status of a public servant is not so intimately connected with the amount of his salary as it is supposed to be. His status depends entirely on the rank which he occupies in the official hierarchy and the powers with which he is invested. The various Indian deputations fought for equality of status for ministers with that of the executive councillors, and their claim has been fully conceded. The Joint Select Committee have unambiguously recommended that "the status of ministers should be similar to that of the members of the executive council." There is no reason to minimise the importance of this assurance or to expect that it would be more honoured in the breach than in observance. With such a clear guarantee for conferring on the ministers a status identical with that of the executive councillors, Indian ministers need not labour under the false impression that reduction in their remuneration would entail lowering of their status. They should on the other hand think of the moral influence which they would be able to wield by surrendering their high salaries. The people hope to have only such men at the helm of affairs as will maintain their assured status without in any way proving themselves a burden to the State. We want strong ministers who can teach the Civil Service and other sister services how to respect them and obey them. This cannot be done by merely maintaining a highly paid domestic establishment or by living in costly surroundings. It requires independence of character, self-respect and real patriotism. We trust none of our present ministers is lacking in any of these qualities. What is required of them is to get rid of the false notion that status is materially dependent on salary.

The opponents of reduction of ministers' salaries evince great solicitude for securing the services of the best men in the land as ministers

They say that if remuneration for ministerships were to be made less attractive than that of executive councillorships, you will not get capable men to accept this responsibility. Such a view, however, entirely fails to appreciate the growth of public spirit and self-sacrifice that has taken place in the country. The Deccan Rayats' Association, which is a body representative of backward classes in the Deccan, went so far as to suggest that ministerships should be honorary offices. People earning large incomes in professions have in the past shown their readiness to serve the country on a much lower remuneration, and there is no evidence to show that this spirit is on the wane. What is required is opportunity. The salaries of British cabinet ministers are fixed without taking into consideration the sacrifice which they would be required to make in accepting office. Is it right to adopt a different principle in a country which is admittedly among the poorest and the people of which are supposed to be spiritual in a special degree?

Of all the avenues for national service opened to Indians under the British Government, none will deny that except for the Governorship of a province, the ministerships offer by far the best opportunities for work. Those who value real service to the nation will certainly not mind a little sacrifice. We have had men like Sir Sankaran Nair, Babu Bhupendranath Basu, even Lord Sinha serving in England on a salary not exceeding Rs. 1,500 per mensem. Will the nation have no right to expect the services of the sons of its soil on similar conditions in India?

Again, there are others who hold that after having pleaded before the Joint Select Committee for equality of status, position and emoluments, it is improper for Indians to go back upon it. This contention assumes that the conditions under which the claim was made before the Joint Select Committee still continue to operate. The present demand for even drastic reduction in this matter is not at all inconsistent with our past contention. When the deputations pleaded for equality of salaries, they had before their mind the proposal that the Governor should be empowered to fix it. They would not have done so if real responsibility had been conceded in the bill itself. It was but natural for them to insist on the equality of salaries because the minister was to be appointed and dismissed solely at the will of the Governor. The position has materially changed in this respect by the grant of real responsibility in certain departments. Now the ministers are the servants of the people and not of the bureaucracy. They interpret and carry out the wishes of the Council and the people. Whether they receive salaries equal to or even less than those of executive councillors, their status remains unimpaired, which would not have been the case when their responsibility was not recognised.

In dealing with the question of salaries of ministers, members of legislative councils will do

well to compare the salaries granted to British Cabinet ministers, or similar officers in France, the United States of America or Japan. Even a front rank politician like Mr. Fisher serves on an annual salary of £1,500 only. Even the recommendations of the Select Committee on the remuneration of British ministers, whose report was issued in December last, make it quite plain that the remuneration for the British Cabinet ministers is not such as to make their position quite comfortable for ever. Except the prime minister, no cabinet minister is to receive more than Rs. 4,200 per mensem. They do not participate in the payment of members of the House of Commons. With these figures before them, is it fair for Indians to tax their fellow-countrymen under fanciful notions of prestige and dignity? Have we not condemned them in the past, when British officers took their stand upon them? The Indian National Congress and all other public bodies in India have been condemning for years together the top-heavy character of the administration. How does it behove us to forget our contention when it is given to us to put it into practice?

K. G. LIMAYE.

#### STABILITY OF EXCHANGE.

FOREIGN exchanges are a mechanism by which the money of one country is changed into the money of another. The fluctuations in the rates of exchange are caused by variations in the relative value of the currencies of the countries between which exchange is quoted. These variations are generally due to (1) the Balance of indebtedness, (2) Loss of credit, (3) Depreciation of the currency, (4) Rate of interest in the two countries, (5) Distance between two countries, (6) Panic and (7) State of emergency like that of war. One more factor which ought to be taken into account is the relative value of the two metals if the currencies of the two countries are in different metals. Of these factors the two most important which are affecting India heavily are the first and the last viz. the balance of indebtedness and the relative value of gold and silver.

During the war the most important factor affecting exchange viz. the balance of trade was favourable to India. This balance would have been settled by the import of precious metals if conditions had been natural and normal. But on account of war, restrictions were put upon the movements of the precious metals. When such was the state of things silver began to appreciate. Before the war silver used to be in the neighbourhood of 27d. per ounce. The rupee could remain a token coin till the rate reached the limit of 43d. per ounce. After this limit was passed, in order to prevent the melting or export from India of silver rupees, the Government of India, as they said, found it necessary to raise the rate of exchange. The first change was made on the 20th December 1916 and then gradually the rate was, as is well