

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. V, No. 36.]

POONA—THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1922.

{INLAND SUBNS. Rs. 6.
{FOREIGN s. 10.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	421
ARTICLES :—	
Treaty Obligations. ...	423
Female and Child Labour in Mines. ...	424
Outmanoeuvred. By Outsider. ...	426
A LETTER FROM LONDON. ...	428
MISCELLANEA :—	
Mr. Sastri's speech in Fiji ...	430

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

A Peace Victory. IT is indeed a happy augury for the maintenance of world-peace that the war clouds, which were massing so threateningly during the past week between England and Turkey, should have been blown away by the powerful will of the common people of England who in unmistakable terms told the bellicose Mr. George and the romantic Mr. Churchill through their representatives, that they for one would not make any more war, and that, if Kemal Pasha was to be fought, these gentlemen would have to do it themselves. That the return into the Balkans of a victorious and militarily strong Turkey is a disturbing factor, should be candidly admitted; that it is the tradition, not of reactionary, but of the most progressive and liberal opinion in England, which frowns on giving any scope to Turkish autocracy and fanaticism, should with equal fairness be conceded. But just because that is so, one has every reason for rejoicing that it is these very elements who have in such circumstances come to the conclusion that whatever wrongs there be, it is not by war and violence that they can be remedied. Let all friends of world-peace thankfully acknowledge this—even if they are fully aware that nothing has helped the people in England so much to come to their conclusion, than the anxiety not to provoke Indian sentiment any further.

* * *

A Complication. THE Protection of Princes Bill, which was introduced in the Council of State last Tuesday week, was on the very same day consented to by that chamber in the form recommended by the Governor General; thus "justifying the purpose for which the Council of State was created," as the *Times of India* benevolently—or was it malevolently? anyhow, so deliciously—put it. As "Outsider" points out,

this action on their part cannot but hamper the further opposition which it is so essential should be offered to the Act. For though the Bill now becomes an Act, as soon as the Governor General signifies his assent to it, it will still not come into effect, until it has lain before both Houses of Parliament for at least eight days and has thereafter received His Majesty's assent. As a matter of fact, when "in the opinion of the Governor General there exists a state of emergency," even this procedure can be dispensed with; but it is hardly credible that the Governor General will go to the length permitted to him in the Reform Act and direct the Act to come into operation forthwith, because, in his opinion, a state of emergency exists which justifies such action. The position now therefore is that the Act, having come into being by the fiat of the Governor General, will remain inoperative, until its fate has finally been decided by the British Parliament—which of course is not in session now and had been prorogued until next month. So much breathing space therefore remains; but since the centre of gravity has been shifted from Simla to London, the time available is none too long, to mobilize all the progressive forces in India against it.

* * *

Full Speed Astern. YET that the principle raised is one of the utmost gravity, admits of no doubt. As we tried to show last week, that principle is the perpetuation of autocratic rule in India. Autocracy was unquestioningly accepted as the basic principle until the end of last century, both by rulers and ruled in India: it is only since opposition to this principle (as appropriate to India) grew, that it was deemed necessary by a special Press Act (of 1910) to prevent that principle being "brought into hatred or contempt." Yet as we all know, that Act did not prevent the hatred and contempt in which that principle was increasingly being held; and in the end, the Reform Act set its seal on the lawfulness of that hatred and contempt and H. R. H. the Duke of Connaught himself formally announced that "the principle of autocracy had all been abandoned." Since the Reform Act then became the law of the land, to hold the principle of autocracy, even of "benevolent despotism", as Lord Chelmsford explained, in contempt and hatred, is in British India not only as legitimate, but even as praiseworthy, as to hold in contempt and hatred the principle of constitutionalism in an autocracy, or

that of monarchy in a republic. The repeal of the 1910 Press Act therefore was a logical necessity; so was the conclusion of the Press Act Committee that the abandonment of the principle of autocracy made any re-enactment of it *vis-a-vis* the Indian States impossible. If to-day the Government of India acts in diametrical opposition to that logic and to such conclusion, it is not because new facts have come to light. The only fact made patent is that the Government of India of 1922 and that of 1919 are pursuing a different policy: that whilst in 1919 the Government tried to adjust itself to the war-idealism of a world made safe for democracy and of the self-determination of all peoples, in 1922 a new Government deliberately goes back on that policy and tries to make India safe for autocracy.

* * *

The I. C. S. Again. THE example of impertinence and insubordination set by the C. P. Civil Servants has not been lost on their brethren in the U. P. The *Leader* recently published a circular letter of the United Provinces I. C. S. Association which among other things notified the consideration of the following resolution:

(i) That every member of the association be required as a condition of his membership, to undertake to obey any order which a general meeting of the association may decide to issue, or may authorize the committee to issue to the members of the association.

(ii) That to enable this association to sue the Secretary of State, either for compensation in the event of posts hitherto reserved for or open to the I. C. S. being abolished, or for any other relief, this association should register itself as a company under the Indian Companies Act, 1913, and that the central association be urged to do likewise.

Obviously the "heaven-born Service" has ceased to look upon itself as an honoured profession meant for *service*. Its members are converting their associations into labour unions for the purpose of collective bargaining, declaring strikes etc. Well, if the I. C. S. men set for themselves no higher ideal in spite of their high education and attainments, they cannot complain if the people of India should treat them only as a labour force. A threat of the I. C. S. and other European services to go on strike, far from frightening Indians, will be quite welcome to them. It will give them an opportunity to prove that the European servants are not indispensable whatever they and Mr. Lloyd George may think to the contrary. It will also make it so easy to deal with them as they deserve.

* * *

The Employment of Women Underground. THAT the fears expressed by Mr. Innes regarding the evil economic effects of the prohibition of the employment of women underground in the mines are idle, is borne out by the following expression of opinion by a European manager in charge of several of the biggest collieries in the Jharia coalfield. He writes to us in a private letter: "The sentiments and proposals in the leading article (of the *SERVANT OF INDIA* of September 7) represent, in my opinion, the correct attitude for all educated Indians to take up toward the employment of

women underground. There is absolutely no necessity for it, and their employment could easily be eliminated within the next five years without in any way either decreasing the earnings of the miners or the cost of coal to the purchaser. In fact, with modern equipment installed in the collieries, I am certain the price to the purchaser could be decreased considerably." We wish the Joint Select Committee appointed to consider the Mines (amending and consolidating) Bill will look into this question very carefully, take courage in both hands and provide a clause empowering Government to prohibit women-labour underground within a definite and reasonable period of time. The present attitude of Government on this question is that of the status quo,—under the misapprehension that the key-industry of the country will be dislocated by the proposed reform.

* * *

The U. P. Liberals. WE congratulate the U. P. Liberals on holding a well attended and successful session of their Provincial Conference last week at Fyzabad. The Chairman of the Reception Committee, Mr. Parameswar Nath Sapru, delivered a short address in which he dealt mainly with the Premier's I. C. S. speech. He poured ridicule on Mr. Lloyd George for wanting Indians to assist Britishers in discharging their *trust* to India, for looking upon her as 'an heirloom to be transmitted to generations both born and unborn' and for developing his wonderful steel-frame theory. He made a very apt quotation from Sir Edward Sullivan who so long ago as 1858 acknowledged that India, by paying twice as much as any other country for educated labour and thus attracting British young men, had served England as a very useful safety valve and saved her from the dangers of an unemployed educated class.

* * *

Mr. Misra's Presidential address. IN his Presidential address Pandit Gokaran Nath Misra took a broad survey of all the important occurrences of the year, and sketched a programme of work for Liberals in and outside the Council. Considering the change of policy that has set in at Whitehall after Mr. Montagu's resignation, it is not surprising that Mr. Misra should have advocated sterner opposition to and more discriminating co-operation with the Government in the Councils. He rightly laid the greatest stress on the need for educating the electorates, which work, owing to the exceptional nature of the times, has not hitherto been sufficiently attended to. The address breathed a broad-minded spirit of toleration and expressed a willingness on the part of the U. P. Liberals to co-operate with political opponents where there was no conflict of principles. But we are not sure that those political opponents will reciprocate Mr. Misra's friendly feelings or resist the temptation to exploit opportunities for party purposes. The resolutions generally followed the lines of the presidential address. One of them expressed grateful thanks to Mr. Montagu and another deprecated the interference of Whitehall with Simla where the Indian Government and the Legislature were in agreement.

TREATY OBLIGATIONS.

IT would be difficult to conceive of an occasion which would have afforded less intrinsic justification for the exercise of the Governor-General's certification power than the one on which Lord Reading now wishes to persuade us that the treaty obligations on which the Government of India had entered with the Indian Princes left him no alternative but to use this exceptional power.

In the first place if the Government of India felt that they were bound in honour to give to the Princes the kind of protection from attack in British Indian newspapers which they had provided for themselves, they ought surely to have enlightened both Houses of the Legislature betimes on the exact wording of the pledges to which they had been committed. That there was a special need for enlightenment on this score cannot be denied, for till at least July of last year, when the Press Law Committee's report was signed, the Home Member and the Law Member themselves were unaware of any such commitments. They must be held to be unaware of the pledges, for the only alternative assumption possible is that they were deliberately oblivious of the treaty obligations, which imputation no one will make against them. The Viceroy himself treated the question last year, not as one which could have only one issue in view of past agreements, but as one to be decided on a balance of considerations. If at the very *fons et origo* of official information ignorance on this point prevailed till such a late period, the Government of India could well have foreseen that in unofficial quarters that ignorance would reign supreme, if no special efforts were made to dispel it by placing before the Legislature the *ipsissima verba* of the agreements which bound the British Government to give protection to the Indian Princes. Not only was no such effort made, but the Bill was brought in towards the close of the session, and when it was at last brought in, there was no citation from the solemn documents which, in the view of the Government of India, would for all reasonable persons close the question.

It is no wonder that the Legislative Assembly concluded from the Home Member's speech that no *prima facie* case had been made out for the Bill. After this it certainly came as a bolt from the blue for the Viceroy to have adopted the extreme procedure of sending the Bill to the Council of State over the head of the Legislative Assembly, seeing that the treaty obligations which were recently discovered in the *bureaux* of the Government of India had not yet been made known to the Legislature. If the Princes were to remain for some time without protection on that account, he should have realised that the fault would have been that of the Government of India's. The Princes who had had no protection for so many decades past, in spite of the existence of the treaties which are now interpreted to imply an imperative obligation, on the part of the British

Government, to afford them protection, could surely have afforded to be without this protection for a year or two more, till the Legislature had been placed in full possession of the facts and had been able to judge of the nature of the pledges. In any case there was not the shade of a shadow of excuse for rejecting the motion for an adjournment of the consideration of the question to the January session of the Council of State. But the Bill was rushed on the plea of Mr. Thompson that "very serious apprehensions might be created in the minds of the rulers of Indian States, if we don't take action at once." But have the members of the Government of India and the Viceroy any idea of the apprehensions that this action will cause in the minds of the British Indian subjects? Anyhow, even if the Assembly had given leave to introduce the Bill, the Bill would not have passed into law this session. What then could be the objection to adjourning the further consideration of the measure till January? It is very strange indeed that in face of such an unreasonable attitude on the part of Government, only one member of the Council of State should have opposed the passage of the Bill.

After all, what are the treaty obligations, as set out in the Legislature, which necessitate the immediate enactment of the Bill? Our comments on this point are subject to correction, on a reference to the official proceedings when published, but the Associated Press of India reports only one sentence in Mr. Thompson's speech which elucidates the nature of the treaties. "As regards the treaty obligations, Mr. Thompson stated that there were groups of twenty States, which had long-standing treaties providing that there should be perpetual friendship, alliance and unity of interest between the two parties from generation to generation, and that the friend and enemies of one would be the friend and enemies of the other, the principle underlying these terms was one of reciprocity." If such a vague and intangible contract is to be interpreted into an obligation on the part of the Government of India to extend to the Princes of India the same protection which they have given themselves, we for our part have no objection, provided only that this reciprocity similarly enables and indeed obliges the Government of India, as it should, to require the Princes to introduce into their states the same form of Government and confer on their subjects the same rights and privileges as they have themselves done. If, because the British Government have pledged their friendship to the States, they are bound to give them the protection against newspaper criticism, which they enjoy themselves, the States in their turn should be bound, by the unity of interest, to adopt the same principle of administration in their States as is prevalent in British India. If Princes have reason to be apprehensive of the danger of journalistic critics living in the adjoining territory, British India has reason to be apprehensive of the autocracy of her neighbours.

Protection cannot be given to the former and denied to the latter. In this view of the matter, we not only do not object but gladly accept the interpretation which the Government of India are placing upon their treaty obligations, and we shall be willing to give to Indian Princes immunity, not only from seditious writings but from seditious speeches as well. And we cannot understand why the Government of India should feel that they are under an obligation to protect the Princes only from writings of a seditious character, but not from speeches of like nature. They will probably reply that they are merely restoring to the Princes the protection which they once enjoyed but which the repeal of the Press Act has now denied to them. It may be so, but if the Government have passed the present Indian Princes Protection Act because the treaties made such a measure necessary, the same treaties should make the Government of India bring forward another bill protecting the Princes from seditious utterances on the platform. We on our part, as we have said above, would be quite ready to give this twofold protection, if it enables the British Government and the British citizens to require the Princes to remodel their policy to suit modern times. But the present non-intervention policy has all the vices and none of the virtues of such a course. No one will be sorry if it gives place to a policy of mutual help. The people of India have not the least desire of throwing to the winds "solemn treaty obligations." But surely, they have every right to insist that such obligations must be not merely unilateral, but bilateral.

FEMALE AND CHILD LABOUR IN MINES.

PAST ATTEMPTS AT LEGISLATION.

THE first coal mine was opened in India in 1820, and yet for the next seventy years the Government gave no thought whatever to the restriction of the working hours of coal or other miners or to the prohibition or regulation of the employment of women and children in mines. However, the International Labour Conference which met in Berlin in 1890 in a sense forced the Government to take this question in hand, for although India was not represented at this Conference and was not bound by its decisions, the Government naturally felt that "it must obviously accord to them the very greatest consideration; and if it departs from them should do so on the clearest evidence that they apply to social and labour conditions which do not exist in India."* The regulations adopted in the final protocol of the Berlin Conference contained the following, among other propositions:—

(1) that children below the age of fourteen years in northern countries, or below that of twelve in southern countries, should not be admitted to underground work in mines; (2) that women should not be allowed to work underground; (3) that

children below fourteen years should not work (above ground) more than six hours a day and should be excluded from unhealthy or dangerous occupations, or should be admitted to them only under protective conditions; and (4) that the working hours of women (above ground) should be limited by law and further restricted in respect of particularly unhealthy or dangerous occupations.

In order to ascertain if any of these regulations were inapplicable to Indian conditions, the Government of India borrowed the services of one of H. M. Inspectors of Mines in England, Mr. James Grundy, who was appointed the first Inspector of Mines in India. In his first report, for the year 1894, Mr. Grundy recorded his conclusion that there was no immediate urgency for the prohibition of the underground labour of women, as this labour was not employed in those extremely cruel conditions which obtained in England when, in 1842, the prohibition of women from working below ground in mines was enacted, and as labour was already scarce and the prohibition, lessening the number not only of women but "at least temporarily" of men as well, owing to the family gang system of labour which is in force, would injuriously affect the mining industry which was then in its infancy. Mr. Grundy therefore reported that "it would be a very untimely act to now prohibit females from working in mines." The word "now", which was italicized in the report itself, is very important, showing clearly that it was Mr. Grundy's opinion that some time after it would not only be advisable but necessary to put an interdict on the employment of women on underground work. At the same time Mr. Grundy felt it necessary to issue the warning that "taking the sum total of women's work they appear to do more work than most men, for they have to act as the servant, bearer and provider to the men, and so in various ways work a greater number of hours in the day," thus implying that a statutory limitation of the working hours of women was essential, as recommended by the Berlin Conference in the fourth proposition quoted above. In regard to child labour, Mr. Grundy recommended the prohibition of boys under ten years of age and girls under 12 years of age from being employed either below ground or on the surface, and, further, the prohibition of all young children below these ages from being in the mine at all under any circumstances.

The mere appointment of a Mining Inspector filled the mine owners with alarm; they denied any regulations to be necessary even for the purpose of securing safety in the working of mines and they declared that though the mining industry would acquiesce in regulations of this kind, they would oppose tooth and nail any legislative interference with the labour force. The Chairman of the Indian Mining Association went the length of saying that "Government would act far more equitably, if, instead of scheming to protect our labour against us, they sought to protect us against

* Sir Charles Rivaz, Member in charge of the Indian Mines Bill, in the Viceroy's Council, on March 20, 1899.

our labour."* The Government of India, finding that they would encounter an organised opposition on the part of the proprietors of mines, appointed in May 1895 a Committee to go into the question of a Mining Act for India. On this Committee the Government was represented by only two members, while the mining interest had a representation of three. One could well imagine what the recommendations of a Committee, composed as to its majority of the representatives of mine-owners, would be like, in regard to what one may call the labour provisions of the Mining Act. And, true to anticipations, they reported that no labour provisions of any kind were desirable! We will give a few extracts from their report:—

The Committee are unanimously of opinion that at present at any rate, there is no necessity for interfering with the labour of women below ground.

As regards the question of prohibiting children from working underground, there is not quite the same unanimity. . . . In small collieries the prohibition of children would mean stopping the women from work, as if children were not allowed to work, it would be imperative to stop them from being taken below at all, and the wife with children would have to stay at home to look after them instead of accompanying her husband below ground, and the work now done by women and children would have to be done by men. It would also mean an additional expense. . . . The general opinion is that the work does not hurt the children, and that the parents as well as mine owners would object if their labour were interfered with, and the Committee are, therefore, of opinion that there is no need for any interference with this class of labour. Any interference would mean increased cost to the owners and the consumers and a loss of comforts to the children and the parents themselves.

The Committee think it quite unnecessary to make any rules about hours of work. The workmen are very independent, coming and going as they like and resting a great deal when in the mine.

The Government of India was naturally not satisfied with these conclusions, especially because "the two important subjects of the employment underground of women and young children were not expressly referred for the consideration of the Committee" who, however, lightly touched on both. It, therefore, referred the Committee's report to Local Governments for opinion, and, on the opinions thus received, formulated its own proposals regarding the health and well-being of labour embodied in clauses 9 to 12 of its Mines Bill of 1899. It was proposed in this Bill to prohibit the employment below ground (above ground work being still allowed) of children under the age of ten years, and the admission below ground of children between the ages of four and ten. It will be observed that the Bill, in respect of the provisions regarding child labour, fell short of Mr. Grundy's recommendations, as he had recommended the prohibition of all labour, below ground and above ground, of boys under ten and girls under twelve. With regard to women and to children between the ages of ten and fourteen years, it was not proposed to go further than to take power by rule to prohibit, res-

trict or regulate their employment underground if in any class of mine this was found to be expedient. It was felt that, though no general prohibition was demanded, it was necessary, where the family gang system did not prevail, or where the mine was dangerous or very deep, or the work very laborious, to forbid or limit the employment of women and children; and this could be met by giving power to Governments to make rules to that effect. These provisions, though they went beyond the recommendations of the Mining Committee who adopted an attitude of blank negative on the subject, followed in the main the final recommendations made by the Government of Bengal after a very careful survey of the subject, and Sir Charles Rivaz, in moving for leave to introduce the Bill, declared that these provisions were considered by the Government of India "to represent the smallest amount of protection which should be afforded by law to these classes of workers".

But the labour clauses in the Bill, though, in the eye of the Government, they constituted the minimum protection required in the circumstances, were not unnaturally denounced by the Indian Mining Association, and the Select Committee which sat on the Bill modified them "in view of these objections" taken by the Association, in the direction of whittling them away. The Bill, as originally drafted, absolutely prohibited young children between six and ten years of age from being taken down the mine; but this was altered in the Bill as amended by the Select Committee. In its new form, the Bill left it to Local Governments to prohibit the admission in any mine of children over four and under twelve years of age. But such a prohibition could be ordered only "under certain very special circumstances," i. e. if by reason of the depth of the mine, or of the difficulty of ingress and egress, or of the nature of the mining operations, or of insufficient ventilation the personal safety or physical health of children in such mine is being, or is likely to be, impaired." At the same time the amended Bill raised the minimum age below which a child may not be employed in a mine from ten to twelve years. Where power was taken to prohibit or regulate the employment of women or children, ample opportunities were given in the amended Bill to mine-owners to prefer objections.

Even these prohibitory provisions, softened as they were in the Select Committee, raised a panic among the owners of mines, and the Government were driven to lower still further the scale of regulations, which they had first proposed to the Council as the bare minimum, by way of protection of mine workers. With the object of allaying the alarm felt by the proprietors of mines the Government decided to remit the Bill once again to a Select Committee, so remodelled as to render the work of emasculating the labour clauses of the Bill easy. From this second Select Committee, however, the Bill emerged with the labour provisions not emasculated, but entirely eliminat-

* First Annual Report of the Inspector of Mines in India for the year 1894, p. 67.

ed. All the clauses, which gave any manner of protection to the work-people, were consequently struck out of the Bill; and children were defined as persons under the age of twelve (instead of fourteen) years. Only the inspecting staff was invested with the power of prohibiting the employment of women and children if such employment was considered to be immediately dangerous to the life or safety of the persons employed. Also power was taken to frame rules in order to prohibit, restrict or regulate the employment of women and children where employment was attended by such danger to the life, safety or health of such women and children. But this was less even than an eye-wash, for no rules have yet been framed during the twentyone years which have elapsed since the passing of the Act.

The Government of India must have no doubt felt intensely humbled to have first announced their immutable determination to afford at least as much protection to the mine workers as was contained in their original proposals which were backed by the Government of Bengal, the province most concerned in the question, and then to have allowed the proposals to suffer a progressive retrogression at every subsequent stage, so that ultimately the whole of the modest measure of protection offered by them was scrapped and all the labour provisions cut out of the Bill. The Government went to the legislature in sackcloth and ashes, and, profuse in their expressions of repentance for their hardness in proposing measures in the interest of labour, implored the employers to accept the Bill shorn of all labour clauses and only embodying provisions calculated to secure safety in the working of mines. But the mineowners, seeing the Government ready to yield all along the line, abandoned their former position of accepting the safety clauses and contended that no regulations of any kind were needed in India. The Government then saw their mistake of giving in at every step to the proprietors of mines, and finding that the sacrifice of labour interests on their part had not succeeded in placating the employers, were forced to take up a stern attitude in order to have some kind of mining law, truncated as it was by the excision of labour provisions. Lord Curzon administered to them a severe reproof, and at last succeeded in enacting a law, but what kind of law? It will be well to quote the candid words of Mr. Smeaton, himself an employer. He said, with a view to persuading his brother-employers in accepting the measure: "The Bill now before the Council [after it had undergone retrograde changes in the Select Committee on two occasions] is in fact a totally new one. It is in effect a reversal of the old Bills in principle and in many of their substantive provisions."* Surely a reversal it was,

*The prohibition of employment or admission of children and women has been swept away altogether. The age limit has been reduced from fourteen to twelve years. The power to interfere in wages, hours of labour, and measurements of task have been brushed aside altogether. The Inspector is re-

for in introducing the Bill, the member in charge had said with much unction, that if labour provisions were eliminated from the Bill "defenceless classes must go without protection," which he would not allow, and this is precisely what he did in the end: he let "defenceless classes go without protection." It was indeed a most ignoble surrender.

LABOUR PROVISIONS OF MINING LAWS.

THE Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau is publishing a series of volumes on "The Mining Laws of the British Empire and of Foreign Countries." It has so far published three volumes: on Nigeria, West Africa and South Africa. We extract from them the labour provisions in force in these colonies, which will perhaps interest the reader in view of the proposed amendment of the Mining Act:—

NIGERIA.

No labourer may be required to work for more than 10 hours a day, and every labourer must be allowed to break off work for two hours during the day and also be allowed adequate time to obtain fuel and to prepare his food in the evening. (Master and Servant Regulations, 1917.)

No woman or girl, and no boy under the age of fourteen years, may be employed in any underground working. (Safe Mining Regulations, 1917.)

THE GOLD COAST AND ASHANTI.

The agreement which is entered into when engaging employees for work on mines provides for a maximum 10-hour day for six days a week.

Women may not be employed on night work in any industrial undertaking. (Employment of Women Ordinance, 1913.)

SOUTH AFRICA.

No person may employ underground on any mine a boy apparently under the age of sixteen years or any female. (Mines and Works Act, 1911.)

No person apparently under the age of sixteen years may work in or upon any mine longer than eight hours during any consecutive twenty-four hours, or longer than forty-eight hours during any consecutive seven days. (Mines and Works Act, 1911.)

The hours for underground labour of adults is eight hours for the day, or forty-eight hours for the week, such hours being exclusive of the hours occupied in going to or from the working place. (Mines and Works Act, 1911.)

OUTMANOEUVRED.

SINCE your last issue one has read press reports from various sources (mostly Anglo-Indian) about what went on behind the scenes at Simla, after the Assembly on that memorable Saturday had refused leave for the introduction of the Protection of Princes Bill. Colour is certainly lent to these reports by what can but appear as our gilded chamber's complete subservience to, and utter pliability in the hands of, Government; and knowing, as one does, the independence of at least some members of that Council, one can but conclude, from the stifling of even such voices, the consummate skill with which all were stampeded into a regular panic and as to the high pressure brought to

legated under the new Bill to what he really ought to be a ministerial officer—and his acts are absolutely subject to the control of the Committees... All powers now reside practically in two representative bodies, namely, the Committee and Mining Board—representative, i.e., of employers and unrepresentative of employees.

bear upon them in the white heat of the moment's excitement.

If correspondents' reports can be trusted, it would seem, that, no sooner had the Assembly refused leave to introduce the Bill, members of government, posing as the Assembly's friends, "more in sorrow than in anger," upbraided members of the Assembly for having made a regular mess of things and stultified themselves completely. Working on their feelings in this way and shedding crocodile tears about such public exhibition of parliamentary ignorance, the wirepullers—so one was told—had almost got the members of the Assembly ready to do any penance demanded, if only they were allowed the supreme boon of going back on their vote. It is of course impossible for an outsider to know the truth of the picture thus presented: if one is inclined to believe in the success of the manoeuvre in the case of quite a few members of the lower chamber, it is, because one has got the fact before one, that every jack member of the upper chamber (bar one) on that hectic Tuesday did behave as he did, and that none of them could have spoken and voted differently, if they had been under such a spell, as described to us by some of these correspondents.

If such are the lamentable facts, it was indeed providential that no ingenuity was able to discover a parliamentary method whereby the Assembly could demonstrate its eagerness for self-abasement. Saved against their will, saved they were anyhow; and however unedifying the unanimous surrender of the Council of State, the Assembly at least will not have to live down the fact of being on record as on occasions capable of losing their heads completely. Personally one is ready to believe that the majority of the Assembly's members were not quite as sheepish as these correspondents made them out to be: anyhow, second thoughts have soon become vocal and the return from the giddy heights of Simla (so dangerous to persons suffering from climbers' vertigo!) to the matter of fact plains of sober commonsense, has completed the change where change was needed.

And removed from the influence of official mesmerism, what are the actual facts? Leave is asked by the Home Member to bring in a Bill, the necessity for which nobody could have denied more trenchantly and cogently than Sir W. H. Vincent himself in the Press Act Committee's Report, signed by him (and by the law member, the Hon'ble T. B. Sapru, who was its Chairman) only one year ago. This Report, the considered and unanimous report of nine members of the legislature, including two of the most important ministers, had explicitly "considered the further question as to which, if any, of its provisions should be retained by incorporation in other laws"; particularly, "whether the dissemination of disaffection against Indian Princes through the Press of British India should be penalized in any way; and they had come to the conclusion, without a single dissident voice being raised, that "we do not

think that we should be justified in recommending any enactment in the Penal Code *or elsewhere* for the purpose of affording such protection." (Italics mine).

In the face of this considered verdict, a Bill is now to be presented to the very Assembly which had just repealed the Press Act of 1910 on the strength of this report—presented by the very members of Government whose contrary opinion was fresh in the memory of all members. Was ever legislature more entitled to refuse leave to introduce a bill, than the Assembly on this occasion? What tactical mistake was theirs? Everybody in India is fully aware of what lies behind such a "Protection of Princes Bill": what then more appropriate, than that the Assembly, truly representing in this the public opinion of the whole of India, should have sternly refused to have anything to do with it? The mistake was not theirs to refuse leave; the tactics of the Assembly were not faulty: what was the absence of all tactics and the very bankruptcy of methods, was for the Government to go back upon its own words and policy and to discover itself in 1922 "bound by agreements and in honour", when in 1921 it had told the Assembly that it had considered the alleged "obligation of the Government of India to protect Indian Princes from such attacks," but did not feel "justified in recommending any such protection in the Penal Code *or elsewhere*."

Not having any case at all to put before the Assembly; and then to make members believe that it is they who have given away their case, is surely a master stroke of *finesse*!

But if these tactics and this *finesse* were applied too late in the case of the Assembly, they unfortunately were applied only too successfully in the case of the Council of State. There official suggestions were so potent, that they sufficed to stifle every independent voice for amendments or even for a mere postponement. There were dark hints as to the dreadful thing that should happen, if the Bill was not consented to as it stood; was not consented to then and there. The deplorable spectacle of an Assembly which had already made an exhibition of itself was painted in vivid colours; the urgency that this chamber at least should retrieve the parliamentary dignity of the Indian Legislature was flatteringly expatiated upon. And so, seemingly, the Council of State sat stock-still, fascinated like the proverbial rabbit by its would-be devourer, the snake; hypnotized and as in a trance, the house withdrew all motions for amendment or postponement, and meekly and obediently, lest greater evil befall them, consented to the Bill as laid before them.

Yet what greater evil could have befallen them? What if the second chamber also had thrown out the Bill? Would the odium on the Governor-General's forcing the Act through been a greater or a lesser one? What if the Bill had been carried by a mere official majority, with the rest strenuously protesting: would that have made the

present task of the Governor-General before Parliament easier or more difficult?

Yet, as if under a magic spell, the Council of State became paralyzed in all its members and apparently failed to see the obvious and transparent fact, that must now be patent to every one of them: viz. that by suppressing every gesture even of dissent, as they had been asked to do, they provided the Government of India with the very case they had hitherto been lacking. For what will happen now when the Act lies on the table of the British Parliament?

To justify the passing of the Act with an Assembly dead against it and a Council of State only in its official majority for it, would clearly have been no easy matter; but now, the position is changed. The Secretary of State will patronizingly refer to the Assembly as having been in a hurry to get away for the holidays and as having in a fit of temper or parliamentary ignorance refused to listen even to the reasons for bringing in this bill—reasons so cogent, that they were able to convince the whole Council of State, who had had the sense not to refuse leave to hear them. Never surely therefore was there clearer necessity laid on the Governor-General for exercising his right of "certifying" the Bill under Sec. 26 of the Reform Act than in this case, when admittedly the reasons for the Act were so overwhelming that nobody could vote against the Act, unless he were deaf—or else had refused to hear these reasons. And so on and so on—

Holding all the trumps and then to throw them all away!

Outmanoeuvred!

OUTSIDER.

A LETTER FROM LONDON.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

LONDON, SEPTEMBER 14, 1922.

INDIA AND BRITISH TEXTILE LABOUR.

THERE was held recently at Blackpool a conference of the United Textile Workers' Association. Among the numerous matters under discussion was a long report presented on the relations of India and this country, particularly in connection with the Indian import duties. It pointed out that the Secretary of State for India had explained to the Indian Legislative Council that as India now had Home Rule she had full control of her own fiscal arrangements. It may be said incidentally that it is extremely improbable that Mr. Montagu, who is obviously referred to, ever made any such explanation as that attributed to him. It had, however, been represented to the Council of the Association by certain Labour M. P.'s that political and religious agitation had aroused a state of feeling in India that was most inimical to Lancashire trade, that Lancashire goods had been burned in public places, and that if Lancashire was to regain its trade with India this feeling of hostility must be turned into one of friendship. The statement continued:—"We recommend that a public declaration be made on behalf of the textile workers of Lancashire that not only are we in favour of the encouragement and development of self-government in India, but are also in favour of

peace with Turkey which will give to the latter country self-control in her own territories, provided that she gives a guarantee that the rights of minorities will be safeguarded. By these means, and these alone, we believe that India can be pacified and the Indian people made friendly towards us. We desire to draw the attention of the Council Legislative (?) to the fact that not only India but the whole of the middle East is at present unfriendly, and that the consequences of our foreign policy, if it be pursued in the future on the lines of the past, will inevitably lead to a catastrophe for the Lancashire textile workers which is terrible to contemplate."

Mr. Tom Shaw, P. M., moved a resolution urging the Government to make friendly representations to the Indian Legislature with the view of obtaining favourable reconsideration of the duties imposed on Lancashire cotton goods imported into India, "believing that taxation is prejudicial to the interests of the consumers." There was nothing, he said, to prevent it being presented to the Government of India that this tax was not only unfair to Lancashire but that it did not benefit the Indian worker, though it helped to put more money into the pockets of Indian mill-owners, who were already making tremendous profits. Mr. Joseph Cross, the general secretary, declared that the whole position in India had changed since the cotton workers of Lancashire approached Lord Morley to get an improvement in the Factory Acts of India. The result of their efforts, he claimed, had been beneficial to the Indian cotton operatives. To-day he considered that it would be advantageous to the cotton workers in both countries if an effort were made to create a friendly understanding between them. It might even be desirable to send a commission to Bombay and other cotton centres in India with that object in view, and in the meantime to send a deputation, representative of every cotton district in Lancashire and the adjacent counties, to the India Office and the Government. The resolution was carried unanimously.

There is no doubt that Lancashire is greatly alarmed at the falling off of trade with India. But the textile operatives here would be less subject to suspicion if they had protested, in the interests of the Indian consumer, against the taxation imposed in favour of Lancashire by the Indian cotton excise duties before Mr. Chamberlain, during the war, imposed a countervailing duty on imported cotton goods for revenue purposes. There is another point that does not seem quite clear to the Lancashire textile workers. They have no more right to make even friendly representations to the Government and people of India than, for instance, to the Government and people of Canada, in the interests of the consumer. It is not known that the idea of making such representations in the case of any self-governing Dominion has occurred to them or that it has been acted upon, for obvious reasons. It is not without significance that such representations should be made in the case of a competitor still, to some extent, under the tutelage of the Home Government. Moreover, it is certain that, in course of time, and without the adventitious aid that Lancashire has had through the excise duties, the Indian mills are likely to progress and the Indian cotton industry, for owners and operatives alike, to prosper. Lancashire is bound to feel the consequence of this, and it will have nothing whatever to do with either political or religious impulses or even economic hostility.

All connected with the Lancashire cotton industry must be made to understand, once and for all, that they cannot be allowed to interfere any longer with the natural development of India's main industry, after agriculture. Their present attitude is a remnant of the not yet defunct view that the tropical colonies and dependencies are plantations to be exploited in the interests of the British capitalists and workers. It is exactly this message that the special correspondent of the "Manchester Guardian" has recently been at pains to deliver to the British people, and why he regards the key to the situation in India, and for that matter, in all those parts of the Empire which, like Ceylon, are seeking for fuller freedom of expression—lies in this country.

LORD MESTON ON IMPERIAL CITIZENSHIP

Lord Meston has usefully improved the occasion of the sessions of the British Association by delivering an instructive address to the members of the Educational Section on "Imperial Citizenship". He made a powerful appeal to the British public to feel its responsibility in regard to India, the people of which, he said, must be induced to feel that we were committed to assist in the advancement of India towards a real and not a merely ceremonial partnership in the Imperial federation. He dealt with Imperial citizenship as an ideal and an emotion, and also as a status. Imperial citizenship as a universal status within the Empire did not exist. It was limited, both geographically and ethnically, owing to the concrete fact that certain white communities in the Empire refusing to permit members of other or non-white communities to live alongside them on terms of civic equality. Unless we could find some means for handling the demand for a common standard, the result would be increasing embarrassment in our task of Imperial unity. There would certainly be a growing lack of spontaneity on the part of the claimants in their response to future Imperial calls upon them. The qualifications for full Imperial citizenship were, he said:—

(1) the attainment of a similar type of constitution; (2) submission to a uniform system of administration; (3) the acceptance of a common code of jurisprudence. He made no excuse for taking India as the type of those higher races to which the status of Imperial citizenship was a question of practical politics and immediate interest. It was the stratum of our Imperial section of the world which was nearest our own in its civilization, traditions, and philosophy, and India's commanding position in our commerce and foreign policy raised the question of her status into the first rank of importance. The issue had, he stated, only recently become acute. After referring to the history of the Indian Labour emigration and its consequences, Lord Meston declared that the belief was general in India that helotry and not citizenship was the status designed for Indians in several of the British territories. As a result of India's part in the war, the whole question rose to another level. It was asked why India should not participate in the new world of freedom, justice, and emancipation for the weaker nations, which we were fighting to establish. British statesmen had answered these demands by certain formal acts and declarations of recognition of India as a partner in the Imperial federation, but when Indian politicians came to translate those ceremonial courtesies into the terms of practical citizenship, they found themselves face to face with a different interpretation of India's status in certain of the Dominions and colonies. The test case was that of Kenya. He was of opinion that if Mr.

Gandhi's movement should ever prevail, the work of Britain in India would be largely undone and India's Imperial value greatly impaired. Against such a calamity there were several kinds of insurance, but the extension of Imperial citizenship was certainly one of them and not the least promising. It was more than a step in social progress. It was a paramount political necessity. At this crisis of its fate, India needed guidance and inspiration. While valid objections to the indiscriminate extension of the privileges of citizenship to Indians might exist, how were we to satisfy India that we were not actuated by selfish prejudice or racial hauteur? It is curious to note, from the summaries reported, that Lord Meston does not appear to have alluded to Mr. Sastri's present mission to Australia, New Zealand and Canada, nor does he seem to have included the Die-hards in the category of those who would deny to Indians, whether within or outside India, equality of civic status. He did, however, make a practical suggestion or two. He thought that in those parts of the Empire where the question of Indian emigration or settlement was controversial, there should at once be a perfectly frank discussion of the issues between India and the Dominion or Colony concerned, and if necessary an impartial inquiry by some such tribunal as a Royal Commission. Anything would be better, he remarked, than the present long-distance bombardments between the India and Colonial Offices, with the uneasy feeling that the British Cabinet could stop the action if it wished. It may be remarked here that, so long as the Colonial Office itself does not implement its obligations under the resolution of last year's Imperial Conference, its bona fides will continue to be suspect not only in India, but in those territories which are under its immediate jurisdiction. It is interesting to learn that, in the resumed negotiations between the two departments on the Kenya question, Lords Peel and Winterton have been actively advancing the Indian point of view.

MR. SASTRI IN CANADA.

Meanwhile, better news come from Canada about the progress of the negotiations between Mr. Sastri, on behalf of the Government of India and the Canadian Cabinet. It was recently reported not only that the British Columbia Government had refused to give ear to Mr. Sastri's representations, but that the Dominion Government, under Mr. Mackenzie King, had returned a somewhat tepid answer. Mr. King, in view of these reports, has written a letter to Mr. Sastri, which he has had published, and in which he gives the assurance that at the earliest favourable moment the Government will be pleased to invite the consideration of Parliament to Mr. Sastri's request that Indians resident in Canada shall be granted the Dominion Parliamentary franchise on terms and conditions identical with those which govern the exercise of that right by Canadian citizens generally. The subject, adds the Canadian Premier, is necessarily one which Parliament alone can determine. It will be submitted to Parliament for consideration when the Franchise Law is under revision. In conveying to the Government of India an expression of the attitude of the Canadian Government in this matter, Mr. Sastri is requested to make it clear that at the present time in eight out of the nine provinces of the Dominion, the federal franchise is already granted to resident Indians on terms identical with those applicable generally to Canadian citizens. The explanation of this letter seems to be that in eight out of the nine Canadian Provinces Indians duly qualified are granted the Provincial and the Dominion,

franchise on equal terms with other Canadian citizens. In British Columbia alone neither franchise is granted to them and the Provincial Government has refused to undertake any alteration in the law in response to Mr. Sastri's request. Under the Dominion constitution, the Dominion Parliament will not interfere in the matter of the Provincial franchise of British Columbia, which is deemed to be a matter of local interest, but it may and will be requested by the Dominion Government to amend the law to enable Indians in British Columbia to exercise the Dominion franchise for the Canadian Parliament.

MISCELLANEA.

MR. SASTRI'S SPEECH IN FIJI.

THE following are extracts of Mr. Sastri's speech at Suva, delivered on the 29th of July last, when a civic reception, attended by the Governor, was held in his honour by the Mayor of Suva. We are indebted to Mr. C. F. Andrews for a report which appeared in the *Pacific Age* :—

There is no time for me to wrap what I have to say in euphemisms or pleasing phrases. I shall only speak just as, I think, I have ventured to do elsewhere. The Mayor was, a minute ago, pleased to describe me as a good citizen of the Empire. I believe I can claim that honour. (Applause.) I have a great faith in the Empire and its mission. I have, at the same time, an idea of its purpose, which perhaps some who call themselves Imperialists do not entertain. I think of the Empire, not so much as to its past, but as to its future, for there are many things of deep import—some of our most radical ideas, some that have concerns with the very roots of life—which have been entirely changed since the war as, in a flash, the danger to the British Empire has been made clear to people, and, as in a flash, its strength in trial has been displayed; and I am proud to think that, when the need did come in all its insistence, the people of India forgot their little grievances and stood by the side of the white population for maintaining, not merely the material glory of the Empire, but for sustaining its moral and spiritual basis. (Applause.) Now that the trial has passed away, and the Empire has come out stronger within itself than ever before, it rests with us citizens of the future, no less than of the past, to see that all that might make for weakness in the Empire is eliminated; that everything that may tend to keep people from people within the Empire, should, if possible, be set aside mercilessly; and that the Empire should stand a guarantee for ever of peace and goodwill amongst the people of the world and of civilisation. (Applause.) When we keep in view this very great end, the paramount need of maintaining the Empire on its moral basis, all petty considerations, such as we have hitherto hugged to our bosom, must give way, sectarian interests, however long standing, ought to have no consideration. Community should welcome community for the British Empire so stands by public declarations which cannot be neglected; the British Empire now stands for the union of races, for the coming together of different civilisations, for complete brotherhood, so far as it is possible to establish it between the East and the West, between the coloured and the colourless populations of the Empire. (Applause.) That is why, during the war and after the war, statesmen of the Empire have met in anxious consultation. India, now recognised to be an equal partner in this mighty political organisation.....

"As I told you before, we are strong enough, I think, and most of us are brave enough, to talk candidly to one another. There is no use in consulting one another's susceptibilities in matters where the truest interests of the Empire are concerned, and I will therefore speak out what is not only in my mind, but also in the minds of the Government of India, whose commission I am proud to bear, for the time being. Now, the Government of India are faced with political difficulties in India, of which I could wish that their compatriots in the Dominions had a clearer idea and a more vivid perception

than they seem to have shown so far. The difficulties in that part of the British Empire are of a tremendous order. Indians have settled in various parts of the Empire, in self-governing Dominions, in Crown Colonies, in Protectorates of one kind or another; in every one of those places outside India, it is true to say, alas, that the Indian is not yet treated as an equal subject of his Majesty. There are many disabilities, many subtractions from his citizenship, and, in some places, which I will not name, there are even humiliations and indignities heaped upon him. As I said before, in India these things are now, more than ever, watched with meticulous care. Indians have one characteristic in common with other peoples, in that they have a certain amount of pride. To be told, sometimes in so many words, sometimes indirectly, that they are but an inferior component of the Britannic Commonwealth, does not improve their temper. They are not soothed by any means when you tell them, as you did, "You are a people whom we do not propose yet to admit to complete equality, you are a people of a subordinate status, of a different civilisation; we cannot assimilate it." I am not here to say that "equality" and "brotherhood" are ideas so simple and easy that you have only got to announce them, that you have only got to put them down on paper in documents, and they will be realised. People's minds have to be changed, and inner conversion to real Christianity, has to take place amongst those who have hitherto held the power, held the privilege, held the first place, to the exclusion of others. It is not the work of a day, it takes some time, it will take some education; but I am one of those who believe that the current now sets in the right direction; I am one of those who believe that, even in the most unpromising places of the British Empire, since the war, there is a recognition that there is a higher law of the Empire, a deeper significance in the Empire's mission, a higher and nobler purpose which the Empire has still to fulfil, and of which every Britisher has to be the vehicle in spirit, as well as in words. I am, therefore, full of hopes that, when the wishes of the Government of India in this matter be identical with the wishes of the people of India, and when the wishes of the Government and of the people of India are known, I am happy to think they will not be set aside any more with light hearts.

In Australia and New Zealand, I found a sympathetic reception of this message. My message was this: "That there must be, as early as possible, a fulfilment of the resolution that the 1921 Conference of Empire statesmen passed." Now that policy is the removal of disabilities existing on Indians lawfully settled and the admission of them to the full rights of British citizenship, the same as other classes of his Majesty's loyal subjects. It is that that I went to plead in Australia and New Zealand; it is that that I will plead, in the course of a few weeks, in Canada; and I will tell you just this thing, that, when I placed the case before the people of Australia and New Zealand, while the Government were, naturally, not able to commit themselves and give me definite promises, I found everywhere amongst the various classes complete approbation of my sentiments, the profoundest sympathy with the views of the Government of India, and the most encouraging recognition of the claims that I put forward on behalf of Indians.

I know only too well that there are parts of the Empire which have hitherto been run on a basis of inequality. There the problem, therefore, is a little more difficult than elsewhere and I am perfectly willing to recognise, for my part, that this work of breaking barriers between communities is not an easy work; but all I ask is that everywhere to-day there must be a heartfelt admission of the end in view; everywhere to-day there must be a readiness to adjust arrangements so that the march towards that goal should begin immediately and proceed ceaselessly until the end is attained. When I say "must," I mean that that is the requirement of the Empire, for what are the words used by the conference to which I have just referred? The words are; "in the interests of the solidarity of the British Empire." No words from me are required to put a gloss on that expression—"in the interests of the solidarity of the Britannic Commonwealth." It means that it is felt by

people all over that the continuance of this status of inequality of this basis of privilege on one side and obligations only on the other, if continued, would mean danger to the Empire, would mean the beginning of an unhappy state of things which no people whatever ought to see for one moment. As I told you before I know human nature is the same in India as in England, and everywhere, I know it is very difficult to part from rights and privileges, and immunities and special advantages; but if it is necessary to do so in the interests of the Empire, I think that one is entitled to ask that even that sacrifice must be cheerfully borne for the sake of one great political organisation, which alone can guarantee peace for humanity in the future, which alone can guarantee the genuine acquisition of those ideals, for the great teachers of humanity have always stood for those ideals of equality and brotherhood which, within the British Empire, are often secularly described as one law, the same opportunities for all, the fullest scope within the Empire and under the Union Jack for every man and every woman to develop himself or herself, according to the endowments with which God has pleased to start them in life. If all are equal in religion, all are equal in a certain sense within the Empire. Not to recognise it is to run counter to the requirements and teaching of all religions, and likewise also to forget the higher purpose of the British Empire.

Too many of us are apt to give a theoretical recognition to these ideals, to say "Yes, but let it be twenty years hence, when I am dead and buried; let everything start with another generation, let the present generation go on as it does"; but that is where the difficulty of India, the special message that I am commissioned to bear, comes in. I am to exhort you, on the one side and on the other, to exercise patience and mutual sympathy, and to put the best that is in you into this work of complete understanding amongst the component parts of the British Empire, and to do it as soon as possible. As I said, the full achievement may take time, but there is no excuse for causing any delay, for merely putting off things for another generation, for I know this, as a student of Indian history that ever since Her Majesty Queen Victoria took over the administration of India, Indians have been accustomed to hear and read the finest sentiments. School boys of three generations ago in India were told that the Union Jack, wherever it flew meant continued progress towards British ideals of equality and justice and brotherhood. Subsequently time after time, royalty, and authority derived from royalty, has proclaimed and repeated these pledges to us; they have been very slow in fulfilment. Sometimes it seemed to us painfully slow, sometimes, alas, it seemed to us that there were statesmen who even went so far as to say that these ideals are only for ornamental decoration in public despatches and that they are not meant for actual fulfilment in private life, in daily administration, in the conduct of the various Governments. That, however, is no longer the case; it is now admitted everywhere that these are the true ideals, and of all the things that have continually extorted my admiration amongst my own people this has extorted the most admiration, the patience that Indians have shown during these many decades while these ideals were only slowly fulfilling, the hope that they have not allowed to die within their breasts that one day these ideals are going to be actual ties, and not merely copy-book maxims. That will stand always in the judgment of any historian, however prejudiced, that will stand always to the credit of the Indian people.

Even now, during the progress of the great non-co-operation movement, which threatened far more perhaps than ever you suspected, even now when the Indian National Congress the other day threw over their words "within the British Empire," who was it that kept India still on the right side? You would be astonished to hear that it was Mr. Gandhi. While a great part of his following insisted on the adoption of violent methods, they likewise insisted that the creed of the greatest political organisation in India should be so altered as to permit their taking India out of the British Empire into the wilderness of politics, into the region of chaos and anarchy, for they said, "we prefer that we shall be allowed the freedom to ruin ourselves, we prefer that to an existence on a sub-

ordinate footing within the British Empire." It was Mr. Gandhi, from whose politics I differ very much, who used his personal influence and advised his followers not to be so rash, for he said "whatever you say of the British Empire, I know one thing." (speaking as though I were Mr. Gandhi, for a minute) "I am against all government in the universe; I do not like one person to control another and to have governmental power over him; nevertheless, I live under the British Government, because I believe that, of all human governments the British Empire governs the least." That means that, within the British Empire, the individual citizen enjoys more real freedom of movement and action than the individual citizen enjoys anywhere, even under Governments which are said to be more democratic. It is a great asset that British statesmen have to-day; it is a great asset, this belief in the ideals of the Empire, which dominates the minds of the people who have great grievances in India, and who feel that, in the seeking of the redress of these grievances they may take a drastic step; even they, however, are willing to learn that the best interests of India lie within the British Empire; that the glory of the British Constitution is that by peaceful and constitutional means exclusively it is possible for a people, to rise from the status of a mere dependency to the level of a self-governing dominion. Do not, by anything that you do in any part of the Empire, shake that confidence, or undermine it. I pray you ladies and gentlemen, on whom rests the future policy of the Empire, remember that each one of you has to be the vehicle of the higher spirit, of the nobler mission of the Empire, and not any longer to wish the continuance of the lower ideals of the more material order.

Now a word to my Indian fellow subjects exclusively. May I tell them that there is an inexorable condition which must be fulfilled before this mighty work of changing the basis of Empire from one of domination to one of equality can be fulfilled; it is a great and mighty work, to which statesmen have to address themselves, and they cannot do it, they cannot march steadily from step to step, unless they are assured of our complete loyalty to the Empire and its ideals. If, as often as power is transferred in India to the representatives of the people, they use it so as to convince statesmen that the extra power, the additional status, the improved position and privilege will all be used only for the good of India within the Empire, then their work will be continuous, their work will be a pleasure, and in no long time our efforts will be crowned with success. I will therefore ask them to exercise the patience, the good faith in British ideals, which they have shown so far, for all things under Providence come to those that wait, that believe, and that allow Providence to work its ends in its own ways, and in its own goodness of time. Do not listen to those who come and advise you, now and then, to try your own hand at reconstruction, to pull down, destroy create chaos, in the hope that out of chaos somebody else will come and build you up a cosmos: it never will be done. Within the British Constitution it is possible to change all things slowly and gradually, without adopting revolutionary methods. That is the glory of the British Constitution above all other Constitutions. While great improvements are possible in other political organisations only through revolution, through violence, through disruption, by the British Constitution it is possible to be affected by change of opinion, by continual political education, by mutual consultation, by compromise, or by the exercise of mutual forbearance and mutual goodwill.

WILSON PHILOLOGICAL LECTURES 1918

MARATHI

Its Sources and Development

BY

HARI NARAYAN APTE

Demi 8 vo. pp. 100

Cloth Bound—Rs. 2. Paper Cover Rs.—1-8.

Postage Extra.

Can be had of:—

The 'Aryabhusan Press,' Poona City.

BOOKS OF THE DAY
ON

Indian Politics.

	Rs.	As.
1. ALLAHABAD AND NAGPUR CONGRESS CONFERENCES AND CONVENTIONS. A Collection of Presidential Addresses.	0	12
2. AMRITSAR AND OUR DUTY TO INDIA. By B. G. Horniman	4	8
do Cloth
do Boards	2	10
3. BRITISH ADMINISTRATION IN INDIA. By G. Anderson	1	12
4. BUREAUCRATIC GOVERNMENT. A Study in Indian Polity. By Bernard Houghton	1	8
5. THE CALL TO YOUNG INDIA. By Lajpat Rai	3	0
6. CONGRESS, CONFERENCES AND CONVENTIONS OF 1909	0	12
7. CONGRESS LEAGUE SCHEME: An Exposition By V. S. Srinivasa Sastri	0	6
8. THE DAWN OVER ASIA. By Paul Richard (Translated by Aurobinda Ghose)	1	8
9. ELEMENTS OF INDIAN TAXATION. By A. Alston	1	8
10. ESSAYS IN NATIONAL IDEALISM. By A. K. Coomaraswamy	1	0
11. ETHICS OF PASSIVE RESISTANCE. By M. S. Maurice	0	4
12. EVOLUTION OF INDIAN POLITY. By R. Shama Shastri	4	0
13. FRIEND OF INDIA. Speeches and Writings of B. G. Horniman	2	0
14. THE FUNDAMENTAL UNITY OF INDIA (From Hindu Sources). By Radhakumud Mukerji.	2	8
15. THE FUTURE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA. By E. Barker.	1	6

Theosophical Publishing House,

Adyar Madras.
AND
INDIAN BOOK SHOP
55 Medows Street. Fort, BOMBAY.

Hon'ble Prof. V. G. Kale's Works.

	Rs.	a.p.
Indian Economics— (4th edition). Featherweight paper Demi. 8 vo. pp. 700. Cloth Bound. Revised & enlarged.	8	0-0
Gokhale and Economic Reforms— Crown 16 mo. pp. 250. Cloth Bound.	2	0-0
Indian Administration— (4th edition). With additional chapters on the Reforms Act. Demi. 8 vo. pp. 528. Cloth Bound.	3	0-0
The Reforms Explained— Demi. 8 vo. pp. 100.	1	0-0
Indian Industrial and Economic Problems— (2nd edition). Crown 16 mo. pp. 340.	1	8-0
India's War Finance and Post-War Problems— Crown 16 mo. pp. 164. Cloth Bound.	2	0-0
Currency Reform in India— Crown 16 mo. pp. 120.	1	0-0
Dawn of Modern Finance in India— Crown 16 mo. pp. 154.	2	0-0

These books can be had of:—

1. The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.

Books of the Day.

Writings & Speeches:	5-0-0
Of the late Hon. R. B. Ganesh Venkatesh Joshi, B. A. Demi. 8vo. pp. 1300. Cloth Bound.	
Aryabhushan School Dictionary:	3-0-0
(Marathi-English) By S. G. Vaze Esqr., B. A. Demi, 8vo, pp. 600. Cloth Bound.	
Writings & Speeches:	2-8-0
Of Dr. Sir Narayan Ganesh Chandawarkar. Demi. 8vo. pp. 660. Cloth Bound.	
A Gist of late Mr. Tilak's Gitarahasya:	0-8-0
By Prof. Vaman Malhar Joshi, M. A. (2nd Edition) Foolscap 16 mo. pp. 80.	
Native States and Post-War Reforms:	1-0-0
By G. R. Abhyankar Esq., B. A., LL. B. Pleader, Sangli. Demi. 8vo. pp. 110.	
Life of late Mr. G. K. Gokhale:	0-4-0
By Hon. Dr. R. P. Paranjpye M. A. (Cantab), B. sc. (Bom.) with nine fine illustrations and facsimile of Gokhale's handwriting. Crown 16 mo. pp. 88.	
Life of Prof. D. K. Karve:	0-4-0
By the Hon. Dr. R. P. Paranjpye M. A. (Cantab), B. sc. (Bom.) with six fine illustrations. Crown 16 mo. pp. 73.	

These books can be had of:—

1 THE ARYABHUSHAN PRESS, POONA CITY.

THE Servants of India Society PAMPHLETS.

1. Self-Government for India under the British Flag— by the Rt. Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President, Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 91.	0-8-0
2. The Public Services in India— by Mr. Hirday Nath Kunzru, Senior Member Upper India Branch, Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 175.	0-10-0
3. The Congress-League Scheme: An exposition— by the Rt. Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President, Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 66.	0-6-0
4. The Co-operative Movement— 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.	1-0-0
5. The Medical Services in India— by an I. M. S. Officer. Crown 16 mo. pp. 53.	0-8-0
6. Trade Union Legislation— by A Labour Advocate. Crown 16 mo. pp. 32.	0-4-0
7. The Conscience Clause for Indians in Indian Education Codes (With a reply to certain Criticisms)— by The Rt. Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, President, Servants of India Society. Crown 16 mo. pp. 67.	0-8-0
8. Hindu Law in the New Era— by K. K. Gokhale Esq., Sub-Judge, Jath State Crown mo. pp. 80	0-10-0

These books can be had of:—

1 The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.

2 The Bombay Vaibhav Press, Bombay, No. 4.

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 CASSI 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.....