

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. V, No. 48.]

POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1922.

{ INLAND SUBS. RS. 6.
{ FOREIGN SUBS. s. 10.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	565
ARTICLES :—	
The Shame of Assam.—III ...	567
The Fiscal Commission's Report. By R. M. J. ...	568
A LETTER FROM LONDON ...	570
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Indians in New Zealand. By B. J. Bettany ...	571
BOOKS RECEIVED ...	572
SUPPLEMENT containing Mr. Srinivasa Sastri's Speech as President of the National Liberal Federation	

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

A GOOD one-fourth of the speech of Mr. C. R. Das, President of the Gaya Congress, was devoted to showing that Government was not justified in adopting the policy of repression they did towards the close of last year and in the early part of this year. In it he traces the growth in England of the subject's (one had rather said, "citizen's") right of resistance to the State from the time when kings claimed unlimited and unconditional passive obedience to them. Mr. Das might well have spared his audience these researches into the hoary past and might have presumed this much elementary knowledge of history on their part. It would appear that these historical bits were meant for the especial behoof of the Moderates, who had lent countenance to repression. To none could they be more superfluous than to the Moderates; for in the first place they have never been behindhand in vehemently condemning excesses on the part of the officials, and in the next place, even those amongst them who went farthest in supporting Government in the maintenance of law and order never questioned the citizen's right to resist, and in the last resort, even to rebel. The fullest acknowledgment of this right in the speeches of for instance Mrs. Besant can not have been forgotten by the public. But was the record of non-co-operators during those stressful days absolutely clean, so that in every case of the exercise of force the charge of an unprovoked attack on popular liberties could be brought home to the officials? On the other hand, was not intimidation exercised freely, was not oppression practised on a large scale, e. g. in Calcutta on the eve of the Prince's visit? For evidence one need only cite Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal

as witness, who has given a circumstantial account of the N.-C.-O.s' misdeeds at the time. If coercion was used, did the activities of non-co-operators supply no justification whatever for some of the repressive acts? Does England's history teach us the lesson that everyone must be given the freedom even to tyrannise over others, if he were so minded? The lesson we have imbibed from English political institutions is a little different. It is, in the words of an authority on political philosophy :

"The moral coercion exercised both by individuals and by associations, so far as it is effected by acts legitimate apart from their coercive intent, should not generally be made a legal offence, if the mischief it causes can be kept within tolerable limits by any other means : though any intimidation by committing or threatening acts of physical violence or other violation of ordinary rights—including breaches of contract—should of course be repressed with as much severity as may be required."

* * *

FOR the rest Mr. Das's speech is a plea for the formulation of a scheme of Swaraj on lines which are none too clear and for the withdrawal of the ban on Councils. In regard to Swaraj, he is "firmly convinced that a parliamentary government is not a government by the people and for the people". He believes that it will only establish a middle class rule. But it is not only in reference to the probable effects of this system of government in the present state of the limited suffrage in India that Mr. Das objects to parliamentary government; he objects to it *per se*. What is the alternative? Mr. Das has tried to elucidate this vital point by quoting at length from an unnamed authoress, but it is altogether beyond our depths. The development of popular government, he seems to say, should begin from bottom upwards, and if there were a choice between local autonomy and provincial or national autonomy he would unhesitatingly prefer the first. Now in local autonomy we have progressed far and if we have not yet obtained a full measure of it, we have at least secured the means of getting it. Is this "the foundation of Swaraj" contemplated by him, which non-co-operators are to require of Government before they start on a campaign of wholesale opposition? It is a mysterious expression which Mr. Das has often employed before, and which he has repeated more than once in this speech. He does not want full Swaraj immediately; provided a real beginning is made in it now, he does not mind if twenty years should be required to have Swaraj in its full-blown form. For what are twenty years in a nation's life? Since this matter is of the utmost practical impor-

"Foundation of Swaraj" again.

tance, Mr. Das might have given to the Congress a glimpse of what he regards as a beginning in self-government instead of treating them to long rigmaroles in English history with which every school-boy is fully conversant. We do not expect that the Congress will respond to his invitation to throw into definite form his own hazy notions of Swaraj, and much less that it will express its approval of them.

Parliamentary Obstruction.

MR. DAS'S views on the question of Council entry are well-known. He reiterates them in this speech. But here also some ambiguity remains. If "we have the majority" in the Councils, Mr. Das says, after the formality of delivering an ultimatum is duly gone through, "we must non-co-operate with the bureaucracy by opposing each and every work of the Council. We must disallow the entire budget. We must move the adjournment of the House on every possible occasion, and defeat every bill that may be introduced. In fact we must so proceed that the Council will refuse to do any work unless and until our demands are satisfied." This is clear enough, but what if non-co-operators are not in a majority? Is it open to them in those circumstances to resort to constitutional co-operation? It may have been due to an oversight, but anyhow, it is a very serious omission. As to this method of parliamentary obstruction, we may ask if it has succeeded in any country in winning Swaraj. Mr. Das proves the futility of violence—here a surprise awaits Maharashtra Nationalists—by showing that it has not succeeded at any time in any country. In point of fact Mr. Das here attempts to prove too much, but is there an instance in history of obstructionist tactics securing political freedom? In Ireland they merely succeeded in drawing the pointed attention of English statesmen and the English public to Irish grievances, but Ireland had to wait long before self-government arrived. Nor was Irish obstruction of the rigid type which Mr. Das has in mind and to which he wishes the non-co-operators to pledge themselves. It must be mentioned that, like Pandit Nehru, Mr. Das makes entry into the Councils conditional upon the Mahomedan clerics sanctioning this course for Mahomedans. If these forbid Council entry, "the Congress should unhesitatingly accept their decision" for all communities for the sake of preserving Hindu-Moslem unity. In regard to other items of non-co-operation, Mr. Das is desirous of stiffening them. The conditions laid down by the Congress before launching on civil disobedience he would abolish; he would continue to bring out pupils from Government schools as before; in these respects he dissents from the Congress authorities and the Civil Disobedience Committee. But the dispensations proposed to be granted by the latter body to the lawyer class he accepts without demur!

IN his very first speech in the new Parliament on November 28th, the Secretary of State, Lord Peel, rebuked the Government of India for drafting the O'Donnell circular so as to suggest that even an immediate and complete cessation of European recruitment of the I.C.S. is not an alternative which Government will sternly refuse to entertain in any circumstances. The circular itself contains no declaration of policy; it is merely intended to obtain information. Even so, why should it contain a paragraph seriously discussing the prospects of the elimination of English recruits? The Government sent round this circular on their own,

without consulting the India Office. Lord Peel only saw it when it was published without authority in Anglo-Indian papers. But after he came to know of it, he did not let the grass grow under his feet. Evidently he wrote to the Government of India—it must be a pretty stinging letter—calling upon them to explain how such a preposterous proposal originated from them. And the Government of India then "explained" to him that "they had reason to believe that a feeling in favour of the stoppage of European recruitment was prevalent among members of the services themselves. Those feelings, according to their information, had existed for a considerable time prior to the issue of their circular letter, and had been brought to the notice of the Viceroy within a few weeks of his assumption of office. The Government of India regarded it as essential that the extent to which this view obtained among the services and the grounds underlying it, should be ascertained and considered, and it was this that prompted their reference to it in the circular." Any one would regard this "explanation" as perfectly satisfactory, but not so Viscount Peel. He still reprimands the Government of India for the unfortunate wording of the letter—it "might have been put in a somewhat different form."

LORD Sydenham concludes from this reference that "the Government of India favour the course of complete cessation. Well, if they do so and the legislature concurs in the policy (for there is no reason to assume the contrary), clearly the Secretary of State has no right to interfere, as the Joint Select Committee has laid down, and His Lordship in that case has no leg to stand upon. We are prepared to concede that the Government of India have as yet expressed no opinion on the matter. But it is clear that the present Secretary of State does not intend to limit his power of interference as the Joint Committee enjoined. He was apparently chafing at the fact that the O'Donnell circular was not first "submitted" to him. Though he admitted in the House of Lords that "there was not any obligation upon them (the Government of India) to submit to the Secretary of State over here a circular letter trying to get information from the Local Governments," he repaired the mistake by prohibiting by a general order the reference of the question of possible retrenchment in the cost of the I. C. S. and other Imperial officers to any Committee. The Secretary of State has already the sole power of recruiting for the all-India services. But is it a sin for others even to inquire into and advise on the question? If any still doubt that a reactionary spirit reigns supreme at Whitehall, this one fact will be enough to remove their doubts. What is even more disquieting is that the Government of India also seem to be gradually sharing the alarm of the Secretary of State. To the European Association of Calcutta the Viceroy the other day expressed his personal conviction as to "the need for recruitment of the young entrant at home into the Civil Service." Now, while the question of the total stoppage of European recruitment is still being examined by the Government of India, is it right that the head of the Government should pronounce against it and thus practically close the question to further consideration? We do not think that Lord Reading would have delivered himself of this opinion if the Diehards in England were not constantly battering him; but it also shows that he is yielding to the pressure.

THE SHAME OF ASSAM.

III.

SUCH are the conditions on the tea gardens of Assam, such is the attitude of Government towards them. And as we behold the whole shameful picture, there stands out clearly the one fact as the root cause of all the evils—the servitude of the labourer. Remove that, and with one stroke you will have made possible the removal of every single other evil mentioned as well.

The Committee themselves are of that opinion, though they do not recognize that the mere abolition of the penal clauses (the 1859 Act) without the abolition of agreements in writing will effect nothing drastic. But even from their point of view they "suppose that the abolition of the Act will have an effect on the wages, in that it will be more difficult under a free labour system to retain discontented labourers on estates where the attractions offered are insufficient, or conditions otherwise unfavourable" (p. 87). One practical planter whose service on the Committee had opened his eyes to the iniquity of the system, believes "that if agreements are abolished managers would be obliged to take more interest in the welfare of their labour force" (p. 91). As to the way this works with a free labour force, we would quote from some evidence before the 1906 Committee (Proceedings, p. 129), given by the manager of a garden in the Duars:

"I have 1600 acres under tea," said this gentleman "with a labour force of about 1900 working coolies. This gives me a daily average of between 1300 and 1400 working coolies a day. It is only for a 6 weeks to two months during the *dhan* planting season that we have great difficulty in getting coolies out to work. But even then we never use pressure to make the coolies work. That is the way we keep our coolies; they turn out or stay at home just as they like. I have nearly doubled my labour force within the last four years. I calculate that a quarter of our labour force is fluctuating, and that it requires that number to be recruited annually to keep up a full labour force."

This incidentally proves that tea can profitably be grown with a free labour force; and if that is so in the Duars, why not in Assam? Of course the managers in Assam practically all said, that, however much you paid a labourer, he would not work more, but would be content to earn the same amount as hitherto, whatever the rate of wages. "The Committee, however, are not disposed to accept this view" (p. 72), nor, fortunately, do they let the statement pass that an increase of wages would be impossible at the present trade depression, without pointing out that the companies making this plea had "paid a dividend of 35% in 1918 and 1919 and 25% in the disastrous year 1920" (p. 7).

Under a capitalistic system naturally profits come first and humanity second. A good case in point is the story of the Calcutta Agents "so keen in getting hundreds of new coolies into the gardens in war time when tea was prosperous and money plentiful without troubling much about the quali-

ty of recruits" (p. 12), which should be read in conjunction with the very discreditable statement that "the Committee are not unmindful of the fact that some gardens cannot afford elaborate hospitals" (p. 23). And if ever the manager is inclined to take the part of their labourers, sure enough his Agents would pull him up—vide the incident related on page 17. Again, take the case of one General Manager (p. 47), who had raised his rate of wages from Rs. 5 in 1917 to Rs. 6, and in 1920 to Rs. 7 and who "wanted to raise the rate still further to Rs. 8 and my Directors agreed. But was not supported by the Tea Association. I did not raise the wages, as I thought it might give rise to friction between my neighbours and myself."

The trouble of course is, that, whilst the employers are banded together in their "Tea Associations" and Planting Associations, and are therefore presenting a united front—how united the efficacy of the discharge ticket system proves—the labourer "has no Trade-Union to back his case," as the Committee truly observe (p. 106); and though Committee after Committee has studied the problem, not one apparently has ever taken any evidence from the labourer direct. This last Committee indeed offer an apology for this omission, viz. that "apart from the fact that the ordinary labourer is not sufficiently educated to give a fair and intelligent expression of his views before a Committee of strangers, the time selected for the enquiry was singularly inopportune" (p. 4), but it is not one that is convincing and only proves how utterly helpless and defenceless this class of labour is, left with one weapon only, that of rioting.

All the greater surely the moral responsibility of the Assam Government, which cannot lightly shift it from its own shoulders by benignly saying that "His Excellency in Council believes with the Committee that managers are a reasonable and fair-minded body of men."

Far be it from us to suggest, that all Assam tea garden managers are brutes and delight in the practices which have been described; on the contrary, human nature being what it is, we are ready to grant that the great majority of managers are sufficiently well-meaning to desire the labourer's welfare, provided their own and their employers' interests are not interfered with thereby. But our point is, that, unless the labourer is free to leave his employment at the end of the month, even the most well-meaning manager has no means of gauging how his labourer's interests fare under his management. As long as that servitude lasts, no "reasonableness" or "fair-mindedness" is of any avail; and for the Governor in Council to content himself in bringing his observations on the Report to a close by trusting, "as must every well-wisher of the great Industry to which the province owes so much, that these words will go home," seems to us the most appalling dereliction of duty that any Government can be guilty of. Why should this Government trust that the managers will be suffi-

ciently fair-minded to undertake a revision of the system, instead of enforcing it by law and by the sanction behind the law? Has the Assam Government ever trusted to the fair-mindedness of the labourer that its words about the inconvenience of absconding "will go home," or has it applied the law to it? Does it trust that its "words will go home," when it catches a burglar or a preacher of sedition? Then, why is it content to "trust" people whom the evidence shows cannot be trusted to pay their labourers a living wage; who cannot be trusted with a truck system which "the Committee have no hesitation in condemning as pernicious" (p. 74); who cannot be trusted to enter into equitable agreements with their labourers; who cannot be trusted to exercise reasonable discipline; who cannot be trusted with their chowkidari and discharge ticket systems; who cannot be trusted to provide adequate medical and sanitary facilities for the people whom they have enticed away from their old homes?

The law, whether in Assam or out of it, is not brought into existence because of the 90% who do not break it, but because of the 10% who do. If therefore even 90% of all estates in Assam were in every respect beyond reproach—which from the evidence before the Committee does not seem to be the case—that would be no reason for postponing still further legislation which ought to ensure that the remaining 10 p.c. black sheep would either change their ways or else have to shut up shop. To let things go on as at present is only to put a premium on the black sheep and to depress the general standard of labourers' treatment throughout the industry. What is wanted, and wanted at once, is not more words, but deeds; and of these we consider indispensable these three:

(1) Prohibition of labourers' agreements in writing and introduction of the system of *parole* agreements not exceeding a month;

(2) Prohibition of the Discharge Ticket system;

(3) Enactment of employers' liability for labourers' welfare, enforcing a minimum decent living wage, maximum hours of work, estate sanitation and labourers' medical assistance, repatriation of invalided labourers, and, last but not least, abolition of any form of truck system.

Only when reform along these three lines has been effected without further equivocation or postponement or compromise—and only then, will the Tea Industry of Assam be fit for the employment of human beings; but the real shame of Assam is not even so much the system under which its Tea Industry is still being carried on, as the feebleness of its Government, which, still reposing on the principles of sixty years ago, is even to-day of that abominable system, perhaps an uneasy spectator, perhaps a rather reluctant accomplice—but an accomplice for all that.

(*Concluded.*)

THE FISCAL COMMISSION'S REPORT.—I.

THE Report of the Indian Fiscal Commission ought to be discussed along with that of the Indian Industrial Commission in order adequately to determine what economic policy it would be in the best interests of India for the State to adopt henceforward. In order to focuss the main issues in this discussion, it would be desirable to delineate the broad outlines of our economic problem and briefly to indicate how it has arisen. It is really unnecessary for this purpose to go far back into history to the days of the East India Company and the policy it pursued towards our handloom weavers and the attitude which the British Government adopted towards Indian calicoes, muslins, silks, etc. in those days. Whatever was the injury inflicted upon us by those measures, they did not unsettle the economic equilibrium of this country. That unsettlement was effected much more recently, during the last fifty years or so. If one date is to be assigned as marking the turning-point in this respect, it is the year 1869, the year of the opening of the Suez Canal for traffic. It was ten or twelve years later that the Canal came into effective working order and it was then that the speed of our economic retrogression became nearly maximum and an undesirable economic transformation came rapidly over this country. The Suez Canal brought India nearer by 3000 miles to the industrially advanced nations of Europe, of whom Great Britain then was undisputedly the foremost. Again, since the sixties a revolution had come over the ship-building industry. Wooden ships were displaced by iron-ships; the latter in their turn were soon displaced by ships made of steel. Improvements were made in the marine engines; the compound engine, the triple expansion engine, the quadruple expansion engine were evolved in rapid succession, effecting greater and greater economies in the consumption of coal. The size of the ships grew equally rapidly. The net effect of it all was that for the first time in human history it became possible to transport huge quantities of bulky goods of comparatively small value cheaply and quickly over thousands of miles of sea. Foodstuffs and raw materials began to enter into trade as they had never done before. The new power-driven factories of the industrially modernised nations of Europe could work up huge quantities of such raw materials quickly and cheaply into finished goods, and the industrial populations engaged in the factories, workshops, mines, railways, etc. needed to be fed with food brought from abroad. Thus a market was opened up in Europe for foodstuffs and raw materials if India could send them.

Again, by the time the Suez Canal began to be effectively used by steamships of large size, inside India the great trunk lines of the railway connecting the chief seaports like Bombay and Calcutta with important internal trade centres like Cawnpore, Lahore or Nagpur had been laid, and the work of constructing branch and feeder lines

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

BY

The Right Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P. C.,

TO THE

Fifth National Liberal Federation

held at Nagpur on December 27, 1922.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

LIBERAL organizations all over India have conferred on me a very great honour and I am profoundly grateful. The conduct of your deliberations at this session is a delicate as well as a difficult task. Some friends have written to tell me of their expectations and would be surprised perhaps to be told they have not exactly heartened me. I should have rejoiced sincerely if your attempt to secure another President and a worthier one had succeeded. My friend Dr. Tej Bahadur Sapru has qualifications for the position, natural and acquired, to which I cannot lay claim. The Liberal party's bad luck had ordained that his release from official bondage should come a few days too late. And I am here. I am willing to serve. Make the best of me you can.

First let us pay a tribute of affectionate memory to those of our friends who have passed away in recent months from the scenes that knew them well. Dewan Bahadur C. Karunakara Menon, after many years' faithful and highly appreciated labour in the field of journalism, died in his native district in honourable poverty. The political views of Babu Motilal Ghose and his quaint manner of expressing them gave him during nearly two generations a place all his own in the public life of our country. We shall long miss the amiable figure of Dr. Sir Bhalochandra Krishna, somewhat rare in recent years on our platform, but one of the heroes of the past generation, of wise and weighty speech and not easily swayed by passion or prejudice. The loss of Sir Vithaldas Damodar Thackersey is a grief from which we shall take very long to recover. His knowledge of business, courage in advocacy and restraint of expression gave his pronouncements uncommon weight in the Assembly. A debate in the old Imperial Council when it still sat in Calcutta is among my vivid memories, in which he vigorously and skilfully assailed the railway policy as to rates, while Mr. Gokhale sitting near him beamed approval and encouragement. The Bombay Legislative Council is the poorer for the death of Rao Bahadur G. K. Sathe, whose clear common sense and quiet speech made his counsel invaluable both to those who sit on the official benches and to their critics.

MR. MONTAGU.

On this occasion, when the Liberal party in India meets for the first time after the recent

political changes in England, our thoughts go naturally to the Right Honourable E. S. Montagu. In the long history of our British connection, no one has loved India more, no one has sacrificed more for her, no one has been more courageous or persistent in the application to her of the noble principles of Liberalism, no one amongst front-bench politicians in England has had a more thorough or sympathetic knowledge and appreciation of her problems or her ambitions, no one has had a higher conception of her destiny within the British Commonwealth, and no one has put together a more substantial record of actual achievement in the pursuit of that destiny. We all regretted very much the sinister intrigue which deprived him of office, and we regret still more those cross currents of English politics which have resulted in his exclusion from Parliament altogether. What a loss it is in these days, when there is reasonable fear of reaction or stagnation in Indian affairs! Though in opposition, his voice would have carried more moral weight than that of any other single member of the House and his guidance would have been of rare authority. India thinks of him with sorrow made poignant by her gratitude and sends him her best wishes for a future career worthy of his great services to India and to the British Commonwealth.

SIGNS OF REACTION.

The Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for India and certain other politicians of note have declared their intentions not to go back on the policy of the Government of India Act, 1919, and to abide loyally by its provisions in spirit as well as in the letter. This doubtless brings some relief to the anxious mind of India, and we trust that the strength of the Labour party in Opposition and of the Liberal party will be sufficient to avert any tendency to reaction which the presence in the new Ministry of some well-known opponents of the Government of India Act might lead us to apprehend. Our friends in England, of whom to the honour of British public life there never has been a want, hold out no great hope of any advance under the present regime. Those who have experience from the inside of actual administration in India already detect pronounced symptoms of a tendency on the part of the India Office, while observing the letter of the law, to violate it in the spirit. The more acute section of the general public here, only too ready to imbibe a note of pessimism, profess to be startled by an

attitude of entrenched confidence on the part of the Imperial services quite at variance with their uneasy apprehensiveness of a little while ago. Speaking in May last to an audience composed almost entirely of high officials, I took the risk of being accused of impertinence, warned them solemnly that there was a very widespread distrust of their good faith in the matter of political reforms in the country and implored them not to be too solicitous of the maintenance of vested interests, but to proceed with high hearts in the work of preparing India for Dominion status, giving continual proof of a recognition on their part that that was their one high mission and purpose here. So cautious and just-minded a man as Sir Sivaswamy Aiyar has recently given expression in the columns of the *Nineteenth Century and After* to similar sentiments. I will make no apology for quoting some sentences from his weighty pronouncement: "It, i. e. the unrest, is largely due to a complete loss of faith in the minds of large sections of the people in the sincerity of the declarations and promises of the Government, and in their sense of justice. Belief in the justice of the British Government has been the most valuable asset of British rule in the past. The result of Mr. Gandhi's agitation has been to undermine this belief. It is this distrust of the Government which is largely responsible for the disbelief of many educated men in the reality of the constitutional reforms, and which has induced them to become extremists and resort to the method of Non-co-operation with all its pernicious consequences. The most pressing problem, in my opinion, is how to restore the faith of the people in the good intentions of the Government."

When I was in England last year I heard a member of the Cabinet deplore a political mishap and add that it could have been avoided if the men on the spot had given timely warning of the magnitude of the danger that was gathering head. The remark struck me at the time as a rather forcible reminder of the duty of all public men, non-official as well as official, to speak out in critical times without fear and without reserve. Doubtless some men in authority will resent candid speech and denounce it as a threat, but that is a risk that must be faced by those who would save communities from injury and statesmen from blunders. It is in this spirit that I venture now to survey broadly and briefly the present political situation.

INDIANISATION OF THE SERVICES.

The new constitution of India has been designed as a first step towards responsible government. It transfers to the control of elected representatives of the people certain departments of public business, while it enhances the influence of those representatives over the remaining departments. The British element in the public services has been told that it will diminish continuously in the future, and that, while it lasts, its function is to train people in self-rule. British officials must now be prepared to be judged by the care and solicitude

with which they discharge this last duty. They have, it must be allowed, a more vivid appreciation of the difficulties and complexities of self-rule. They must know that, while Parliament can pass an Act and sanction a few rules, the actual transfer of political power has to be effected in this country in a multitude of matters more or less large, and that they must not lose a day or an opportunity in giving to the children of the soil every possible facility for learning how to work parliamentary institutions in their entire range. While the statute prescribes that after ten years a commission should be appointed to examine and report how far further progress is possible, the executive in India are expected in the interval not to mark time or refuse sullenly to move, but to do everything short of Parliamentary legislation to keep the good work going. Let us take, in the first instance, what is put down in the forefront of the preamble to the Act, viz. the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the public service. Before the declaration of policy of August 1917, the position of Indians in the public services had been the subject of one of the bitterest complaints against British administration. After the Act, one would expect the association of Indians in every branch of the public service to proceed with marked speed. Some time ago, instead of declaring in conformity with the above-mentioned policy what the minimum proportion of the British element should be for the time being and leaving the balance to be filled up by statutory Indians, the old principle was continued of dividing the cadre in British and Indian proportions, as though it were a common patrimony, and the Indians were to be limited to a percentage of 48 which was to be reached in ten years from an immediate beginning of 33 per cent. This 33 per cent. is on the annual recruitment. Before the Indian element would actually reach 33 per cent. of the whole service, it would be 20 to 25 years. When that element attains to 48 per cent. it would be about 30 to 35 years. Already interested people fill the air in Britain and in India with the cry that the Indian element is growing alarmingly and dangerously large. The famous O'Donnell circular asserts that the proportion of Indians to the total cadre is to-day only 12 per cent. We are thus enabled to see the slender basis on which alarmist forecasts of the destruction of the steel frame are based. It is such unfounded representations, repeated in the English Press over Anglo-Indian signatures, which are to a great extent responsible for the growing unpopularity of the Indian services, and which friends of India like Lord Meston, Sir Claude Hill and Sir Valentine Chirol find it so difficult to counteract. Now my question is, Is the Indian patriot generally and the elected member in particular of our new Legislatures content with this rate of Indianisation of the great Civil Service? On the contrary, is it not a most depressing and disheartening indication of the intolerably long delay in the attainment

of full responsible government, which it is the apparent intention of the authorities to cause in so far as it is in their power? When we think in addition of the overpowering consideration of economy, we are disposed to grudge every single year of this delay.

I wish to take you somewhat deeper into this question of Indianisation. Now by the very hypothesis of the case an important aspect of Indianisation is the admission of qualified Indian members of the Service into those branches of administration where they would be trained in the inner art of government and initiated into its secrets. No better test could be devised of the sincerity of the authorities in their desire to obey the requirements of the preamble to our Act than the extent to which they have appointed Indians to the Secretariat of the Government of India and the various Local Governments. The following table gives the necessary figures for comparison:—

TABLE I.

Government of India.		
Secretaries (including Joint Secretaries)	13	1 Indian
Deputy Secretaries	... 13	3 Indians
Under Secretaries	... 5	1 Indian
	31	5

TABLE II.

Local Governments.				
	Secretaries	Dy. Secy's.	Under Secy's.	Indians.
Assam ...	4	0	2 (1 Indian)=	6 1
Bengal ...	9	3	2	=13 Nil
B. & O. ...	6 (1 Indian)	0	5(2 Indians)=	11 3
Bombay ...	9	6 (1 Indian)	3 (1 Indian)=	18 2
C. P. ...	3	0	3(2 Indians)=	6 2
Madras ...	8 (1 Indian)	1	7(6 Indians)=	16 7
Punjab ...	7 (1 Indian)	0	10 (1 Indian)=	17 2
U. P. ...	9 (1 Indian)	4	5 (3Indians)=	18 4

*55 (4 Indians) 13 *(1 Indian) *37 (16 Indians)=105 20

*N. B. Including figures for the P. W. D. also.

If it be urged that Indians of sufficiently long standing are not available, the following table will supply the means of testing the contention.

TABLE III.

Indian Officers of	5 years	10 years	15 years	20 years & up,
Assam ...	1	1	1	1
Bengal ...	4 (1)	0	1	1
B. & O.	0	1	...
Bombay ...	1	1	3	1
C. P. ...	2 (1)	1	1	2
Madras ...	1	2	1	4
Punjab ...	1	1	1	2
U. P. ...	6 (3)	3	4	4
	19 (2)	8	15	15

This table shows that there are at least 19 Indian officers available for Under-Secretaryships under the Government of India, 8 officers for Deputy-Secretaryships, 13 for Joint or Deputy-Secretaryships and 15 for Secretaryships, and memberships of the Executive Councils, etc. Assuming that there had been no declaration of policy in 1917 and no action consequent thereupon, these figures would disclose grounds for the belief that

Indians had not had a fair chance given to them of acquiring Secretariat experience. Judged in the light of that declaration and the preamble to the Act, the authorities responsible for the selection of Secretariat personnel will find it hard to prove that they have done their duty. While a tilting of the balance in favour of Indians might be justified and even required in view of the future, they are not getting even their due. How ridiculously wide of the mark is the cry of interested parties that Ministers choose their officers on grounds of favouritism!

THREATENED INCREASES IN SALARIES.

I have never been slow to sing the praise of the Indian Civil Service. I admire their high record, and I am thankful, deeply and sincerely thankful, for the way in which they have built up the administration of India on firm, efficient and thorough lines and given us, what perhaps we might not be able to evolve for ourselves, a whole body of auxiliary and subordinate services characterised by a fair degree of integrity, discipline and usefulness. I am not quite fitted by my birth or upbringing to judge of the pecuniary circumstances of well-placed officials, but some recent observation in England and the Dominions inclines me to concede that there is much in the contention that in the case of those who have to maintain establishments in India and outside, salaries, even though improved slightly, are not the same as they were some years ago. At the same time I am one of those who hold firmly that the claims, however legitimate in one sense, of high-salaried employees of the State are by no means comparable in justness or urgency to those of employees in receipt of modest salaries. Further I contend that their claims to relief are sternly limited and may be completely negated by the low condition of public finance and the intolerable burden on a notoriously poor tax-payer. On purely economic considerations, therefore, it seems to me that, if further recruitment in Britain is possible only on a greatly increased scale of salaries, allowances, and emoluments of one kind or another, the representatives of the people in our Legislative Assembly will be compelled, with much reluctance, to recommend a cessation or at least a substantial abatement of such recruitment. No commission, however authoritative, can reconcile us to increased impositions on account of the British services. Moreover, British prestige and the continuance of relations of mutual friendship and confidence between the races alike require that none but the best products of British culture should be brought hereafter to fill positions of influence and responsibility alongside of the best men turned out of our Universities. More than once before we have made the costly mistake of supposing that to increase the attractions of the services is necessarily to improve the quality of recruits. I am aware that during the last two years the number of British competitors at the Civil Service Examination has diminished considerably, and in consequence the

recruitment has been greatly in favour of the Indian element. Some further experience is necessary before we can determine how far this alteration is permanent. It seems to me anyhow the equity of the case would give to the children of the soil the benefit of any unforeseen conditions that operate in their favour.

ORDER REGARDING THE I. M. S.

A recent cablegram gives the disquieting news that the Secretary of State for India has appointed or is about to appoint to the Indian Medical Service 30 men on terms of special advantage, and I have read in some newspapers that this action of the Secretary of State is heralded by the termination of the services of Indians that have been taken temporarily during the war. While I was in England, I heard that a proposal of the Government of India, that in consideration of the difficulty of attracting British recruits ten appointments should be conferred on these temporary incumbents, was turned down by the India Office. I make these statements for what they are worth. I have not verified them. But one would like to know on what recommendations of the Government of India the Secretary of State's recent addition to the burdens of India is based. Our case is that the retention of the Indian Medical Service on its present footing has the effect of treating the civil medical needs of India as though they were completely subservient to the requirements of the Military and that it constitutes not only a serious hardship on the independent medical profession in India, but an artificial bar to the advance of medical research in this country. Champions of this service have not improved their case by resting it in great part on the necessity of providing qualified European medical assistance to the European services of the country. These latter services would on that view become in the popular eye even more burdensome than they are. It is quite true that under the statute the Secretary of State in Council has power to determine such matters; and the Indian Medical Service is placed in a specially privileged position by Rule 12 of the Devolution Rules: "A local Government shall employ such number of Indian Medical Service officers in such appointments and on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of State in Council." But the mere possession of power will not justify any and every use of it. The Indian Legislative Assembly has certain financial powers and would be quite justified under provocation in employing them so as to embarrass the Government. I much fear that if the 30 appointments are made by the Secretary of State to the Indian Medical Service on the conditions named, no one can foretell what the Assembly will do to safeguard the taxpayer's interests. It is difficult to imagine a representative House anywhere in the world sitting still and watching the nation's resources squandered with so little justification while the Central

Government and most Local Governments lay under the nightmare of financial bankruptcy. How entirely without initiative we are here in India is proved by the statement made the other day by Sir Ludovic Porter in the U. P. Council that the Retrenchment Committee of that province could not even consider the case of the Imperial Services without special leave of the Secretary of State.

CONTROL OF THE SERVICES.

Before I leave the subject of the services, there is one suggestion which I commend to the acceptance of the Liberal Federation. The point occurred to me rather forcibly when we were considering the provisions of the Government of India Bill before the meeting of the Joint Select Committee. There is no government in the world of the magnitude and importance of that of India whose employees down to those drawing salaries of 400 and 500 rupees are chosen for them, punished and dismissed by superior authority. The anomaly, why the humiliation of it, was made glaringly manifest when, in a measure conferring self-government on the people of India, the provision was repeated that all the Imperial services were to be recruited by the Secretary of State and that their salaries, pensions, allowances, &c. were to be regulated by him and were exempted from the vote of the Legislative Assembly consisting of a great majority of elected members and supposed to be endowed with the power of sanctioning, reducing, or refusing money grants at the time of the annual budget. It is highly honourable to the discipline and the sense of propriety of these services as a whole that they have remained amenable to the control of the Governor General in Council or the Governor in Council, though these cannot dismiss them. It is difficult, however, for Ministers and Indian Executive Councillors to command the same willing homage and co-operation from the great body of these services. It seems to me that the time is come when we must demand that the Governor General of India in Council should take the place of the Secretary of State for India in Council in all matters relating to the Indian Civil Service and other Imperial services, the High Commissioner for India entering into covenants, dealing with the Civil Service Commissioners and doing other functions in this connection as the agent of the Government of India. Of course the statute would have to be altered and many rules and regulations modified accordingly. But the dignity and authority of the Government of India must be recognized and the Secretary of State for India, who is entirely out of touch with Indian sentiment and can defy it with impunity, removed from the position of supremacy which he now occupies with regard to the great services.

This proposal would seem to be incongruous with the plea advanced here for provincial autonomy. In fact certain provinces have already begun to clamour for the complete provincialization of the Services hitherto recruited in England and called Imperial. Without doubt that is the proper ideal

but there are cases in which what is logical is not necessarily sound, and this is one such. I cannot do more than mention the principal grounds on which I recommend this half-way-house arrangement. In some provinces appointments are regulated on communal considerations, while it is necessary that the higher services should be on grounds purely of merit and efficiency. Narrow political considerations would interfere with the bestowal of patronage far more in the provinces than at the centre. It is desirable that provincial barriers should not be recognised in the recruitment of the higher services, so that the unity of India may be maintained in this striking way. The public spirit and civic virtues of a people are largely influenced by the character of the services, which must deteriorate under political influences.

Let me likewise recall the disappointment of the public that the experiment of appointing an Indian to one of the Governorships was abandoned so soon as the man of first choice vacated his office. It is doubtless true unfortunately that the name of any conceivable Indian would have been received with disapprobation by the ill-tempered section of the Press. The same remark would apply to the post of High Commissioner for India. But this circumstance should not be taken advantage of by a high-minded Government anxious to associate competent Indians in every branch of the public service.

While on the subject of high appointments I must deprecate the practice that now seems to have established itself of shifting Governors from one province to another. Some years ago strong disapproval was expressed of the appointment of High Court Judges to the executive Government. It seemed as though the authorities agreed to the general principle. But curiously enough, soon afterwards, an Executive Councillor at the end of his term was appointed High Court Judge. Now holders of these high appointments must not be taught to expect further favours, and the people of every province are entitled to expect that their affairs would be administered by one who is above fear or favour.

THE ARMY.

The Army question, however, is the test of tests for the *bona fides* of the British Government. Its urgency arises from two considerations, either of them strong in itself, but both together of paramount and overpowering force. The first consideration is financial, it being indisputable that the straitened state of Indian finance is due in great part to the inordinately bloated expenditure on the Army. The Indian Government are genuinely alarmed and, besides affording full information to the Assembly and seeking their advice, they have also forwarded to England with their own recommendations the findings of a strong and representative Committee which were calculated to effect certain economies immediately and also reduce the total cost of the Army by gradually

Indianising the commissioned ranks and reducing the British part of the Army. Nobody can tell with certainty at what stage these urgent proposals and recommendations lie in England, but it is rumoured that the Army authorities, who have the last say in the matter, have not been moved even by India's direst necessity. The other aspect of the matter goes even more to the root. Dominion status, which has been promised to India, is not possible in its fullest sense without the means of self-defence. It is true she pays every anna of the stupendous cost of the Army and in that way fulfils, nay more than fulfils, the conditions embodied in a resolution of the House of Commons of the 4th March, 1862: "That this House (while fully recognizing the claims of all portions of the British Empire to Imperial aid in their protection against perils arising from the consequences of Imperial policy) is of opinion that Colonies exercising the right of self-government ought to undertake the main responsibility of providing for their own internal order and security, and ought to assist in their own external defence." An unexampled policy of suspicion, however, has hitherto denied the inhabitant of India admission to the King's commission, with the result that, even if Indianisation began today on the most generous and thorough-going scale and were prosecuted without intermission in the most honest spirit, it would take 25 to 30 years to complete the process. One hears that the proposals now before the authorities would spread the process over something like 35 years, and that even these are likely to prove unacceptable. Was Mr. Montagu gifted with prophetic insight when on the 5th December, 1919, at the last stage of the Government of India Bill he warned the House of Commons in a memorable passage? "Do not", he said, "deny to India self-government because she cannot take her proper share in her own defence and then deny to her people the opportunity of learning to defend themselves". This odious combination of insult and injury was paralleled only in India till the other day by the denial of representative institutions to her people on account of their illiteracy and resistance at the same time to all attempts to introduce a system of compulsory elementary education. The stagnation that has overcome the proposals of the Government of India with a view to retrench expenditure on the Army and Indianise the officer ranks is the most serious indictment of the intentions of the British authorities, and one does not see how the charge can be refuted. The delay aggravates anti-British feeling every day, and a loyal citizen feels it his duty to sound a serious note of warning and trusts that it will not be construed as a threat. The idea that self-defence is an inseparable attribute of Dominion autonomy is a theory of recent growth. In its early stages what was required was that the expenditure should be borne by the self-governing colony, a condition which has always been fulfilled by India. I believe British troops were not

withdrawn from the Transvaal till several years after it had received self-government. No doubt the inauguration of the Irish Free State has been followed within a short time by the withdrawal of the last English garrison. But this precedent cannot be applied in its rigidity to India, where the citizen has long been denied the right to bear arms or to exercise any but the most insignificant command in the so-called Indian Army. If the civil side of Dominion status is practicable in this country much before the military side, the anomaly is the direct consequence of the narrow policy pursued by Britain hitherto; and during the period that the Indianisation of the Army takes place, the British Army here must agree to defend the country, though it be governed by a civil power not of its own nationality. There is no inherent necessity for the transfer of civil power to wait on, or be measured by, the transfer of military power. At any rate Great Britain is under a moral obligation not to insist on any close concomitance between the two.

INDIANS OVERSEAS.

I had intended after my speeches concerning my Dominion tour not to refer to the subject of Indians overseas in this speech. But certain events that are taking place around us render it advisable that I should express my feelings on the subject as clearly as possible. British Guiana and Fiji have recently been visited by Commissions appointed by our Government. Considering their personnel, I am inclined to await with confidence the publication of their recommendations. Great interest attaches to the colony of Kenya, where the relations between the white settlers and our countrymen are so strained that influential men in London throw up their hands in despair. The white settlers, in whose composition as a rule greed and pride seem to be combined to an intense degree, cannot brook the idea of equality with Indians and threaten violence if a system based on equality were forced on them. Our people are equally determined to take nothing less than equality. I heard good accounts of Sir Robert Coryndon, the new Governor of Kenya, but it is doubtful that he can do much. It is surprising that after two or three years of struggle the Colonial Office should abdicate its function as it were, and the Duke of Devonshire proclaim that he would support the man on the spot. It is difficult to interpret properly a meagre cablegram, but the principles involved and our interests at stake alike require that we should not put our trust too much in the personal idiosyncrasies of the man on the spot, whom an arrogant and overgrown community may coerce in many ways. If the Imperial Cabinet of Great Britain find themselves unable, owing to the truculence of white colonists, to carry out the resolution of 1921, it is an impressive lesson to other communities in the Commonwealth that what prevails at the seat of empire is neither justice nor the sanctity of resolutions, but a threat of force. Even in the history of British India an episode or two have happened in which the European

community have gone immoderate lengths in defence of unjust privilege and monopoly. In French Canada the establishment of responsible government was accompanied in 1849 by an outbreak on the part of the English malcontents which ended in the burning down of the House of Parliament and a personal insult to the Earl of Elgin, Her Majesty's representative. A sentence may be quoted from his despatch on the subject and commended to the Colonial Minister and his man on the spot. "Meanwhile it is my firm conviction that if this dictation be submitted to, the Government of this province by constitutional means will be impossible, and that the struggle between overbearing minorities backed by force and majorities resting on legalities and established forms, which has so long proved the bane of Canada, driving capital from the province and producing a state of chronic discontent, will be perpetuated."

With regard to the self-governing Dominions, the Bombay Corporation and Indian Chamber of Commerce have passed resolutions expressive of impatience at the way in which they treat the just rights of our countrymen. Apparently these bodies think that we had best retaliate at present. I have more than a suspicion that this is exactly what the shrewd anti-Asiatic would desire. In fact I was asked by a representative of South Africa last year in London: "If we hit you hard, why don't you hit us hard in return? We have agreed to the principle of reciprocity." They know that the number of their nationals resident in India is so small as to be negligible, and that our retaliation therefore cannot amount to much. On the other hand, if we did retaliate, we should have shot our last arrow, and our opponents might cry quits. I am sure our nationals domiciled abroad will not thank us in the end, for we shall have lost the moral advantage we now possess in urging their claims. Moreover, in the three Dominions that I have visited I see no insuperable barrier in the way of our people similar to that which by all accounts exists in South Africa. Our people in Australasia or Canada have not organised themselves and made a demand for equality. In fact they are incapable without aid from us of a sustained struggle for their rights. Active Indian propaganda is the one condition of ultimate success. Without such it is unwise to expect just treatment or become angry when it is denied. We have just made one attempt at direct negotiation and, though I say so, not without some success. I submit it is too soon to give up hope.

THE WORKING OF REFORMS.

Let me now turn to a review of the earlier events under the new constitution. They were full of promise and gave cause for gratulation. Officials were cordial and courteous, non-officials were willing to learn and full of consideration for the needs of the executive. Both alike were keen on the success of the Reforms. In several provinces the Governors forgot diarchy and treated the

two halves of Government as one undivided Cabinet. The new legislatures, under the double blight of non-co-operation and financial bankruptcy, faced their tasks with a courage and sagacity which promised well for the future of political India. On the central Government, contrary to expectation, the interest of India centred. The Legislative Assembly, though consisting of representatives from diverse parts of India, discharged its duties like a tried body of legislators and won the approbation not only of their President but of impartial observers generally. The official members too for their part showed a spirit of tolerance and helpfulness which did them great credit. Rules and regulations were interpreted in a liberal spirit, and the Assembly were invited to discuss the military Budget and other proposals as though they had not been excluded from their scope. A strong committee of that body also sat on military matters generally and produced a unanimous report, which did not make heroic recommendations, but which even so lies unheeded on the shelves of the War Office. On a resolution on Indian autonomy the Home Member, Sir William Vincent, thought it necessary to adopt a conciliatory attitude and himself proposed an amendment which, being accepted by the Assembly without a dissentient, committed that body, including the members of Government, to the view that the question of further constitutional reform should not be allowed to wait till the ten-year limit had expired. Again, on a motion regarding the rapid Indianisation of the services the same spokesman of Government treated the question from a detached and sagacious point of view and agreed to institute immediate inquiries as to how to secure increased recruitment of Indians to the all-India services. With regard to those sections in the Act which represented the vestige of autocracy, endowing the Governor-General and the Governors, acting sometimes singly and sometimes with their Councils, with extraordinary powers of overriding their legislatures, one must admit that on the whole there has been little cause for public dissatisfaction. Such exercise happened only in two or three instances in the provinces and passed off quietly. It is well-known that the Governor-General of India in Council recently resisted great pressure brought to bear on him to resort to the process of certification in connection with the Budget. His forbearance till last September must be mentioned with especial thankfulness, because it has had the somewhat unexpected effect of enhancing the prestige of the Indian Parliament. It will be remembered that it was contemplated to leave the Government of India in the possession of undisputed and indisputable authority and that this authority should be frequently and as a matter of course asserted. The institution, however, of two Houses of Legislature, one with an overpowering and the other with a decided elected majority, has made the exercise

of overriding powers a matter of such grave risks that it was possible for the Assembly by judicious restraints upon its own conduct to have allowed the autocratic sections to remain inoperative for a long period, and then it might have been comparatively easy to ask for the repeal of the obnoxious sections. From a popular point of view it is regrettable that with regard to the Princes Protection Bill one of these sections has been utilized. On the merits of the question, I should say the enactment of the measure was unnecessary. On the other hand, it is open to question, with the clear sight which comes after the event, whether the Assembly was wise to refuse leave for the Bill to be introduced. It was and is to our interest that if the Governor-General has recourse to these sections, he does so in cases in which a detached observer would say that the Assembly had behaved with moderation and self-restraint and given the executive no justification or excuse for out of the way procedure.

To go back to the main line of thought. I was saying that, though the original idea had been to give the popular voice no real controlling power, the forbearance of the executive had in practice given the Indian Parliament a fair measure of real control over the policy and measures of administration. In my accounts of our new constitution and its working during my recent tour, I have always emphasised this unintended effect and claimed for the authors of the Government of India Bill that they builded better than they knew. To the higher officials concerned in the working of the new regime, I have given full meed of praise for their friendly and liberal attitude. I used to mention Sir Harcourt Butler in particular as a striking instance not only of ability, but of that rare sense of discipline which is one of the high qualities of the Indian Civil Service and which enables its members cheerfully and faithfully to carry out policies of which, however, they may not personally approve. Sir Harcourt, far from favouring the original Montagu-Chelmsford proposals, had fathered a rival scheme and pushed it as far as he could. Nevertheless, when called upon to administer the Act, which he had strenuously opposed, he was regarded as one of its truest interpreters.

IMPROPER INTERFERENCE.

But has this great chapter closed? Are we no longer a happy family? Have the authorities begun to weary of well-doing? Are they pulling themselves back? One would not like to believe so, but there are disquieting portents which may not be overlooked, and they proceed from a quarter where, while Mr. Montagu was in office, Indian interests never failed to find a champion. One of the cardinal principles laid down by the Joint Select Committee on the Government of India Bill was that, when the legislature and the executive were in agreement on any matter not involving Imperial interests, there should be no interference from higher authority. Fiscal autonomy, to the extent that we now enjoy it, is regarded as a special

application of this principle. During the discussions of 1919 it was regarded as of the utmost importance, and in the period of transition public opinion in India must jealously safeguard it from violation by the Secretary of State in the case of the Government of India or by the Government of India in the case of the Local Governments. Some months ago in another connection I had occasion to praise Mr. Montagu for the way in which he was willing to let the autonomy of India develop even at the cost of some self-suppression, and I have heard him say, with humorous exaggeration, that his ambition was very soon to abolish himself. Can it be said today that the India Office respects this principle sufficiently? I read the other day a long string of matters of apparent agreement between the Government of India and the Indian Legislature either negatived or held up at Whitehall—the recommendations as to military expenditure, proposals for Indianising the Army, proposals for diminishing recruitment in England to the all-India services, proposals for appointing Indians to the Indian Medical Service, proposals in regard to Frontier policy and the recommendations of the Racial Distinctions Committee. Even if the Secretary of State in Council has interfered only in some of these matters, it is a cause for public alarm in India, and it is necessary to consider how we could help the Government of India resist these encroachments. At the time this principle was enunciated, I remember pointing out that, if it was to be at all efficacious, the Government of India ought to be expressly freed from the necessity of previously consulting the Secretary of State before taking part in the discussions with the legislature. My information is that the rules require such previous reference in far too many matters yet. This unwholesome practice unduly limits the initiative of the Government of India and automatically narrows the limits of possible concurrence with the legislature. It is no wonder the tendency to reaction, wherever it exists in the official world, has received encouragement by knowledge of these circumstances, betokening, as they do, a change in the atmosphere of Whitehall. The Secretary of State has recently sent out orders forbidding Local Governments to refer to committees any question in any manner affecting any of the Imperial services. In practice this would greatly narrow the scope of our legislatures and prevent them from even advising on reserved subjects, let alone exercising increased influence over them.

DIARCHY.

Since I spoke on this subject in Bombay my opinion about diarchy has not been shaken. I think it has reached its limit of usefulness. Not having inside knowledge of any administration, I am unable to enforce my opinion by a striking array of specific instances. Perhaps Ministers at present in office and Executive Councillors, when freed from official restraints and called upon to state their experience before a duly authorised commission, will make out an overwhelming case for the termination of duality in provincial admi-

nistration. The best results have been obtained where Governors have treated Councillors and Ministers as belonging to one Cabinet. The rule requiring that the Finance Member should be an Executive Councillor has placed Ministers at a decided disadvantage in obtaining money for their departments. Official discipline too is difficult to maintain, as Ministers have discovered, when an officer cannot be censured or transferred except with the consent of the Governor. In some provinces Ministers are not recognised as forming one official group. This practice violates the recommendation of the Joint Select Committee, which was in these words:—"In these circumstances the Committee think that it should be recognised from the commencement that Ministers may be expected to act in concert together. They probably would do so; and in the opinion of the Committee it is better that they should, and therefore that the fact should be recognised on the face of the Bill." Some Ministers have complained that, while anybody and everybody was free to communicate his views on the O'Donnell circular to the Government of India, they, *i. e.* the Ministers, were precluded from doing so, because their Governor took a narrow view of diarchy and would not consult them where a reserved subject was concerned. In another case a Minister had to threaten to resign before the Governor would allow him to choose his under-Secretary. A Governor has even been known to play a backward section of the Legislative Council against his Ministers, who could not except in special cases depend on the official votes either. They thus depend on a highly precarious and shifting majority. The United Provinces Council presented to a scandalized India the spectacle one day of an Executive Councillor speaking against a Minister and on another day the spectacle of a Minister requesting his own Secretary not to move an amendment to which he, the Minister, had not given his consent. In the same province for many days a Councillor and a Secretary were openly accused, without eliciting any satisfactory reply, of canvassing members of the Legislature against the District Boards Bill which had been brought forward by a Minister. The fact that no notice is known to have been taken of these incidents by the Governor would seem to lend colour to the suspicion that he rather enjoyed the confusion of the Minister in the circumstances. In Madras, where the evils of diarchy are the least felt, the desire for complete provincial autonomy is the strongest. One of the Ministers of that province said the other day:

"I am Minister of Development *minus* Forests and you all know that Development depends a good deal on Forests. I am Minister of Industries without Factories, which are a reserved subject, and Industries without Factories are unimaginable. I am Minister of Agriculture *minus* Irrigation. You can understand what that means. How Agriculture can be carried on extensively without Irrigation in the hands of those who are

responsible for it is rather hard to realise. I am also Minister of Industries without Electricity, which is also a reserved subject. You all know the part which Electricity is playing in the development of Industries now-a-days. The subjects of Labour and of Boilers are also reserved. But these after all are some of the defects of the Reform scheme."

A half and half system is naturally productive of friction and wears out the nerves of those who have to work it. Members of the services are not the least loud in demanding that the system should be developed to the full. It seems now to serve no useful purpose. No one, official or non-official, has questioned the efficiency of Ministers or their ability to manage the reserved services if these should be entrusted to their care. The public will long remember the indiscriminate arrests of a few months ago and the high-handed use in certain place of section 144 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, and they no longer wish to have such powers exercised by officers without fear of being called to account in the house of legislature.

These remarks should not be interpreted as amounting to a wholesale condemnation either of diarchy or of the machinery of which it forms a feature. An enumeration of the good work accomplished by the popular side of our Local Governments would be cheerful reading. Here is a summary, by no means careful or exhaustive. Ministers in all the provinces have to their credit legislative measures which will redound to the country's advantage. I need instance only a few in order to show how successful they are in initiating new policies in their respective departments. It is an unfortunate circumstance that Ministers were called to administer these departments just when financial difficulties became very serious; and therefore naturally the first reforms to be effected were those which did not entail much outlay of money. For instance, municipalities and district boards have in most provinces been placed on a popular footing. But Ministers have not shrunk from undertaking large schemes of expansion involving heavy increases in expenditure and thus facing additional taxation. Some of the measures introduce bold new departures in policy which would have been almost inconceivable in the old régime. I would give the first place among these to Dr. Paranjpye's Compulsory Education Act, which replaces the optional compulsion of the Act of 1918 by absolute compulsion and seeks to universalise primary education in the whole of the presidency within ten years. When the whole scheme is completed, it will throw an additional burden upon the provincial exchequer of more than three quarters of a crore every year. Mr. Chintamani has introduced in the United Provinces excise reforms calculated to effect a very drastic reduction in the consumption of alcohol, etc. In the Bombay Presidency Mr. C. V. Mehta has not yet been able to complete his inquiry into this question, but he has already introduced a reform which, if small in itself, initiates a new policy

substituting direct for indirect checks on consumption. In Madras Ministers have adopted the policy of giving judicious State aid to new or nascent industries and have put in hand several other measures of no small benefit to the province. Reform of old universities and the establishment of new ones are taken in hand in several provinces. These and other measures of the kind are the first fruits of the popular control over transferred departments, for which we the Constitutionalists need not blush.

It is not meant that diarchy has been a pitfall to the feet or a fetter to the limbs of Ministers. But it has serious defects, as has been pointed out. It has served its purpose as a test and as a preparation. It is now a clog and an irritation. The demand for its removal comes from many sides. The satisfaction of the demand will go far to allay public discontent and ease the tension between the Government and the people. The Legislative Assembly has lent its countenance to the acceleration of the march of India's constitution. No risks need be apprehended from the grant of full autonomy to the provinces, except the loss of two Councillorships in the bigger, and one Councillorship in the smaller, provinces to the Indian Civil Service.

If at our next election the matter is properly placed before the constituencies, there can be no doubt of their giving a mandate to their representatives to try and secure provincial autonomy as early as possible. A legal difficulty occurs to me. Supposing the question of provincial autonomy were raised by a private member in a legislature in 1924, and a resolution were moved asking that representatives be elected to an all-India Convention for the purpose, would the Governor be justified in disallowing the resolution? I am informed that the law would permit him to do so. At the same time the law would not stand in the way of his allowing the resolution either. So that it would be largely a question of how thoroughly the constituencies had been educated in the matter and what momentum the demand for provincial autonomy had gathered. If our non-co-operator friends would not indulge in the violent fun of breaking up of other people's meetings, but cheerfully help in the good work, the prospect would by no means be gloomy. Should any Governor, however, be obdurate, the elected members of the legislature could still obey their mandate by meeting at their own instance without fear of their proceedings losing moral authority in the eyes of reasonable people.

THE 10-YEAR LIMIT.

Speaking a few months ago to a meeting of Bombay Liberals, I expressed my opinion of the provision regarding the appointment of a statutory commission after ten years. The obvious interpretation is that while Parliament must appoint a commission at that time there is nothing to prevent a commission issuing before that period. During the Commons debate in 1919 Mr. Montagu explained the point clearly in these words: "If

there is a remarkable and unforeseeable development in Indian conditions in the short space of ten years, it does not tie the hands of Parliament in any way whatever. There can always be a commission appointed in the interim." On another motion Mr. H. A. L. Fisher delivered himself of a similar opinion: "May I point out that there is nothing in the Bill which prevents revision taking place before ten years, but there must be a revision at the expiration of ten years? If it be true that great progress will be made, and if it becomes obvious that the transferred subjects are being handled wisely and effectively to the satisfaction of the Indian population by the Indian Ministers, then there is no obstacle to a revision at an earlier period than ten years." Let it be remembered that in the original proposals of Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford it had been suggested that a fresh transfer of subjects should take place at the end of five years. It would be pedantic, it would be inexpedient, nay it would be a political blunder against which it is our duty to warn Government, to prolong the trying period of transition unnecessarily, to allow the sense of grievance to deepen until it becomes a danger and to refuse to rectify an error which actual experience has exposed in the divided constitution of the provinces. I therefore commend a suggestion which our honoured leader Sir Sivaswamy Aiyar has made at the end of his article in *The Nineteenth Century and After* in these words: "The least that should be done by the Government in the present circumstances is to send out a small but strong committee of statesmen and constitutional lawyers to ascertain on the spot how the system of diarchy has been working, what defects have been brought to light, and what remedies could be devised to promote smoothness and efficiency in working." Before, however, the present conservative government would take this step, they would have to be convinced that the constituencies in India desired it strongly and had expressed their desire in the usual way at election time.

REFORM AT THE CENTRE.

This, however, is not the whole of our demand. At the last session this Federation of Liberals asked in addition that the Central Government should be brought under popular control in all matters except ecclesiastical, political and defence. Perhaps that resolution would be repeated at this session. When I presided earlier in the year at the meeting of Bombay Liberals, I ventured to express a feeling of hesitation with reference to this demand and indicated my grounds for the hesitation. But I promised at the same time that in a matter of that kind, where the difference was not one of aim or principle but of temporary expediency, I should consider myself bound by the superior wisdom of the party. Sir Sivaswamy Aiyar, a safe man, if there is one in our ranks, has pleaded cogently for popularisation of the Central Government in the article from which I have already quoted. An argument that appeals to me is contained in the following sentences. "The Central Legislature has enorm-

ous voting power, but absolutely no responsibility. But for the fact that the Government has displayed the greatest possible tact and the members of the Legislature great self-restraint, and that both sides have been anxious to make the Reforms a success, there would have been a deadlock several times during the course of the last year and a half. It is impossible for the Government to adopt any bold policy in any matter, legislative, administrative or financial, for the reason that they cannot be certain beforehand of the amount of support that they are likely to receive in the Assembly. The divorce of power and responsibility, which was regarded as the greatest defect of the Minto-Morley scheme, is perpetuated in a magnified form in the Central Legislature at the present moment." I have likewise endeavoured to ascertain the views of as many men of our party as possible and I find that, although some share my hesitation, opinion preponderates heavily on the other side. Let me therefore fall in publicly with the majority view. After all, when the provinces have attained to autonomy and assumed responsibility for peace and order, the Central Government cannot long lag behind. Its responsibility to the constituencies must arrive inevitably, and the sooner the better.

While agitation for these important advances is in progress, each day will bring its own problems. I see members of the Assembly are bringing up a motion for the abolition of the distinction between votable and non-votable items of expenditure. The non-votable items far exceed the limits which are compatible even with a first instalment of the power of the purse. What is almost a humiliation to the Government and Legislature alike is that the salaries and pensions of persons appointed by the Secretary of State in Council and of Chief Commissioners and Judicial Commissioners should be excluded from the scope of the Assembly's vote or discussion. The correct principle is for the Imperial Government to guarantee the salaries and pensions only of those officers who are appointed by the Crown. It is little short of a slight to treat as sacrosanct enormous sums taken from the taxpayer and payable to junior officers reaching down in some cases to below Rs. 500 a month. We know that, when responsible government was given to other communities, due provision was made for British services. But then this demand is not that the Government of India should be made absolutely responsible, and the Governor General in Council has overriding powers for exceptional cases. Serious objection would likewise be taken to allowing military expenditure to be voted by the Assembly. We admit that expenditure depends on policy and military policy it would be premature for the Assembly to attempt to lay down or regulate. But the difficulty is all the creation of the executive. If they had used their irresponsible power with moderation and kept the military budget within the limits of reason, the revolt against budget exclusions would not be so strong. But as it is, a desperate situa-

tion can only be met by a desperate remedy, and as the Assembly consists of human beings and not of angels, the Government might find that they had presumed too far on what was once euphemistically described as the Indian's faculty of unlimited acquiescence.

FORMATION OF PARTIES.

There is also much in the working of our constitution which cannot give cause for satisfaction. In no case has responsibility been brought home to a Minister. When a Minister was recently defeated in a certain province over an important Bill on a transferred subject, he neither resigned nor was called upon to resign. The country would perhaps have welcomed a proof that the Legislature not only has the power of dismissal in law but can actually exercise it on adequate occasion. It is with profound grief that one records the impression that in the Punjab and Madras the majority has shown that it cannot be trusted to treat the minority with fairness and equity. The evil in the southern province is bound to be felt for a long time yet. May I from this place appeal to my friends, Dewan Bahadur Kesava Pillay and C. Ramalinga Reddy, to use their undoubted influence so that the bitterness may be assuaged and the younger generation grow up in an atmosphere of less strife and contention? One may venture to think that there is no need any more for non-Brahmin leaders to spread the unloving gospel, "Do not vote for the Brahmin, never trust the Brahmin." No clear definition of parties has yet been evolved, except in the Assembly, and there for a wonder the Democratic party glories in having no leader. No leader, no discipline—is an axiom in political organization. In the country at large people are mostly under the spell of that pious doctrine of inexperience, unity. A vague hankering after a reconciliation of all parties and the honours of a universal peacemaker is the dominant characteristic of a considerable number of men in public life, of attractive personality and decided talent, but unwilling to recognize that Indian politics have come into a phase of reality in which unity is not only impossible, but a sure sign of inefficacy. The apparent advantage of being free to embrace what is for the time being convenient stands in the way of most people labelling themselves Moderates or Extremists, Liberals or Non-co-operators. As soon as the votes are polled and the names of the successful candidates announced, it ought to be possible, as in other countries, to calculate the exact distribution of parties in the legislatures. Not knowing how many their followers are, Ministers, supposed to represent the non-official part of the legislature are compelled to look upon the official nominated element as the nucleus of their voting strength, hoping by individual negotiation to beat up a few more recruits on each occasion—a most distressing situation for those who are expected to build up the strength of the popular party. How dare we talk of full Parliamentary

institutions so long as nine out of every ten politicians will refuse to take a name, be classified or acknowledge a leader? As to the education of electorates to which our venerated leader, Sir Dinshaw Wacha, draw our attention last May, nothing much seems to be doing. Even if special popular lectures on civics should prove impracticable, and there is no reason why they should do so, the practice might at least be started of members going down to their constituencies after the rising of Parliament and speaking to them on what has been done or may be done. Our new constituencies cannot be expected to compel the attendance of their representatives for some time yet; the representatives should regard it as their duty to keep them fully informed as to the state of public affairs and legislation. The lesson will soon have to be learnt that nothing of more than ordinary consequence could be done in Parliament without the wish of the electorates on the subject having been specifically ascertained. Besides being illiterate, ignorant and desirous to be let alone, the ordinary elector is liable to be gulled by the demagogue and persuaded to vote for the person who makes the most intemperate speeches and the most extravagant promises. The education of the electorates even in advanced countries is a never-ending process. When I was last in London during the season of the recent General Election, I heard no remark so often as this—that a large number of men and women had come into the registers for the first time, that they had no experience, and no calculation could be made as to how they would vote. Candidates, whether successful or not, and when successful more than otherwise, must remember that this is more their duty than that of others. The situation is devoid of hope so long as the bulk of our legislators grudge the few weeks at a time they give to public business and, as soon as Parliament rises, do not think of going to their electorates and rendering an account of their doings, but run back to their business, briefs or lands.

ORGANISATION OF OUR PARTY.

I will now ask your leave to say one or two words about our party. It would perhaps be best to clear the ground of two criticisms. We have from the very nature of the case to answer charges from two opposite ends. Our extremist countrymen complain that we have merged ourselves in the bureaucracy and must be held responsible for their blunders, high-handedness and repression. Our answer must be firm and frank. So long as they will proclaim war on the established government, talk openly of revolution, inculcate disloyalty and rash political action and send about the country a committee of men of influence with the express object of finding out the prospects of a campaign of civil disobedience, we must sternly disapprove and stoutly oppose. So long as they preach the gospel of despair, they command neither our assent nor even our sympathy. So long as they boycott the present constitution, pook-pook

the reforms and talk of wrecking the Councils, there is no common ground between us and we can have nothing to do with them. Officials and organs of official opinion deplore our lack of organisation and vigorous propaganda. We must admit the truth of this charge, though we are not without excuse. But when they attack us for indecision of thought, fear of unpopularity and a tendency to take up the most violent and passionate cries of the extremists and echo them feebly, thus affording no constant support to Government, we must repudiate the charges as unfounded. Our business is to promote our country's welfare, to enlarge her political status through the present constitution, to secure her ordered progress and compatibly with these aims, but not otherwise, to support Government. When government officials go beyond the necessities of the case and become indiscriminate in repressive measures, threatening to stifle the very spirit of agitation, we will not hesitate to condemn their action. When the Secretary of State abuses his irresponsible power in disregard of the Indian taxpayer, we cannot but protest. When we are faced with a prospect of stagnation while there is so much to do every day in the direction of preparing the Indian people for self-government, we must give solemn warning. We are prepared to let our leaders accept office and help the officials when they carry out our policy and our aim. We will oppose and thwart them when they neglect or defy our wishes. It is amazing how they expect us to stand by them when they do us harm as well as when they do us good, in their excessive military expenditure, in their high-handedness, in their hesitation to afford Indian talent every possible opening for employment in the highest and most delicate spheres of work, seeing that in no long time Indians must be prepared for self-government. Our British brethren must understand this clearly. Every day we shall ask, what has been done to-day towards the advent of Swaraj? Of every officer we shall inquire, does he realize that he is here to fit our people for self-rule? Of every rupee of ex-

penditure we shall require to be satisfied that it was unavoidable and in the interests of India. We believe in the ideals of the Britannic Commonwealth, we cherish our connection with it, trusting that our equal partnership therein, which has been admitted in theory, will soon be translated into fact in all essentials. We believe in the efficacy of peaceful and constitutional methods, and in the pursuit of our high aims we are upheld by the consciousness that they have been admitted as proper and legitimate by the highest authority. And as our motto is *Ordered Progress*, we do not despise compromise in public affairs, provided it is honourable, advances the present position and does not bar further progress.

The first requisite of a party organization is the maintenance of a list of members who are prepared to own themselves as belonging to the Liberal Federation, to subscribe to its principles and to pay a certain prescribed fee periodically. The second requisite is to appoint a leader for all India and for each province every year, who will be entitled during his period of office to speak for the party, to treat with Government on behalf of his party, to call meetings of the Executive when necessary for the purpose of determining policy or action, to bring up matters of discipline when they are of more than ordinary importance, and to be consulted before individuals in the party or groups make serious pronouncements or adopt definite action on important occasions. It would be well to adopt the term leader, for it would carry the right to lead and therefore signify real business. 'President,' on the other hand, suggests mere dignity and may go to the man of wealth or social standing and is no good for our present purpose. He should be placed in funds so as to command secretarial facilities. The third requisite would be a general fund, both for propaganda and electioneering purposes. This, however, would be very slow in growing and we need not be discouraged by it.

had begun. Every mile of railway pushed inland helped on the one hand to bring the cheap, foreign manufactured goods of all kinds into the local market, and on the other to take away what food-stuffs and raw materials could be got to the seaports for export. Indigenous handicrafts could not hold ground against machine-made goods, and the only thing the millions of craftsmen of all sorts, dislodged from their occupations, could do was to add to the number of the tillers of the soil. With the advent of the new era of iron and steel and natural motive power, handicrafts largely died in other countries also, but in place of the old occupations countless new occupations arose. There were the coal mines, iron mines, other mines; there were the smelting works, foundries, iron and steel works, shipyards, all manner of factories and workshops and the transport, banking, insurance and other commercial activities based upon this industrial development. In some countries like England the new era dawned largely through private enterprise and individual initiative. In others like Germany, Italy and notably Japan, the State took an active part in training the people in the new processes and in getting industries of the new type to take root in the country. It was in less than forty years that a complete economic modernisation was consciously brought about by the State. In India, however, the handicrafts began swiftly to die in the new era of railways and steamships, but the people did not know how to open out new channels of employment. Our wooden ships, for instance, were swept off the seas, but we did not know how to build ships of iron or steel, and it was nobody's business to teach us that. Thousands of miles of railways were built in this country, but the vast variety of railway plant and stores were all imported ready-made. We never learnt to make these things out of our own mineral resources in this country. We started some cotton and jute mills, but we never learnt to make the machinery needed in them. The iron and steel and the machinery-making industries which form the backbone of all modern industry and commerce were not established in this country and, therefore, the superstructure of other industries and commerce connected with them never rose. Hence it was that our millions of unemployed craftsmen only swelled the number of cultivators. That only made matters worse in agriculture, for it meant excessive subdivision and fragmentation of holdings and progressive increase in agricultural indebtedness; and the yield of the soil could not improve much under such conditions, in spite of improvements in the arts of cultivation.

This is what happened recently in our country and yet it could have happened otherwise. Suppose, for instance, that the State had decided to construct railways only as fast as the requisite stores could be manufactured in this country out of our own natural resources and as far as possible, with the labour of our own countrymen, the speed of railway construction would probably have been much

slower, at least in the beginning, than it actually was. But the most vital stimulus to the industrial modernisation of the country would have been given by the establishment of the basic industries of iron and steel and machinery-making. Other industries and trades would naturally have grown up around them because of the initiation of the people of this country into the new methods of manufacture and organisation. The slowness of railway construction, in so far as it was inevitable under this policy, would have given a breathing-space for the economic readjustment of society to take place. This pioneering by the State in the industrial field with a view to supplying its own wants in the form of railway and other stores could have been achieved without the use of any protective tariffs whatever on imported goods. And once the new industries were naturalised in this country, the State could easily have withdrawn from actual manufacture of the stores it needed and stimulated the new indigenous concerns by its patronage. The unsettlement of the economic equilibrium of this country would very probably have been successfully prevented by the adoption of such policy of State initiative. There would have been no undue pressure on the soil and we would have been to-day as much of a manufacturing and commercial nation as is France, the United States or Japan.

But, it is said, railway construction was rushed in this country because of the experiences of the Mutiny of 1857. To that it need only be replied that a railwayless country would be at least as great an inconvenience to the rebels as it would be to the guardians of law and order; so that if on other grounds it had been considered desirable to go slow with railway construction, it need not have been rushed for this particular purpose, especially in a disarmed country like India.

It must be admitted that slow growth of railway construction would have meant delay in the birth and growth of national consciousness, of perhaps a couple of decades or so, and similar delay in certain other matters of general enlightenment. The question merely is whether this price was worth paying if the slowness of railway construction could be utilised for the purpose of naturalising modern methods of industry in this country and preventing a sudden economic unsettlement.

Protests were often made by Indian public men against the policy of rapid railway construction adopted by the State; but what was urged upon the Government was not that railways should be constructed entirely, or as far as possible, out of Indian-made stores, but that less money should be spent on railways and more on irrigation. The fact is, our public men did not realise the significance of the manufacture of railway stores in this country.

Lastly, it may be urged that the State in India could certainly not be expected to adopt the policy of active initiative in industrial matters,

when its general policy was that of *laissez-faire* in consonance with that of the British Government. Now, whatever may have been the policy of the British Government, the State in India, whether in the time of the Company or the Crown, always followed the policy of active initiative. Only, the latter was confined to certain domains. Speaking of economic matters alone, it was the State which was largely responsible for the introduction and naturalisation in this country of tea, coffee, jute, cinchona plantation, quinine manufacture, certain varieties of cotton, groundnut, sugarcane and wheat. The Government savings banks are an instance of the State initiative in the commercial field. The history of the agricultural departments, Central and Provincial, during the last twenty years in particular shows what State initiative can do in training even an illiterate people in new methods of work, through agricultural schools and colleges, experimental farms, practical demonstrations, cattle shows, dairies, agricultural exhibitions, lectures, pamphlets, cinema shows, lantern slides and what not. Had it not been for the rapid increase in the pressure on the soil of the craftsmen all over the country thrown out of employment by the speedy construction of railways through ready-made imported stores, the results of State initiative in agriculture would have been more encouraging than they were. But it was not a policy of *laissez-faire*, anyhow.

R. M. J.

A LETTER FROM LONDON.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

LONDON, DECEMBER 7.

CONSTITUTIONS FOR CROWN COLONIES.

CONSTITUTION-MAKING is in the air. It seems to be our most prolific manufacture during these last few years. First there was the case of the Indian Reforms Act of 1919, about which, of course, there are many conflicting opinions. Then there was the case of Kenya Colony, which has caused the gravest dissatisfaction to the Indian residents and the people of India. Then came the case of Malta, which was so pleased with its grant of self-government that it actually had a series of stamps overprinted with the phrase "Self-Government." Now the Irish Constitution has been finally passed and come into effect. It will be followed by constitutional changes in the West Indies; and Ceylon, too, is under consideration. As regards Ceylon, I understand on excellent authority that the Colonial Office, under the stimulus of Mr. James Peiris and his colleagues who are expected here shortly, is taking the matter of constitutional reforms up in the very near future. I should not be at all surprised if the new heads at the Colonial Office are none too happy at the legacy left them by their political predecessors or by the Ceylon Administration. It cannot be pleasant to find that the atmosphere is charged with resentment at the recent events that caused so many of the elected members

of the Colonial Legislature to resign their seats by way of protest. In spite of Mr. Ormsby Gore's attitude of non-possumus, in reply to Colonel Wedgwood's plea for going back upon the recent decisions, I should not wonder if his private feelings lay in the direction of wishing that what has been done had not been done. At any rate, it is certain that those who go to him in order to urge substantial reforms for Ceylon will not be met with official reticence or with a blank refusal. His sympathies are generous, and he will pull his full weight with the Government here. This applies, too, to the suggestions that have been made with regard to constitutional reforms in the West Indies and British Guiana. As to Kenya, he tells us that new proposals have gone out to the Governor, that the segregation schemes involved in the town-planning proposals at Kampala and elsewhere in Uganda are being suspended pending the replies that he hopes soon to receive, and I am confident that the Colonial Office will have a good deal to say, under the new regime, in securing a satisfactory settlement that was so impossible of achievement whilst Mr. Winston Churchill presided at the Downing Street office. It seems strange that the Minister who has done so brilliantly in trying to bring into existence the Irish Free State should have failed so egregiously in his dealings with non-Europeans. It must be attributed to the fact that Mr. Churchill believes himself to be one of God's Englishmen, and therefore one of the elect of the world.

Mr. Saklatwala is intent upon establishing his position as a master of irrelevant loquacity. Nobody quite knows what he is arguing about when he is on his feet in the House of Commons, which is vastly amused by his excursions into the realms of oratory enforced by somewhat peculiar gestures. He kept the House in roars of laughter between three and four a. m. on Tuesday this week by talking irrelevancies, some of them about his conception of Indian affairs, on the question of whether the Sudan should have a vote for the encouragement of cotton-growing or not.

INDIA IN PARLIAMENT.

Mr. Ormsby-Gore told Sir Charles Yate that the question of future administration of Aden is still under discussion, and that he was not able to make a statement on the subject. He informed the house that the Government of India will be fully consulted before any action was taken. Sir Edwin Stockton, one of the Manchester members elicited the information that the Government of India had not yet forwarded their views on the Report of the Indian Fiscal Commission, and that in the meantime it was not proposed to make any communication to them. Col. Yate was much worried that it should have been suggested that Indian political prisoners should be differently treated from ordinary prisoners, and Lord Winterton kindly offered to show him the report of a debate in the Assembly on the subject which would illuminate the gallant Colonel's mind. Mr. Morel was told that

the Indian Fiji delegation's report was at present under the consideration of the Government of India, but it would be necessary to consult the Indian Legislature before any decision was arrived at. Sir Charles Yate wanted to know what steps were being taken, as a result of events at Multan, to secure a proper percentage of British magistrates being always available for duties arising out of religious and racial conflicts, and what that percentage was to be. Lord Winterton was unable to satisfy the baronet's curiosity. On the question of the desirability of requiring the taking of an oath of allegiance as a condition of service in all the various public services of India, including the members and servants of municipal authorities, Lord Winterton pointed out the difficulties imposed by the Promissory Oaths Act, 1868, and the Indian Oaths Act, 1873. He did not think it would be useful to repeal one Act and not both, and that a very big question of policy was involved in imposing on the officials of all municipalities in this country a similar oath. He referred his questioners to the Leader of the House if they wished to get an Act of Parliament passed. Questions were also answered by Mr. Ormsby-Gore on the subject of the treatment of mitsai children in Hongkong and the use of Chinese labour in Nauru, under the Mandate.

MR. MONTAGU AT THE CAMBRIDGE UNION.

Though out of office, Mr. Montagu never loses an occasion of keeping India's claims before the public. He had an opportunity of doing so this week in a debate at the Cambridge Union, of which he is an ex-President. He spoke fourth on the following motion: "That this House regrets the Indian policy of the late Government as being against the best interests of the British Empire." The proposer was Mr. A. A. Hope, an Oxford man, who was opposed by the retiring President of the Union, Mr. Ian Macpherson. The third speaker was Mr. Ian Colvin, a well-known antagonist of the Reforms and all things connected with them. As an old Anglo-Indian, he charged Mr. Montagu with having merely changed the old economical efficient Government into an uneconomical and inefficient Government. The forces of disturbance which he had unleashed were, he declared, bringing Mr. Montagu the inevitable reward of the doctrinaire politician. Mr. Montagu had no difficulty in dealing with his opponents. He said that they had done no more than issue an invitation to men of education in India to interest themselves in their own country and destiny. Was not this better than stagnation? The late Government had felt that the logical outcome of British effort in India was complete self-government. To this there was but one alternative—permanent benevolent subordination. There had been nothing sudden and nothing illogical in the policy that he had furthered. The criticisms that the step towards self-government had come at an inappropriate time and been effected by a bad method were illegitimate. He had learnt in seventeen years in

the House of Commons that those who waited for the proper method and the proper time could wait for ever. Then it was often better to do things too soon than too late, and in 1917 the time was ripe for a declaration of policy. Efforts then made to frame a new constitution for India brought a greater endeavour from the princes and people of India towards winning the war. The other side of the House, he said, adopted that strange doctrine that diversity of population prevented the country from obtaining unity. Nobody could see what the ultimate form of government would be in India—this must be left to the Indians themselves, but it would probably be a quasi-federal system formed on some provincial unit. The atmosphere in India had been aggravated by the consummate folly of the Allies' treatment of the Turkish question. He then paid a compliment to the Indian Civil Service but remarked that self-government implied that it must be turned into an executive instrument. Thus opportunity of the Service to help India was to-day greater than ever. The idea that the Indian who proved himself capable of performing an equal task with an Englishman should be barred on account of race was wrong. There had been talk of caste in India; but let us, he urged, not introduce such a system in our dealings with our fellow-men from India. There was a glorious common work awaiting Englishmen and Indians alike. There was no doubt as to the nature of the response, for the motion was defeated by 330 votes to 104, or a majority of 226.

Mr. Jehangir Petit leaves by this mail on his return to Bombay. He has been spending some weeks in this country under medical orders, and is going back home very much better for his treatment here.

CORRESPONDENCE.

INDIANS IN NEW ZEALAND,

THE following is an extract from a private letter received by the Rt. Hon'ble V.S. Srinivasa Sastri. The letter, containing as it does, some constructive suggestions may be of interest to the reader.

SIR,—I would very much like to see an improvement in the position occupied by your countrymen here in New Zealand; but until they make some attempt themselves to raise their status, I am afraid it will be difficult to do much for them. You will, I feel sure, readily understand my meaning. They come here and the first thing we notice is that they take on the occupation of scavengers and immediately they go down in public estimation. How true it is that the world accepts people at their own valuation and no matter how high that valuation may be, it is accepted, so long as they deliver the goods.

The only suggestion that I can offer at present is the appointment of a representative, a well educated, sympathetic and tactful man, preferably an Englishman who has spent considerable time in India, with deep knowledge of Indian character and trend of thought and with a wide knowledge of Indian languages, one the Indian can go to with confidence and can state his case, seeking assistance in the removal of disabilities or any other trouble that may crop up. I know I am asking a great deal, but I think it the only way and surely the Indian Government can afford the salaries and incidental expenses for half a dozen such men and I feel sure there are many such men in India who will willingly devote their talents

in such a worthy cause. Being British subjects, you cannot appoint a Consul, but I see no reason why a competent representative should not be appointed.

Another suggestion. Would it not be possible to enlist the sympathies of some of the wealthy Indians to form a Financial Syndicate, with the object of assisting Indians into businesses? The funds could be placed in the hands of the suggested representative provided he was a business man, and shops could be rented or leased or businesses purchased and the Indian or Company of Indians placed in charge, and the business nursed until it showed profits, when the cash advanced could be repaid gradually as per arrangement. To show my meaning, I will give an outline of what the Chinese are doing. Their Syndicate bring out their countrymen paying passages, poll-tax of £100 and finance them into a business and standing by them until the business pays, then they commence to draw in their capital, and I can assure you that they do prosper.

J. H. BETTANY.

4, Konini Road, Mataiti,
Wellington, November 9.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

From S. Ganesan, Madras.

MACSWINEY, TERENCE: PRINCIPLES OF FREEDOM. 1922. 7½ × 5. pp. ix & 196. Rs. 2.

MAHATMA GANDHI: YOUNG INDIA, 1919-22, with a brief sketch of the non-co-operation movement by Babu Rajendra Prasad. 1922. 7½ × 5. pp. lxiv & 1199.

From Ganesh & Co., Madras.

GANDHI AND THE ANGLICAN BISHOPS.: 1922. 7½ × 4½. pp. 64.

From the All-India Congress Khaddar Department, Bombay.

KHADDAR WORK IN INDIA: Report of work from 13th May 1922 to 12th August 1922. 1922. 8½ × 5½. pp. 103. 8 annas.

From the Talbot Press, Dublin.

BURCA, P. DE. & J. F. BOYLE: FREE STATE OR REPUBLIC? Pen pictures of the Historic Treaty Session of Dael Eireann. 1922. 7½ × 5. pp. 93. 2s. 6d.

O'HEGARTY: A SHORT MEMOIR OF TERENCE MACSWINEY with a chapter by Danniell Corkery. 1922. 7½ × 4.

From J. B. Target, Geneva.

ROY, MANABENDRA NATH: WHAT DO WE WANT? 1922. 8 × 5½. pp. 43. 4 annas.

From the Reception Committee, Ahmedabad.

REPORT OF THE 30th INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, held at Ahmedabad in 1921. 1922. 13 × 8½. pp. 124 & 13.

From the Leader Press, Allahabad.

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE NATIONAL LIBERAL FEDERATION OF INDIA held at Allahabad in Dec. 1921. 1922. 13 × 8½. pp. iv & 96.

CUT ME OUT

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

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

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

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

PUBLIC SPEAKING AND DEBATE.

Rs. A.

- The Art of Extempore Speaking, or how to Attain Fluency of Speech.** By Harold Ford, M. A., LL. D., D. C. L. 12th Ed. Enlarged and revised 15-
- The Chairman's Guide and Secretary's Companion, with useful hints for the Conduct of business and social Gatherings of all kinds** 3-
- The Chairman's Manual, being a guide to the Management of Meetings in General and of Meetings of local Authorities, with separate and complete treatment of the Meetings of Public Companies, By Gurdon Palin, of Gray's Inn, Barr-at-Law, and Earnest Martin, Fellow of the Chartered Institute of secretaries** ... 4 13-
- How to Conduct a Meeting, Standing Orders and Rules of Debate. Parliamentary Practice explained and adapted for the use of local Governing Bodies, Labour Organisations, etc.** By John Rigg 3-

Theosophical Publishing House.

Adyar

Madras.

AND

INDIAN BOOK SHOP

55 Meadows Street.

Fort, BOMBAY.

BEST REMEDY

'Eminent Doctors of England, America, Africa nay of every part of the world, admire and strongly recommend to the sufferers, our infallible Cure for Gonorrhoea, Gout, Syphilis, Impotency and Granulation (eye diseases). If you want the surest cure for any, please apply with 2 annas postage for particulars to:—

G. R. KHORANA,
LYALLPUR.

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

- | | Rs. a. p. |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Indian Economics—
(4th edition). Featherweight paper Demi.
8 vo. pp. 700. Cloth Bound. Revised & enlarged. | 8-0-0 |
| 2. Gokhale and Economic Reforms—
Crown 16 mo. pp. 250. Cloth Bound. | 2-0-0 |
| 3. Indian Administration—
(4th edition). With additional chapters on the Reforms Act. Demi. 8 vo. pp. 528. Cloth Bound. | 3-0-0 |
| 4. The Reforms Explained—
Demi. 8 vo. pp. 100. | 1-0-0 |
| 5. Indian Industrial and Economic Problems—
(2nd edition). Crown 16 mo. pp. 340. | 1-0-0 |
| 6. India's War Finance and Post-War Problems—
Crown 16 mo. pp. 164. Cloth Bound. | 2-0-0 |
| 7. Currency Reform in India—
Crown 16 mo. pp. 120. | 1-0-0 |
| 8. 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.

FOR terms of Advertisement, please apply to the Manager, SERVANT OF INDIA, Kibe Wada, Budhwar Peth, POONA CITY.