

# THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. V, No. 9.]

POONA—THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 1922.

{ INLAND SUBSN. Rs. 6.  
FOREIGN s. 8.

CONTENTS.		PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	...	97
ARTICLES:—		
Genoa ...	...	100
Parties in the Central Legislature. By Politicus ...	...	101
America's Two Dry Years. ...	...	102
The Imperial Budget. By V. N. Godbole, M. A. ...	...	104
THE WORLD OUTSIDE ...	...	106

## TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

An Attempt at  
Justification.

A DEBATE was raised by way of an adjournment motion in the Council of State on the prosecution of Mr. Gandhi, and the answer was elicited from the Government of India that the prosecution indicated no change in the Government's policy; that they had pursued a policy of forbearance as long as they could, and when it no longer became possible to do so they were forced to take action. "They had given the non-co-operation party an opportunity of revising its attitude. After the Bardoli resolution, the non-co-operation party had not taken that opportunity, and Government, therefore, came to the conclusion that they could no longer hold their hand." Does this mean that after the Bardoli resolutions were announced the Government waited to see if they would be loyally carried out by the non-co-operators, thus effecting a complete change in the programme which the party had mapped out for themselves, but when they found that instead of being carried out, these resolutions were departed from in essential points at Delhi, there was nothing left for them but to embark upon the prosecution? If this is the meaning of the Government's reply, then clearly there was no justification whatsoever for this action. We have already expressed our opinion of the Delhi resolutions and adhere to it, but deploring as we do those resolutions, one cannot ignore—and the Government cannot ignore—the persistent attempts made by Mr. Gandhi immediately after the resolutions were passed to evacuate them, as we said at the time, of all their contents and practically to reduce them to a *réchauffé* of the Bardoli resolutions. No justification can be found for the Government's action in the changes of programme of the non-co-operation party, but every reason can be found for it in the howl of the Diehards in England.

WHEN we read that Mr. Gandhi was sentenced on each of three counts to two years' simple imprisonment, we wondered what the three counts could be under section 124 A of the Indian Penal Code, and doubted if each of the three incriminating articles had not been regarded as a separate count. But we hastened to repress our doubt, believing that it was impossible that the sentence could have been trebled because three seditious articles were proved against Mr. Gandhi. It now appears, however, that such is the sober truth, and if so it is nothing less than amazing. It is certainly not the Government's opinion that Mr. Gandhi wrote only these three seditious articles during his non-co-operation campaign; if they prosecuted him on these articles, they must surely have done so for the general tendency of his writings, and the tendency was to be proved on the evidence of these three articles. And to a layman it would appear that if a sentence was to be imposed upon him, it would be for the seditious tendency of his writings as a whole and not for each of the seditious articles that could be discovered against him. If the view taken in this trial is correct, then we cannot understand why all the back numbers of *Young India* since Mr. Gandhi inaugurated the non-co-operation movement were not requisitioned and the writer punished separately for every article appearing in them. For it is impossible to say that the three articles which the Government selected for the prosecution partake of a seditious character in any special degree which is not equally applicable to almost every other article written by Mr. Gandhi recently. Surely the Government did not single out just three out of all this mass of articles with the view of having the aggregate sentence suit their ideas of what Mr. Gandhi deserved?

\* \* \*

THE protection which military expenditure has enjoyed all these years from public criticism has made its growth most reckless and has encouraged the practice of the most shocking extravagance. In an able speech the like of which we do not remember to have been made on the Indian budget since the days of the late Mr. Gokhale, Sir Sivaswami Aiyer was able to show that without the slightest decrease in the present efficiency of the fighting force and without embarking on a policy of Indianization but by cutting off luxuries of

organisation, it would be possible to effect an economy of no less than Rs. 581 lakhs in the military expenditure proposed for the next year. To mention only one or two instances from the wealth of details supplied by him, there would appear to be "one doctor excluding sub assistant surgeons to every three patients, which seems rather a high proportion." The salary of "an inspector of physical training" is only Rs. 64,200 per annum! And the saving that could be effected by the Indianization of the army would be really astounding. Sir Sivawamy Aiyer was willing that that policy should be followed quite cautiously and suggested that in the next year only 10 British units should be replaced by Indian units. But the saving that would be effected by it would be no less than Rs. 125 lakhs. Except for a false idea of prestige we do not see any reason for Government not accepting his proposals for cutting off the luxuries of organisation. A Geddes axe is what the Government of India most badly wants. But if it cannot get as good an instrument let us hope that the proposed Retrenchment Committee will prove a tolerable substitute.

\* \* \*

The Depressed  
Classes of the  
United States.

IN our issue of March 2nd we spoke of the educational facilities reserved to Europeans in India. The Anglo-Saxon mind apparently works pretty much alike everywhere: for from the *Crisis* of February just to hand we gather that Negroes fare even worse in the United States.

"In the 15 States and the District of Columbia for which salaries by race could be obtained, the public school teachers received \$42,510,703 in salaries. Of this sum \$36,649,827 was for the teachers of 3,552,431 white children and \$5,860,876 for the teachers of 1,852,131 colored children. On a per capita basis, this is \$10.32 for each white child and \$2.89 for each colored child."

The same issue gives a few glaring facts in connection with one specific, through by no means exceptional, case—that of the State of Mississippi—typical of the Southern States of the American Union in general. Of High Schools there are 575 rural ones for 1¼ lakhs of white children, but *not one* for the 2 lakhs of colored children. In cities, the whites have 400 such schools, the blacks four of a lesser standard. Of Agricultural High Schools the whites have got 49, the blacks, none. At its last session the Legislature voted three and a half million dollars for the support of Colleges for the whites, and \$50,000 for the blacks. You will say that perhaps there is no demand for higher education amongst the negroes of Mississippi? Not only is there, but it is even so strong that the whites with fiendish ingenuity have had to make it illegal for the Negroes to tax themselves for schools! Only "qualified electors" may do that; but the Mississippi Negro of course is disqualified. Where, as in the Negro town of Mound Bayou, the Negroes were permitted to tax themselves, they put up a lakh of dollars for a school. An instructive glimpse of what it is like to be a coloured citizen of an Anglo-Saxon Commonwealth!

\* \* \*

Farmer and  
Spinner.

MORE and more is it being discerned that the greatest clash for the future will lie not so much in the antagonism between bourgeoisie and proletariat, as in that between town and country. The trouble, as usual, lies in the fact that the "workers" and "peasants" understand each other so little, that they move in different worlds and look at the other man's conditions from the point of view of their own. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the contradictory value placed upon cottage industries by agriculturists and industrialists respectively. The latter are impatient of the crude, laborious and unscientific way work is carried on, which could be done in the twinkling of an eye by machinery. The former are aghast at the conditions prevailing in urban factories and are convinced that nothing good can possibly come of such de-humanized system. The first mistake is to compare seasonal with regular work: rural industries should be strictly seasonal, providing occupation and however small an additional income during the slack time of the year, when no work on the land is possible. This is where Mr. Gandhi's *charkha* comes in and it is as absurd to deny its value as a subsidiary rural industry, as it is to hail it as the substitute for all industrial machinery. It really should be treated as the equivalent of the town worker's allotment garden where the bare statement of the cost of raising a cabbage does by no means represent the real value to the factory worker of the work done by him on his cabbage patch. The real underlying mistake is to think of all work in terms of production, instead of producers; of material efficiency, instead of moral value. Nothing is more soul-destroying for man than to overspecialize—and the man whose sole occupation is the punching out of pin heads becomes as witless as his brother whose sphere of work is bounded by the bunds of his rice patch. In a Commonwealth, which places the individual citizen first and last, no agriculturist should be without the opportunity of seasonal industrial work, nor any industrial worker be deprived of the exhilaration of having a bit of a garden patch of his own to look after. The drink evil is to the largest extent a desperate effort to transcend the monotony of one's daily work: what about trying cottage industries and suburban allotments?

\* \* \*

THE four per cent. increase in excise duty on cotton piecegoods being rejected by the Legislative Assembly, the corresponding increase in the import duty was also rejected by it. The division on the latter motion cut across the usual party divisions in that House: the leaders of the National and Democratic parties combined to retain the import duty at the old rate, while prominent members of both parties as well as independent members who have not attached themselves to either party were to be found in both lobbies. It is by no means difficult to understand the motives which must have actuated the

members in casting their votes as they did. While undoubtedly most of the members were in favour of increasing the import duty as a measure of protection—and Mr. Seshagiri Aiyar's vote in this sense is very significant, he being a member of the Fiscal Commission—the majority thought they must suspend their judgment on the question of the most advantageous fiscal tariff for India till the Commission's report was available, and that for the present they could consider the proposal only in the light of a revenue-producing duty. But a minority were of the opinion that they might as well utilise the first opportunity that had offered to carry out their protectionist ideas. On the whole there is no doubt that the Assembly has acted wisely in foregoing the advantage which was within its reach till the conclusions of the Fiscal Commission, which we are told are unanimous and therefore in favour of Protection, have been considered by the Government and the Legislature.

The Answer to  
Lancashire.

THE amendment moved on this subject by the Hon'ble Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas in the Council of State has, however, a significance of its own. Agreeing that a four cent. increase in the import duty on piecergoods was inadvisable in the existing conditions, he moved for a nominal increase of half per cent.—not surely to add to the revenue or to afford increased protection to the indigenous industry, but merely to assert the Legislature's right to arrange her tariff as it suited India, regardless of how it might react on Lancashire or other parts of the British Empire. Surely there will be plenty of occasions to test the value of the fiscal freedom which has been accorded to India by the reforms, and the increase in import duties, if it is approved by the legislature, may well be postponed for some time. But when one sees the frantic agitation now being carried on in the interest of Lancashire merely because the excise duty is not raised to suit her interests, it becomes clear that Mr. Lalubhai's amendment was not without justification. If India has fiscal independence, as we are assured over and over again in the most authoritative fashion that she has, Lancashire can have no reason to be upset by our keeping the duties at the old level, and the answer one is tempted to make to such an agitation is an increase in the duty, not so much to benefit oneself as to spite one's enemy. We do not regret that the Council of State rejected the amendment, but it certainly reflects the temper of the Indian Legislature if Lancashire continues nagging at it.

A Minister's  
Weakness.

THE Hon'ble Mr. Madhusudan Das, the Public Health Minister of Bihar and Orissa, bewailed his lot in the Legislative Council in the following terms :

"Can he (a Minister) transfer a Civil Surgeon? Can he remove a Civil Surgeon? Can he exercise any control over them (I. M. S. officers)? Can he send the Civil Surgeon to the remotest villages where cholera is raging, or where there is a flood? Can he say to a Civil Surgeon,

'come, help me,' and will the Civil Surgeon come? The position of a Minister is like this. You hold him responsible, but you have given him no power. His position is like a man sitting near the driving wheel and you are told you shall be responsible for accidents if the motor goes wrong; not the driver but you shall be responsible. This is absurd."

Against this queer plaint, we have the clear assurance of Col. Austen Smith, Inspector-General of Civil Hospitals, that there need be no misgiving on the score :

"In his speech the Hon'ble Minister has said that he cannot even order a Civil Surgeon to accompany him to investigate an outbreak of cholera. I can assure him that, as the head of my service and the Medical Department of this province, he can issue any orders he considers necessary, and they will be loyally obeyed by any of my Civil Surgeons. He can rest assured that all Civil Surgeons of I. M. S. will loyally carry out any order he may issue."

If, being given statutory authority over a department, a Minister is reluctant to exercise it and feels overawed by his European subordinates, he does wrong not only to his own province but to the whole country by continuing nominally in power. The only course open to him is to make way for one who will wield the power.

THE removal of untouchability having been laid down by Mr. Gandhi as a necessary preliminary

condition for the attainment of swaraj, it is of some importance to define when untouchability could be considered to have been removed. Some would appear to be easily satisfied, the test proposed by them being the admission of the Panchamas into public schools. Others are more exacting and insist on their being freely allowed to take water from the village wells. But what do the Panchamas themselves say? At a conference of the Telegu and Tamil leather-worker castes, held recently in Madras under the presidency of the Rajah of Pithapuram, the chairman of the reception committee, an enlightened Panchama who has been nominated to the Madras Legislative Council, said on behalf of his community that until they were allowed to bathe in the temple tanks, enter the shrines and offer worship to the gods like the other Hindus, untouchability could not be said to be removed. As the Rajah of Pithapuram feelingly asked, are not the Panchamas as much the children of God as the other castes are and can there be a more heinous sin than to prevent a child from seeing its father and mother?

THE Government of India have given effect to a recent resolution of the Legislative Assembly moved by Mr. N. M. Joshi and passed by a large majority asking for the removal of sex disqualification of electors to the Legislative Assembly. According to the Electoral Rules this removal of disqualification can apply only to provinces where no such disqualification exists in the matter of elections to the local legislatures. That is to say, it can apply at present only to Bombay and Madras.

## G E N O A .

WHEN Washington was on the point of petering out and it became apparent that the limitation in armaments boiled itself simply down to a substitution of submarines for capital ships, and that the final disappearance of the Anglo-Japanese alliance heralded only the first appearance of a Franco-Japanese alliance: it was at that psychological moment that the inimitable Mr. George made his bid for the support of all common-sense people throughout the world and advocated the Economic Reconstruction of Europe. After all the fine words at Washington, he, Lloyd George, the man who won the War and won, er, that is to say, was about to win the Peace, he himself was going to butter really the parsnips of a distracted world. No more nonsense about high flown Naval Politics and Pacts and Pacific problems: it was plain business that was called for. Europe was on the road to bankruptcy: then let all good Europeans and especially all good European business men come together and in a business-like way put the tottering concern on its feet again. After Washington and pretence, Genoa and realities.

The gesture was fine. After all, had not Lloyd George signed the Irish Peace? So perhaps, he really meant more than a gesture this time. Was the economic peace all the world longed for perhaps going to be signed at Genoa after all? Expectations could certainly not have been higher.

But just as Briand had agreed to Genoa, Briand had to resign and pass the reins of his government to Poincaré, the leader of the French Diehards. And the first thing that Poincaré did was to say point blank that he detested Conferences; all conferences, and particularly the Genoa Conference. After that the curtain of secret diplomacy descended upon this *tableau* of "Complete Accord" between the two allies. When it went up again, it showed a Poincaré saying, that of course France would attend Genoa, but there must be preparation for it. The "Complete Accord" of the two allies must be still further completed; France and England must first of all, privately, agree on what Genoa is to decide, so that, when Genoa does eventually come off, it need merely spectacularly register what has already been decided. In fact, M. Poincaré agrees to the Genoa Conference, provided it is not a Conference, but a pantomime. In order to do that, it is further indispensable to eliminate Russia and Germany, who in a real Conference of course would have been able to veto ready-made Anglo-French decisions. Hence Russia cannot be tolerated at Genoa, except in the role of a penitent monster; and Germany—. Well, Germany of course was not going to be treated like that at all: only the terms of the Versailles Treaty being unalterable and sacrosanct, of course Genoa must rule out of order any little side-issues such as German Reparations &c.

As luck would have it, just then the Bonomi Cabinet fell and Italy, which as host was to make

all necessary preparations, found itself without a government. Signor Bonomi continued for a little longer, until a successor could be found and by the time that had been done, it was clearly too late to assemble at Genoa on March 8th, the date originally fixed. M. Poincaré thought a delay of three months a minimum, but eventually agreed to a delay of one month.

Simultaneously the French discovered a burning zeal in their nation for—the League of Nations. The French who until then had done more than anybody else to stultify the League, who had opposed the only policy which could have assured reality to the League—viz. the admission of Germany and Russia—now suddenly were wonderfully solicitous about the insult to the League, of calling a special Conference at Genoa, when the League at Geneva was all ready and eager to do the job. One understands that after the Upper Silesia verdict of the League, France would think better of that hitherto hated step-child of hers: but what is really incomprehensible is that people like Lord Grey and Lord Robert Cecil should have been taken in by such transparent "solicitude" about the League's status. Or had they realized that nothing was any more to be hoped for from Genoa, and that Geneva at least promised still some sort of a hope, forlorn hope perhaps, still a hope?

Meanwhile the secret diplomacy, beloved by M. Poincaré, pursued its subterranean course. France after having publicly refused to "shake hands with murder" and meet Russia at Genoa as an equal among equals, privately sent emissaries to Moscow—to discuss the terms of a possible alliance! *Some* "realpolitik", that! You see Poland is a squeezed lemon. Its current year's budget shows 10 billion paper token on the revenue side and 110 billion on the expenditure side, and it needs no labouring to prove that under the circumstances even with the best will in the world the Polish half of the Franco-Polish pincers enclosing Germany would soon prove utterly useless for bearing any strain, if indeed it had not actually done so already. With an imaginativeness and versatility which does her diplomats honour, France faced the problem of a substitute. If Poland is no good any more, why not Russia? After all, Russia to-day has the *biggest* army in the world and, with a judicious supply of war material, would soon have the *finest* army in the world too. After all, extreme disparity in politics never stood in the way of an alliance between the French Republic and Tsarist Russia: so why should it do so in the case of modern French Diehards and Russian Bolsheviks? Whether meant seriously or not, the scheme in any case had the result of nipping the great entente between England, Germany and Russia, which was just beginning to bud and which, it was hoped, would burst into full bloom at Genoa. Once more, England had been foiled in its designs of isolating France.

As for Germany, it suffices to say that whilst the public debt in 1914 amounted to 5,000 million

marks and at the time of the armistice to 140,000, it had reached the fantastic figure of 418,000,000,000 marks and six months ago—the latest figure we can lay our hands upon at the moment. Any turn in the screw of trying to squeeze more blood out of the German stone, of course leads to further leaps in the total Public Debt of Germany, to further issue of paper marks, and to further collapse of the German exchange. Last Christmas it was, that the Inter Allied Reparation Commission as its only reply presented its revolver to the forehead of Germany which had just thought that it had proved even to them, that it could not, really could not, pay anything further. The German exchange thereupon fell from 700 to 1000. To-day, that the same Commission has made the same reply to a similar German appeal, the mark has rushed down from 1000 to 1500 for £1. It is really obvious, that Germany truthfully is and always will be quite incapable of paying the grotesque sums demanded. Then what? Abate the preposterous Reparation claims? Not at all, say Poincaré, Foch & Co.: if the Boche does not pay, we'll pull the trigger; his life or his money. But, you ask, what good? That will not create the money you want? No, say they; it's his life or his money we want; and, in fact, it's his life rather than his money that we really want. . . .

The spectacle thus presented does not make a very pretty picture for that France which still believes itself to be the light of all other nations, the very *coryphaeus* of all humanity. But what will you? After all, French Public Debt, compared with the German Public Debt, shows no essential difference: before the war, at the Armistice and six months ago, the respective figures for France were 34,000; 151,000; and 320,000 million francs. If there is any difference, it is merely that of exchange, and at the present exchange France is as much worse off than Germany, than the *Franc* is better value than the *Mark*. What a vicious circle! The more you make Germany pay, the higher its public debt, the higher that debt, the lower the *mark*, the lower the *mark*, the lower the value of the debt. So one understands the impotent rage of a France that sees itself baffled, after having believed itself to have been—at a colossal cost—definitively victorious. But if such allowances can be made for France, what can be said for Mr. George, who more than anybody else is responsible for the present impossible reparation load of Germany through his contemptible bungling at Versailles? For it is Mr. George, who has recognized again and again the iniquity of the Versailles provisions after having signed them; who goes on making one "stern declaration" after another to that effect; who tells France—at a safe distance—that such fooling must now really stop: and who yet everytime eats his words and after a seaside pow-wow with France's representative allows himself to be politely bowed out. Was there ever a more preposterous attitude than that of Mr. George, who fancies himself as Dictator of Europe, who talks big and

never does anything! What is gained by holding up France to public opprobrium in one moment, and in the next countenancing, actively or passively, the very action on the part of France, for which she was pilloried by him? If that is statesmanship, we must say, we prefer idiocy.

Now this Mr. George, who, from Prinkipo of Genoa, has always seen right and never yet had the pluck to act right: he of all people should now peremptorily demand from Parliament an unequivocal vote of confidence, to enable him to go to Genoa! The audacity really takes one's breath away. Who can still believe, that Genoa will lead to any tangible and beneficial results? Who particularly, would still believe that Mr. George would achieve anything tangible or beneficial, whether at Genoa or anywhere else?

Certainly not Washington.

Washington has declined to take part in the Genoa pantomime, and has said so, very clearly and unambiguously. But it has not been content with this negative part. The United States are fully aware that Europe is bankrupt; they even more painfully are aware that bankrupt customers are of no earthly use. But realizing that inter-European jealousy is merely daily intensifying the general bankruptcy and that there is no hope for Economic Reconstruction, unless the playing at war ceases in Europe: Washington has now taken a hand to stop this European folly, not merely negatively by abstaining from Genoa, but positively, by three distinct acts.

*Primo*:—Washington presents with its compliments a statement of the monies due by Europe and requests an early settlement;

*Secundo*:—Washington recalls the last of its Army of Occupation from the Rhine;

*Tertio*:—Washington demands a seat on the Allied Reparation Commission.

The honours are certainly with Washington.—

#### PARTIES IN THE CENTRAL LEGISLATURE.

THE Democratic Party in the Central Legislature has since been followed by the National Party under the leadership of Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer. There is besides another party, that of the Independents, a straggling, indefinite body with no organisation and no programme. So far as one can see, there are no distinctive features which mark off one from the other; both have Responsible Government as their goal; both have a constructive scheme of moral and material progress; both desire European co-operation and both wish to co-operate with the Government when desirable and oppose them when necessary. The Democrats call themselves as constituting an Opposition; an Opposition in the Central Legislature is an anomaly at present and the party is therefore in no sense one that can come into power by displacing the executive. If the Nationals stand for development on orderly lines, the Democrats do the same and the

suggestion that the latter may show hostility to Government is entirely baseless. Sir Vithaldas Thackersey, speaking at the dinner he gave recently to members of the Legislature, said:—

This is the occasion when men of all shades of opinion should join their hands and support the Government of India in their fight against the reactionaries and die-hards in England, who may otherwise upset all the good work that has been done up to now. The attitude which His Excellency the Viceroy and the Government of India have taken regarding the many important questions which agitate the public mind and supporting our just claims is now too well known for me to refer to in detail here.

He further assured the Government that they could always count on the wholehearted support of his party in all measures taken by them to advance Indian interests. What then may be the *raison d'être* for the existence of two parties whose ostensible aims are identical? The reason must be found either in differences based on personnel or on the attitude of the members towards public questions. One may ask what prevented Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer from joining the Democratic party, and he had only to do it for his being enthusiastically elected as its leader. But he and several others could not, partly for personal reasons and partly because generally the outlook of the latter differs from that of Democrats. It may in the end turn out to be that the one is Radical and the other Conservative, one bold, courageous and inclined to take risks, and the other moderate, timid and unwilling to undertake hazardous enterprises. The composition of the two parties is instructive: one is composed predominantly of the elected members of the Assembly, the other has many nominated members; the strength of one is more than double the other and public opinion is entirely in favour of the former, as reflecting popular feelings.

One cannot but admit that the formation of parties has led to many advantages in the transaction of public business. A sense of discipline has been evolved, and also a sense of responsibility. Members are learning to concentrate upon particular subjects and there is division of labour. The time of the Assembly is not so much spent upon duplicated questions and resolutions. Exchange of opinion, conjoint action, better voting and better organisation have been brought about. But, there are serious disadvantages in frittering the popular element in the Assembly and in creating and encouraging party rivalries. The Central Government is irresponsible; the presence of three Indian members in the Executive Council does not alter the character of the Government. Only partial power has been bestowed upon the Assembly and until full power and complete responsibility are secured, it will be wrong and injurious to national interests to break the united strength by artificially created differences. It will be time enough, when responsibility has to be shouldered, to form parties; and then they may have to be constituted on quite different lines. In many provinces, parties have not yet formed

though there is partial responsibility, because no vital, live issues have arisen to necessitate divisions. Where they have been established, as in Madras or in the United Provinces, they do not and cannot correspond to the parties which are now in existence in the Central Legislature.

At a time when the whole nation is astir and desires *swraj* in the quickest possible time, the energies of the popular element in the Assembly must be directed, not in creating differences between one section and another, but in securing greater and greater power from the Government. One is unable to see why the Nationals should have voted with the Government in the four divisions over the grants, in regard to two of which, the Democrats were defeated. The latter cannot be said to have been unreasonable and yet we have the spectacle of the majority of elected members being defeated by a combination of elected and nominated elements. But this is a comparatively small matter. A time may come, it may come sooner than may be imagined, when grave political issues may arise, and then the Government quite naturally will try to play one party against another to the detriment of national interests. The party thus approached by Government may be adamant and reject the advances. But the opportunities for sowing dissensions will be greater than when there is only one party, one single phalanx of robust, intrepid representatives bent upon obtaining power by all the means open within the constitution. Incidentally the new grouping in the Assembly threatens the already attenuated ranks of Liberals in the country. Members of this persuasion have joined either party, and if corresponding parties are to be started in the provinces, then still further depletion will take place, a result which has obviously escaped the attention of people up in Delhi.

POLITICUS.

#### AMERICA'S TWO DRY YEARS.

IN the discussions now going on in all the provinces regarding the future excise policy of India, the one uncertain element which confronts those with whom it rests to shape that policy is the success or non-success which has attended Prohibition in the United States. Curiously enough, the protagonists on both sides appeal to the experience of America and draw conclusions therefrom in support of the particular view which they hold and, what is more, the statistics put forward by either seem at the first blush to justify it completely. The truth is that the accounts which we usually receive from America of the results which have flowed from this her great venture are so obviously coloured by a bias either in favour of or against Prohibition that they afford really very little help to an impartial student of the question. Fortunately in P. W. Wilson's account—some excerpts from which are given below—we have a story upon which reliance can be placed, for the writer does not start with any preconception and has no particular

thesis to prove or disprove. He was specially commissioned to prepare a report on the entire question of Prohibition for the consideration of social students in the United Kingdom, and this commission it will be seen has been executed with ability and in a thoroughly dispassionate spirit. The following passages of the report, therefore, will be found as instructive as they are interesting; but the whole report, being a weighty and authoritative contribution to the discussion of the subject, is well worth perusal by temperance workers.

In the past there have been four methods for taking stimulants or narcotics first as beer, secondly as wine, thirdly as spirits, and lastly as drugs. Beginning with beer I find that by general admission commercial brewing has ceased. Some months ago there was a decision allowing such brewing to be renewed for medical purposes only, but Congress has since forbidden this by legislation—the Wallis-Campbell Act. With the disappearance of the legal saloon there is no means of distributing beer, owing to its bulk, and the only question that remains is to what extent there has sprung up the practice of brewing beer in the home. Such brewing is both possible and inexpensive, and the most sensational figures have been given for Chicago, New York and other cities to indicate that it is prevalent. These statistics are however estimates only, and it does not appear as if there were any comparison between the volume of beer actually home-brewed and the former supplied by a highly organised, efficiently conducted and legally recognised industry. Home brewing involves trouble. This trouble falls on the housewife. And it is this very housewife who has supported prohibition.

In a country so full of enterprise as is the United States it was inevitable that specialities for home brewing would be advertised and sold. Such brewing is, however, illegal, and if it continues after the novelty has worn off it would be possible for Congress to legislate—if legislation is necessary—against the supply of the prepared ingredients. My belief is that this aspect of the case has been much exaggerated and that in any event it is only of a temporary importance. I am, of course, dealing with the matter from the standpoint of a British observer, who has to compare the situation with that of his own country, where there are 100,000 liquor licenses for 40,000,000 people. By the side of that fact home brew in the United States is, I am convinced, only a picturesque detail. That some families are so amusing themselves is probable. That inadvertently they may be poisoning themselves is possible, but that the hobby will develop in years to come seems incredible.

With regard to wine I would say that this seems another detail. While there are amusing stories of alcoholic melons in California and of suspected mincemeat and brandied fruits, the broad fact is that the fermentation of wine as an industry, as in France or Portugal, is not carried on in the United States. Some housewives have for many years prepared their cordials and they will doubtless continue in some cases still to do this, but, generally speaking, wine can only be replenished by import from Europe. That import is illegal except for sacramental or for medicinal purposes. It is possible that there has been some evasion of the law in both these directions, but recent legislation—the Willis-Campbell Act—

forbids further imports until existing stocks in bond are exhausted by permit. It is stated that in 1920 France exported 8,000,000 bottles of champagne to Britain. To the United States, with more than double the population, the export from France was only 285,000 bottles. This gives each American on the average one bottle of champagne in every 386 years.

On drugs, it is not easy to obtain nation-wide and reliable statistics. There is no doubt that the United States is a country where the patent medicine is universally advertised and consumed. But what may be called the great drug scare occurred in the year 1919, before the Eighteenth Amendment had been applied. Then it was asserted that there were a million drug addicts in the forty-eight States and most alarming figures were presented of the amount of opium and narcotics consumed. These statistics, offered by a committee investigating for the Treasury, were, however, somewhat discounted by the actual test of the draft for the army, which showed that out of 3,500,000 men there were only 3,120 addicts, or less than 1 in 1,000. Other evidence indicated that addiction is fairly evenly distributed between men and women, and that it particularly assails the young person. The military result was thus to be accepted as typical.

I can find no proof and hardly any serious assertion that the absence of drink has driven any considerable number of persons to drugs. Reports from many States are to some extent conflicting, but apparently it is agreed that the danger of drug is greatest in the big cities, where the danger of alcoholism is also most apparent, and that drugs and drink are therefore not rivals and alternatives but allies.

The success or failure of prohibition does not depend on either wine or drugs, which are, once more, details, but on spirits. If the people have only turned from beer in order to consume whisky, and bad whisky at that, the reform will have done more harm than good.

The proposition that there has been any increase in the consumption of spirits is, I cannot but think, wholly wide of the mark. The utmost that can be alleged, is that this consumption in certain areas has not been stamped out, and the quality of the spirits consumed has deteriorated. In the aggregate, the volume of "hooch" put down the human throat in the United States is a mere fraction of what it was before the Amendment came into effect. Of this estimate, enormous increase in price may be taken as an infallible proof. While there are places still wide open, their number is comparatively few, compared with the saloons and the bars available in the old days—and it is understood that injunctions will now be resorted to by the agents. There are no advertisements of liquor in the press. No sky-signs announce a favorite label. And the label on the bottle now tells nothing as to its contents. The very fact that substitutes of every kind, some of them sheer poison, are too freely imbibed show how rare is the real stuff. Liquor has ceased to be a commodity and has become a valuable. It is now worth while for the bandit to break into one's neighbour's cellar.

To sum up, then, I have reported to Britain that prohibition has come to stay, that it is a policy particularly approved by women, that it has virtually stopped the consumption of beer and has enormously reduced the consumption of wine and spirits, without stimulating, so far as can be

discerned, the taste for drugs, I have pointed out the strict attitude assumed by the Supreme Court and by Congress and have further explained the significance of the various evasions, and of the new alcoholism, in its more violent forms. On the social results of the policy, I seem to find but one responsible opinion, at any rate among employers. Even on Mondays labour is alert and efficient. A wave of unemployment, though possibly exaggerated, has been sufficiently serious to render noticeable an unprecedented absence of distress. Apparently, savings bank deposits are rapidly growing and with them the number of depositors' accounts. According to insurance companies, there have been several years added recently to the expectation of life among persons holding their policies. If I remember rightly, a remarkable fall in infant mortality has occurred in New York, some thousands of babies' lives being saved. From several sources and several cities I have information, apparently reliable, that crime has diminished and especially crimes of passion and violence. One hears of a lumber can in Michigan and an Italian quarter in Long Island being similarly transformed. In one western city for some years dry, I asked in vain for the poor house and the prison. Apparently they had none and the work poorhouse or workhouse seemed unfamiliar. I had to explain it. That some employers are applying to the workers a rule against liquor which they do not themselves observe is perfectly true. In that sense there is, for the moment, one law for the rich and another law for the poor. But a "wet" parade, arranged here in New York last summer, was a failure. I can discover no general and popular resentment against the self-denying ordinance, nor any disinclination in Europe to emigrate to "Sahara".

What appears to be happening is a liquidation of thirst among those who already have it without the thirst being renewed among the younger generation that is growing up to take their place. I have in mind two families, in one of which the father and in the other of which the mother drank at times to excess. In both cases the children are being reared without a taste, and I believe without encountering the smell or the sight of liquor. I cannot but compare such instances with the deplorable scenes outside public houses which I witnessed in England only a few weeks ago. Prohibition is not a gospel; it is simply a law. It does not aim at a positive good. It does negative considerable evils. Whether Britain will easily adopt this policy I am still very doubtful. Britain is to-day wetter than the wettest State of the Union before prohibition went into effect. If, however, Britain once gets hold of the big facts she may move quickly. She would then have no land frontier to watch and no forests and mountains on the American scale. Britain, once dry, might be thus more dry than the United States. That, however, is prophesy, and for the moment Britain has to be convinced.

### THE IMPERIAL BUDGET.

THE outstanding feature of the budget, viz. the large deficit necessitating heavy taxation, suggests a reference to the theory of budget-making. What does a series of deficits connote and what are the further implications of a failure to make two ends meet for three years in succession? A deficit means in the first place a miscalculation as to Revenue. Ordinarily the figures for the preceding year or some

earlier years are taken as a basis and the increases in items are also calculated according to the rate of increase displayed during the preceding five or ten years. Allowance is then made for the peculiar social and political conditions of that year which might deflect the revenue from the line indicated by former figures. The leading question then would be: what led to the upsetting of the calculation? The Honourable Finance Member explains it as the result of world-causes over which India has no control. Allowing for this factor which at present is very uncertain, it seems rather queer that the trade depression which is responsible for the shortage of revenue was not foreseen. One is inclined to think that revenue was calculated in a much more optimistic vein than was warranted by facts. Incidentally the deficits in the expected revenue from Railways and Posts show that increased rates are not always conducive to increased yield. Beyond a point the taxation acts as a check to demand and this point has been reached, judging by the poor response of trade. On the whole the impression is left on the mind that such a serious miscalculation of Revenue bespeaks a poor art of budget-making.

Thus far we have spoken without any reference to Expenditure. A series of deficits connotes an expenditure swollen beyond the bounds of prudence and constitutes a warning against financial collapse. The greatest sinner in the matter is the Army. Lord Meston's Committee calculated a maximum military expenditure of 43 crores. Are we to say that the Committee was a set of ignoramuses who did not know what they were talking about? How then does the actual expenditure exceed the Committee's calculation by nearly 20 crores? It is not for laymen to understand the mysteries of the Army department. All that we can say is that the Meston Committee standard should be regarded as a high water-mark for the Army.

The additions to the topmost ranks of services are accountable for a large part of addition to the Civil Expenditure. If we are allowed to make a drastic proposal we would say that one-tenth all of the services should be curtailed. It is better to put up with the resulting inefficiency than to go to the verge of bankruptcy because the only means by which we can keep up present expenditure is borrowing, which with an already enormous public debt should not be so much as thought of.

One serious consequence of the string of deficits is living on borrowed capital. In this respect the ways and means programme for 1921-22 is enough to frighten the most callous spendthrift. A rupee loan of nearly 50 crores and a sterling loan of nearly 25 crores makes a formidable total of 75 crores as an addition to the Public Debt. It means in the first place an addition of 1½ crores to the Home Charges and an addition of 3 crores to the interest item of the yearly expenditure in India.



If however the Government do not apply the knife to any of the items of expenditure we have to resign ourselves to the new régime of 150 crore budget instead of the old 120 crore budget. Granting that the expenditure is to remain as it is, the next thing is to consider the alternatives of new taxation and borrowing as rival methods of filling up the gap between income and expenditure.

"Non-economic expenditure is primarily to be met out of income and unless it can be so dealt with, ought not to be incurred" (Bastable, Public Finance, p. 670). This is the solid bed-rock of ordinary Finance. Loans except for productive expenditure curtail the future power of spending by adding the weight of interest permanently to the national budget. Consequently new taxation is a far better method of meeting deficits than new loans. However unpleasant it may be, we must accept the new taxes with as good a grace as possible. However, we must examine the adequacy of the taxes as well as their equity.

With regard to the customs duty the Hon. Finance Member counts upon a brisk trade and increasing purchasing power of the people due to a good harvest. The second may be accepted as a fact but the briskness of trade is problematical, and it is just possible that the estimates of Revenue would be falsified this year too. In principle there is no objection to a 15% *ad valorem* duty excepting that it would raise the price of cloth, &c for very poor consumers who cannot escape the tax.

The duty on sugar should be welcome as giving a certain amount of protection to Indian sugar and the opportunity should be availed of to encourage the manufacture of a superior article.

The tax on yarn ought equally to act as an encouragement to the Indian spinning mills and is therefore welcome.

The increase in Income-tax as it does not affect any but the rich is without interest to the generality of tax-payers but is serious in its effects upon capital. A high income-tax kept on for a series of years is sure to check enterprise and may possibly drive out capital abroad. The doubling of the duty on salt is a retrograde step and has been already vetoed by the Assembly. As substitutes for salt duty we might suggest increase of stamp duty which has the merit of being paid by those who benefit by the particular service rendered by the State and not by everybody.

One result of the increase of the customs duties like those on kerosine, sugar, &c. is to increase the cost of living for all. This means, in justice, more wages all round which means increase of expenditure which, again, means increased taxation. How are we to get out of this vicious circle? One thing is clear and that is the urgency of means towards the rehabilitation of the old scale of prices. The question cannot be discussed in connection with the Budget, but it may be said here that piling up of indirect duties is the surest means of delaying the process.

This suggests that direct taxation should preponderate over indirect taxation. Another agency is the cancellation of notes by allowing the Secretary of State to draw from the paper currency reserve in England. The Finance Member appears to be unduly nervous about a cancellation of 33 crores of notes out of a total of 170 crores. We think that the process will do a world of good to the already booming money-market. It is only reckless speculators that can look with anxiety upon a contraction of notes. Tight money is a nightmare of happy-go-lucky traders. For our part we welcome the suggested deflation of about one-sixth of the total paper circulation which will be a powerful antidote to the inflation of prices.

The Budget gives no hope of cancelling the floating loan in the form of Treasury bills. This is a dangerous form of credit since at any time new Treasury bills may fail to find sufficient purchasers. And this after the sermons on the unstable character of Treasury bills contained in the last year's budget speech looks fairly unrepentant.

Railway capital outlay of 30 crores is not excessive considering that trade and commerce depend on the carrying capacity of the Railways, that inefficiency of this branch might obstruct our export trade. It has been the fashion to criticize Railway Capital outlay as tending to swell the Home charges; but we think such criticism to be misplaced. If we want to have the Railways we must keep them fit. But we are constrained to remind the Government of the obligation to manufacture as much Railway material as is possible in India instead of purchasing all the "stores" in England.

On the supposition therefore that expenditure cannot be curtailed we produce about 30 crores by new taxation and about 50 crores by loans. But is the expenditure to be regarded as sacrosanct? Anti-waste propaganda are as much needed in India as in England. We might take a leaf out of the book of England which has reduced even vital items. One melancholy result of deficits has been the postponement of improvements in Education and Sanitation.

It is a nice question whether accounts should be kept on a 2 shilling basis when the possibility of reaching that point of exchange seems to be as remote as ever. Why not demolish the fetish of the Pythagorean number of 2 (shillings)? The bogus items of gain from exchange and loss by exchange might disappear, if the 16d. — a rupee basis is restored.

The possibility of extinguishing the Provincial Contributions to the Central Exchequer now seems to be very remote. If the provinces insist on the "gradual extinction" of these contributions they will be simply giving with one hand what they take with the other. The demand should therefore be given up and the Provinces might think out ways of increasing the Revenue and lessening Expenditure so far as their own budgets are concerned.

It is to be hoped that the revival of trade would soon re-establish the Council bills. In the absence of these the Secretary of State will draw on the Gold Standard Reserve and this would lead to its depletion. In that case its utility to serve as the 'first line of defence' in the case of a weak exchange would be lessened if it does not vanish altogether. Where would the 'gold exchange standard' be in that case? Such are the straits to which an artificial standard has brought us.

The chastened tone of the whole budget speech is a welcome sign of the desire to take the Legislature into confidence. The Hon. Finance Member has done well in recognising that dogmatism is out of place in Finance and that in the multitude of counsel there is safety. If misfortune has taught all of us that our pet theories may at any time be upset by stubborn facts, then we might say that the war has not been fought in vain.

V. N. GODBOLE.

### THE WORLD OUTSIDE.

*Nationalist Education in Poland.* JUST how much is possible for people who have really set their minds on doing something, is shown by the Hebrew school system in Poland. In that country, where by the way the greatest compact mass of modern Jewry is domiciled, it is practically impossible for Jewish children to attend Polish schools on account of the treatment meted out to them there—a treatment which ranges from ostracism, insults and constant pinpricks to naked physical violence. As a result the whole education of their children rests upon the Jewish population (which on the average is miserably poor), since the Polish State does not even recognize, let alone subsidize, these schools which serve a community representing 14% of a total population of 2-38 crores. But the voluntary system is amazingly well organized by this Polish Jewry; everybody is assessed for every kind of communal need and the tax-gatherers employed are so insistent, that they are said to be more successful in collecting these "voluntary" dues than their Gentile colleagues are, who have got the whole machinery of the law behind them. The Jewish school system is not uniform either, but the figures of the "Tarbut", which we cull from the *Jewish Chronicle* of January 20th, give an idea of what can be done by people ready for self-help. The "Tarbut" is a Zionist Education Society whose principle is to impart education through the medium of Hebrew, though Polish is obligatory and instruction in Polish literature, language and history is given in Polish. This "Tarbut" Society alone controls 272 schools, including kindergartens, elementary and secondary schools; employs 1019 teachers and educates 34,230 children. It would be interesting to compare the results of these Jewish Nationalists in a foreign country with the results of our Indian Nationalists in their own country. Perhaps it would also be unkind.

*Bribery by Proxy.* WE earnestly recommend to those gentlemen who are never tired of hinting darkly at the racial incapacity of Orientals for democratic institutions, to ponder the case of the latest member of that august occidental body, the U. S. A. Senate. The facts are that a Mr. Newberry contested a Michigan "primary" in August 1918 and won by an extremely narrow margin. But no sooner was the election over, than was a prosecution under the Corrupt Practices Act instigated against him, which in due course eventuated in a conviction and sentence of two years' imprisonment. With the legal delays and quibbles open to rich people in the "Land of the Free", Mr. Newberry obtained lately a reversal of that sentence by the U. S. Supreme Court, where a narrow majority (of 5-to 4) let him off on the technicality that the Court was incompetent to make case law on the subject of senatorial elections: Mr. Newberry having pleaded that he was totally ignorant at the time of the fact that \$195,000 had been spent by his brother, his brother-in-law and "friends" of his on his election and that the contest had cost him personally not a cent. Having thus got off (1), Mr. Newberry had the audacity after these 3½ years to present himself at the Senate for admission. All this of course is not particularly savoury nor, it must be confessed, novel. But what is one to say to the Senate's vote which by 46 out of 96 went for his admission? Well might Mr. G.G. Gloom exclaim (according to the *New Republic* of January 25th): "Well if he's not in jail, he might as well be in the Senate!" Mr. Newberry's opponent, by the way, in the election was none less than Henry Ford. But 100% America does not hesitate as between a Henry Ford and a Henry Newberry. For was not Mr. Newberry a Commander in the Navy, with sons and son-in-law on active service during the war, whilst Henry Ford—well, was he not a pacifist?

*Forced Labour.* NOWHERE in the world probably is the prejudice against the Soviet régime of Russia as virulent as in America. The "free" citizens of the great and "free" Republic never tire of declaiming against the wicked slavery of the poor dear masses of the Russian people, who are kept down by the terrorist absolutism of those inhuman monsters, Lenin & Co., and who dare not call their soul their own. With what shrieks of horror was not received the news of conscription of labour in Russia! What freedom was there left, when the State could demand from the individual forced labour on any terms satisfactory to the State? Was there anything quite as abominable as to turn the individual into a mere human machine? All lovers of the principle of liberty, whether in or out of America, can but associate themselves with these indignant protests. At the same time some of them (and we amongst them) feel surprised that these liberty-loving Americans should have had to carry their indignation

five thousand miles abroad, when at home in Kansas ——. The State of Kansas some time ago passed a brand new law under the innocuous title of "Industrial Relations Act." This Act with one stroke made strikes impossible. At least, it made them legally impossible. For, as a matter of fact, there is a little strike going on there just now—a little strike of coal miners. But it won't last much longer. The majesty of the law must be vindicated. Also the dividends of the mining companies. What does compulsory arbitration mean anyhow, if the compulsion fails to compel? Now, what are these strikers, these pestilential fellows, doing? How are they living? On Trade Union funds? Well, is that not on charity? And is not everybody who can work, but refuses to work and prefers to live on charity, a vagrant? Therefore, says the Attorney General of Kansas, let everyone of these recalcitrants be sent under a Vagrancy Law to jail for from 10 to 30 days for each offence committed. At the expiration of each sentence (during which the prisoners are compelled to work at hard labour!) each man presumably will be asked whether he is going back to work in his mine—and if not, will he not have committed a fresh offence, become a vagrant once more, and, in due course, once more too a prisoner at hard labour?—How Americans must thank God, that they are not as these sinners, these Russians, who have got a forced labour system and barefacedly conscript workers! How different in liberty loving America, where, thank God, a man's got the constitutional right to accept employment or not, as he pleases! Leastways, if he is rich.

**The Triumphant Progress of Guild Socialism.** THE first Annual Report of the London Guild of Builders for the period ending September 30th, 1921, has just been issued. It discloses a wonderful expansion in the business done and an equally wonderful efficiency: wonderful, that is, to those who cannot realize of how much better quality work must necessarily be, if done as a service to the community rather than as unavoidable drudgery for the benefit of a minority of rich people. The Guild above-mentioned has a pay-roll of £4000 per week, £600,000 worth of contracts still on hand, and their budgeting and estimating is done so perfectly, that the year under review ended in an almost superhumanly accurate balance of Revenue and Expenditure, with only £43 out on the huge turnover. (Sir Malcolm Hailey, please note!) That the Building Trade's success should stimulate other workers to an analogous effort, is only natural. The London Guild of Clothiers has been at work now for some time, doing a substantial amount of work for private persons and is now entering the lists for public clothing contracts. The latest recruit, as we gather from the *Musicians Journal* for January, is "The Music Guild," which has just been formed "to make the musician his own employer by bringing all music makers and music lovers together to finance and run the pro-

fession, thus ruling out those whose only concern is to make money out of both of them." This guild thus represents a new kind of association, not a guild of the producers only, but of producers and "consumers" together. Of this type apparently is the Austrian Builders' and City Improvement Guild, which tries to solve the housing problem in Austria by taking control of the building, upkeep and distribution of new houses. It consists to-day of 200,000 members, according to the *Guild Socialist* of February, and was started by the amalgamation of the Builders' Union, the Garden City Association and the Lodgers' Union. The Guild idea is certainly making wonderful progress—small wonder, that even the Webbses' *New Statesman*, wedded as they and it are to State Socialism, feel the necessity (in the issue of February 25th) of acknowledging "the success which the guilds have already achieved," though they "still regard them as an experiment." The dear Fabians!

**Measuring with the Same Measure.** THE same issue of this paper, by the way contains an extremely valuable article by Sir L. Chiozza Money on a subject which is never yet sufficiently appreciated by the general public—we mean the wastefulness of the capitalistic system. Sir Leo draws attention to the blissful ignorance of people who are loudest in their denunciation of public wastefulness, but who utterly fail to realize the truly colossal waste going on in a private business. The boom following the end of the war caused fantastic profits, e. g. in shipping and spinning. The result was that cotton mills and old tubs were sold to companies formed *ad hoc* at prices and with a capitalisation based on the very scale of profits which were being earned at the time: the total of the new capital issues of the two years 1919-20 aggregating £621,000,000—the bulk of which represents money irretrievably lost. Of course it is not the big financiers and industrialists who have paid the difference between the boom prices and present values: that loss is naturally shouldered by the small investor, upon whom all these issues are in the end (and at the psychological moment) unloaded. And yet it is these *petits rentiers* who are always most scared by the prospects of socialist "confiscations"—quite oblivious of the capitalist confiscations to which they are being submitted again and again. How many private businesses could survive the searching criticisms levelled at the administration of public business? If the open methods of democracy are found so effective in the one case, why not try them in the other? For ourselves we are declared enemies of state socialism, but even under a system of state socialism, it is unthinkable that a Government Rubber Board would be allowed to waste £8,000,000 as did the Dunlop Co. last year, or a State Industry to cancel 80% of its capital liability, as did that big company, mentioned by Sir Leo Chiozza Money, reducing as they did their £1 shares to 4s. If big business really feels able to convince the public that Nationalization is uneconomic, let them introduce the same searching publicity in their private concerns as is already the rule for all public services.

## SELECTION.

## MR. FISHER'S EULOGY.

SPEAKING at the dinner which Mr. Sastri gave to Lord Lytton on March 3, Mr. H. A. L. Fisher said they ought not to separate without drinking the toast of their host. He doubted whether the career of any Indian in the long annals of Anglo-Indian history had been marked by such richness and variety of experience as that of Mr. Sastri. It was my privilege (he continued) last September to be one of the delegates representing His Majesty's Government at the Assembly at the League of Nations at Geneva and it is no flattery or exaggeration to say that the great sensation of that meeting was furnished by the eloquence of our distinguished host. I remember coming out of the Assembly room and being accosted by a distinguished representative of a South American State. He said, "I congratulate the British Empire; I never realised what British India meant or what Great Britain had done in India until I heard that speech of Mr. Sastri." (Cheers.) For myself I consider that our host both by his eloquence and the impression his integrity or character has made has greatly spread the reputation of Great Britain all over the world. Not only did he worthily represent British India at Geneva, but he was also at the Washington Conference, and there again he made the same impression of firmness of character and elevation of view. He leaves for India in a few days and carries with him I am sure the best wishes of his many friends in this country. We hope that he will make his influence and his sane views of policy widely felt amongst his fellow countrymen. We realise he will be a great influence for good all over the British Empire, and know that further Imperial missions await him. He stands for sane, reasonable and moderate policy and we wish him health, prosperity and a long period of political influence. (Cheers.)

THE  
Servants of India Society's  
PAMPHLETS.

1. Self-Government for India under the British Flag— 0-8-0  
by the Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President,  
Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 91.
  2. The Public Services in India— 0-10-0  
by Mr. Hirday Nath Kunsru, Senior Member,  
Upper India Branch, Servants of India Society.  
Crown 16 mo. pp. 175.
  3. The Congress-League Scheme: An exposition— 0-6-0  
by the Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri. Crown 16  
mo. pp. 66.
  4. The Co-operative Movement— 1-0-0  
by Mr. V. Venkatasubbaiya, member, Servants of  
India Society and Mr. V. L. Metha, Manager,  
Bombay Central Co-operative Bank Ltd. Bombay.  
Crown 16 mo. pp. 191.
  5. The Medical Services in India— 0-8-0  
by an I. M. S. Officer. Crown 16 mo. pp. 58.
  6. Trade Union Legislation— 0-4-0  
by A Labour Advocate. Crown 16 mo. pp. 32.
- 
1. Arya-Bhushan School Dictionary— 3-0-0  
*Marathi-English*. by S. G. Vase, Esq. B. A. Demi  
8 vo. pp. 600. Cloth Bound.
  2. Life of G. K. Gokhale— 0-4-0  
by Hon. Mr. R. P. Paranjpye. With nine fine illus-  
trations and facsimile of the dead patriot's hand-  
writing. (4th edition). Crown 16 mo. pp. 88.
  3. Life of Prof. D. K. Karve— 0-4-0  
The Great Social Reformer, by the Hon. Mr. R. P.  
Paranjpye. Crown 16 mo. pp. 72.
  4. Native States and Post-War Reforms— 1-0-0  
by Mr. G. R. Abhyankar, B. A. LL. B., Sangli State.  
Crown 16 mo. pp. 96.
  5. A Gist of Gita-Rahasya— 0-8-0  
(2nd edition, reprint) by Mr. V. M. Joshi, M. A.  
(N. B.—The above prices do not include postage, which  
will be extra.)

## HINDU LAW.

(3rd Edition.)

BY

J. R. GHARPURE, Esq., B. A. LL. B.,  
*High Court Vakil, Bombay.*

Price Rupees Ten, Postage Extra.

Copies can be had at—

The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.

## Currency Reform in India

BY

Prof. V. G. KALE,

Price Re. One.

Please order your requirements at once from—

THE ARYABHUSHAN PRESS,  
POONA CITY.

## Books of the Day.

Gokhale &amp; Economic Reforms: 2-0-0

By Professor V. G. Kale, M. A., Fergusson College,  
Poona, Crown 16 mo. pp. 250. Cloth Bound.

Indian Administration: 2-8-0

By Professor V. G. Kale, M. A., Fergusson College,  
Poona. Demi. 8 vo. pp. 432. Cloth Bound. Fourth  
Edition thoroughly revised, enlarged and brought  
up-to-date.

Indian Economics: (In Press)

By Prof. V. G. Kale, M. A., Professor of History  
and Economics, Fergusson College, Poona; Demi  
8vo. pp. 520 Cloth Bound. Second Edition thorough-  
ly revised and enlarged.

Writings &amp; Speeches: 5-0-0

Of the late Hon. R. B. Ganesh Venkatesh Joshi.  
Demi. 8vo. pp. 1300. Cloth Bound.

The Writings &amp; Speeches: 2-8-0

Of Sir Narayan Ganesh Chandawarkar. Demi 8vo.  
pp. 660 Cloth Bound.

The 'Aryabhushan Press,' Poona City.

## A Conscience Clause

FOR INDIANS

In Indian Education Codes

(WITH A REPLY TO CERTAIN CRITICISM).

BY

The Right Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri

*President, Servants of India Society.*

Crown-16 mo. 67 pp. Paper Bound.

Price Annas Eight.

A pamphlet very helpful to members of the  
Provincial Councils and of the Central Indian  
Legislatures, Educationists and persons taking  
interest in public questions.

Copies can be had of:—

THE MANAGER, ARYABHUSHAN PRESS,  
POONA CITY.

## CUT ME OUT

and mail me, with your name and address, to  
Good Luck Co., Benares City.

I will bring you, per V. P. P., one COSSI SILK SUIT  
length for Rs. 12 only. These pieces are economical, hard  
wear and handsome ever made.

Test them any way you please—Why not give it a trial

Name.....  
Address.....