

THE Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY.

VOL. VI, No. 1.]

POONA—THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1923.

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

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	1
ARTICLES :—	
Lord Peel's Despatch	4
The Services Commission	5
The Delhi Session	6
" Without Precedent. " By A Student of Constitutional History	8
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
A Pathway to Social Reform. By G. R. Hingnekar... ..	11
MISCELLANEA :—	
Mr. Sastri's Speech on the Royal Commission for the I. C. S.	12

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

WE warmly congratulate Sir William Marris, the new Governor of the U. P., on the excellent beginning of his administration. One of his very first acts was the withdrawal of the Criminal Law Amendment Act and now he has announced, in opening the present session of the Legislative Council, a general amnesty to all political prisoners except one who was guilty of incitement to murder. Both these measures were recommended by the Legislative Council in its session of October last and passed without a division in spite of Government opposition, which was particularly strong to the granting of amnesty. In thus giving effect to the wishes of the Council Sir William Marris has carried out the spirit of the Reform Act, for which he deserves our special thanks at a time when the India Office is by no means setting a good example. Political disturbances due to non-co-operation were stronger and more numerous in the U. P. than in other provinces, and if in spite of that fact the local Government has been able to take these conciliatory steps, there is no justification whatever for other Governments not doing the same.

At Question Time. THE SERVANT OF INDIA, we notice, was quoted in the Assembly on January 17th in a series of questions put by Rai Bahadur G. C. Nag and based on our " Railway " articles of July 20th, Aug. 10th, 31st, Sept. 21st and 28th. The point we raised on the present practice of charging strategic railways to the general railways budget is now apparently "under the consideration of Government" and we trust will not be lost sight of when the next budget is considered. As regards the fact, which we thought we had established, that third class passenger

traffic pays handsomely whilst first class passenger traffic is run at a loss, Mr. Innes asserted that it was "not possible to apportion the net profits earned by railways in respect of the different classes of passenger traffic." Surely a somewhat surprising statement to make in the face of the very precise and detailed table of figures contained in our issue of September 23, 1922 and in the absence of any attempt on the honourable Gentleman's part to prove these figures incorrect or misleading. The matter cannot be dismissed quite as airily as that and the gravity, not to say scandal, of the present situation surely demands more than a mere "as advised at present, Government do not propose to take action."

* * *

Purchase of Stores. THE appointment of Mr. Dadiba M. Dalal to be India's High Commissioner in London will now at last quieten the fears entertained in Indian commercial circles that in placing orders for this country British firms were still being unduly favoured despite the sound policy laid down by the Government of India that the High Commissioner should purchase supplies for India in a market where, quality for quality, it can be had cheapest. No specific instances of favouritism have, we believe, yet been cited since the inauguration of the new policy in the matter but complaints are loud that the principle laid down for the High Commissioner's guidance is not observed in practice. These complaints were voiced last week by Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas in the Council of State and only drew forth another assurance from the Government that the policy was being loyally carried out. *Prima facie*, the complaints do not appear to be without substance, for it was given out in Parliament only recently—and the news is said to have been received by the British manufacturers with much alarm—that in £ 20¾ millions worth of rolling stock purchased in foreign countries for Indian consumption England's share was no less than 17½ millions. Now, by all accounts, Germany is able to supply railway material much cheaper than England. For instance, the *Morning Post* of 5th inst. says that Germany is selling locomotives in South America at half the price the United States can sell them, and less than half the price at which they can be sold by England. This statement is borne out by the practice of other countries which are required to go to a foreign market for the purchase of railway material. In

Russia, for instance, the special Railway Mission sent out by the Soviet Government to purchase material for the reconstruction of Russia's railway system had placed orders abroad to the value of 397 million Swedish kronen (approximately £ 24 millions), of which 242 millions were placed in Germany, 118 millions in Sweden and only 21 millions (about £1,250,000) in England. That is India partitioned England to the extent of 84% of her total supplies, while Russia did so only to the extent of 5%. There is nothing to show that Russia had any special reason for benefiting Germany at her own cost or that she had any particular antipathy towards England. These figures go to strengthen the suspicion that undue preference was being shown to England. There is no doubt that the new High Commissioner, who has already secured the confidence of the commercial classes, will promptly correct such abuses as may be found to exist in his office and will give complete satisfaction to India.

Communal Representation in the Services.

WHATEVER relaxations may be allowed on communal grounds in the lower branches of the public service, in the higher branches the rule must be strictly observed that the recruitment thereof shall be governed solely by considerations of merit. The pity of it is that the retrograde recommendations of the last Public Services Commission have already impinged upon this principle and thus made resistance to further attacks a hard task. That was the source of the difficulty in which the Home Member and other official members found themselves in the Legislative Assembly *vis a vis* Col. Gidney's resolution. It may perhaps be thought that, in accepting definite proportions as regards the Indianising of the services, the Indians had already committed themselves to the communal principle in the appointments to the public service. But this becomes necessary only because the Government insists upon maintaining in England the venue of the competitive examinations which even now are the chief, and should be the only, source of recruitment. When this is changed, as it should be, and the examinations are held in India, there will no further need of prescribing any minimum proportion of Indians in the services. The best method of keeping the superior public offices free from any taint of communalism or any other extraneous influence is to constitute the Civil Service Commission provided for in the Government of India Act, giving the Commissioners a tenure equivalent to that of High Court Judges and thus preserving their independence of the Executive Government.

"SMASH the Councils into smithereens," still remains the battle-cry of Mr. Das. Indeed it cannot be otherwise till he breaks loose the bonds by which he is tied to the policy of non-co-operation. But he is saddled with the *damnosa hereditas* of the past and is unable to shake himself free from it. In a speech

he made in Bombay he declared that non-co-operators like himself and the men of his party were bound, on entering the Councils, to pursue a policy of pure obstruction and must therefore be prepared to oppose even beneficial measures, thus sacrificing what could be obtained by constructive statesmanship in the hope of obtaining swaraj. This opinion, however, that the Councils should be penetrated in order to be destroyed, does not as yet represent the collective decision of the Dasite party, though it is not improbable that Mr. Das and Pandit Nehru, the most weighty members, will exert a decisive influence in favour of it. Mr. Kelkar, on the other hand, after some faint attempt to show that his party also was in favour of offering wholesale opposition in the Councils, has now come off the fence and declared in his paper that he and his friends are now going definitively to revert to the late Mr. Tilak's Amritsar policy (December 1919) of "responsive co-operation," which was subsequently defined by Mr. Tilak in the manifesto of his party as one of "unhesitating co-operation or constitutional opposition, as it may be expedient for the occasion. So far as the group which Mr. Kelkar represents is concerned, the past three years are to be blotted out of its existence altogether and therefore the non-co-operation policy is also to be liquidated. This group, however, has little influence with the Dasite party as a whole, and is solicitous for nothing more just now than to be tolerated in the party. Hence it is that Mr. Kelkar, instead of trying to hammer out something like a uniform and coherent policy for the Dasite party, actually boasts that the policy of that party is as variegated as the rainbow itself.

Kenya.

THE position in Kenya is again as acute as it ever was in its recent history. The white settlers are organising themselves under their notorious leaders to resort to physical force in order to prevent legislation taking effect, should Indians be given equality with them by the order of the Colonial Office. "Physical pressure would only be resorted to," we are blandly told, "to show that persuasion exerted was meant to be acted upon." The Indians on their part are equally determined to assert their rights and are preparing for the non-payment of taxes. When it comes to a matter of exerting 'persuasive' pressure we have no doubt that the Indians will be able to do it much more effectively than the white settlers, being numerically and economically much the stronger community. We have every hope, however, that the Colonial Office, now that it is no longer under the unprincipled direction of Mr. Churchill, will not allow itself to be bluffed or frightened into suspending the execution of the equality resolution of the Imperial Conference of 1921 on which rests the future solidarity of the British Empire. The Indian community in Kenya has hitherto shown exemplary patience in the face of the utmost provocation. It is but natural that they should sometimes feel that their patience was

not appreciated but interpreted as weakness. They seem to be swayed at present by such a feeling. We would however implore them not to be overcome by it, though the provocation is very great indeed. They have hitherto shown a moral superiority to the white settlers, which under all circumstances they will do well to maintain. Moreover, the fact that the whites are protesting against the continuance of Major Ormsby Gore as Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies should convince them that he is standing firmly by justice and their cause a further proof of which is afforded by the postponement of the next elections till the question of Indian representation is settled. As early as 1920 the Indians were resolved on non-payment of taxes, but kept their resolution in abeyance on the advice of their best friends. We hope they will now also listen to similar advice and strengthen the hands of the Government of India and of Major Ormsby-Gore and other friends. Patience under trying circumstances is not a sign of weakness but of strength.

Opposition vs. Obstruction.

SOME persons confound the obstructive policy advocated by the Das party with the opposition generally offered by His Majesty's Opposition in Parliament; but there is all the difference in the world between obstructive tactics employed for the purpose of bringing the Government machinery to a dead stop and the leadership in constructive criticism of Government policy which the Opposition signifies. This distinction is thus expressed by an organ of the Labour party, which has now assumed the duties of the Opposition in England:—

We believe that it is the duty of an Opposition to oppose, but we do not interpret that often-quoted sentence to mean that it is the Opposition's duty to obstruct. Labour does not feel that it has been given a mandate to bring Parliamentary institutions into discredit, or to impede the dispatch of necessary public business, or to interject bitter personal criticism of other people's manners into the orderly debate of public questions. It realises that its business is to show that our representative institutions can be made to work efficiently and smoothly, and to prove that zeal for the people's welfare is not inconsistent with respect for Parliamentary forms that have living roots in the history of democracy.

Constructive Criticism & Destructive Tactics.

INDEED, the aims of these two policies are not only divergent, but flatly contradictory. The obstructive policy aims at the destruction of the constitution; so far is this from being the aim of the Opposition that the *Manchester Guardian* can truly speak of the Leader of the opposition as "generally acting as a sustaining buttress to the first pillar of the constitution." The Leader himself, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, shows in the *New Leader* how different is the objective of his party from that pursued either by the Irish party under Parnell or the Fourth party under Randolph Churchill. He says:

In both instances the reaction upon Parliament was to put it on its defence, a profound mistake if a party is not out to destroy Parliament. The Labour party should follow neither precedent. It wants Parliament to work; it wants to use rules so as to increase the opportunities of a body of men full of constructive ideas. It must not put

Parliament on the defensive: it must enlist Parliament to fight with it. It may have to obstruct in order to show its teeth, but obstruction can never become its policy. It aims at restoring interest and reality to Parliamentary proceedings. It is like a good workman taking a pride in his tools. It is going to develop things, but not the destructive thing. It is to make Parliament respond, not by protective and limiting rules, but by more freedom and more energy. It is to restore power and initiative to the private member by showing him how he can work in a team of active and keen men who will make Parliament go fast and smoothly. We are constitutionalists, not because we are craven and fear revolutions which some people like to talk about, but because we believe that in the only sense that revolutions are good this is the surest way to bring them about. Parliament to us is not a fetish, it is a good instrument—bad if we are bad and if the country is bad, good otherwise.

* * *

IT was, we must confess, a good "Civil Disobedience" stroke of policy for Mr. C. Rajagopalachar and other leaders of the Congress to utilise the unfortunate turn that took place in the Near East Conference at Lausanne at the time of the Congress gathering in giving to the so-called constructive programme of non-co-operation something of the dynamic quality that it so far lacked altogether. The Mahomedans were urgent with the Congress for making a big push in the aggressive activities of the national movement in view of the desperate crisis that had occurred in India's fortunes, and the Congress responded by making a call on the country for 25 lakhs of rupees and 50 thousand volunteers—for carrying on a campaign of civil disobedience. It was a good gesture and it satisfied the Mahomedans. But now, pressed to disclose their intentions, the Congress leaders are saying that the money and the workers would be used not in inaugurating civil disobedience, but only in pushing forward the constructive programme mapped out at Bardoli and Delhi. No amount of urgency, they say, can make the country fit for activities for which it is as yet unfit; all that an emergency can do is to call forth greater effort on our part to prepare ourselves for the ultimate struggle; and what better preparations towards that end are possible than to push on the constructive programme? So it would appear that, without making any substantial change in the direction of its energies, the Congress is enabled by this move to make khaddar and other uninspiring items of work somewhat attractive to the youth by investing the latter in martyr's garments. We do not regret this unexpected development in the Congress policy; rather we rejoice at it. For we would ourselves like to see forwarded by all possible means the constructive programme of the Congress which (at any rate so it seemed till yesterday) has no guts in it. If it now comes to have some appeal to the Congress workers because of its association with a militant programme, which, however, will never come off, we have no quarrel whatsoever with this clever exploitation of the ebullition of feeling at Gaya. But the mortification of the Dasite party can only be imagined at the utilisation of the "Army of Civil Disobedience" for conducting propaganda against the Councils! For the Council-boycott is also one of the activities in which the civil revolt volunteers will engage, and for most volunteers, we suppose, it will be principal activity. No wonder that the *Mahratta* thinks that the civil disobedience stunt is employed by the Congress only to undermine the influence of the Dasite party in the country.

LORD PEEL'S DESPATCH.

THE excitement of the public in the country at large caused by the publication of the Secretary of State's despatch on the extension of reforms cannot reach the intensity of the excitement caused by the speech of the late Prime Minister. In the first place, the public mind is somewhat jaded by a succession of excitements; in the second place, the despatch has been too long delayed; and in the third place, its contents have been more or less known for some time. Viscount Peel naturally makes some play with the fact that the Legislative Assembly had had only one session when it demanded further advance. No serious emphasis could have been laid on the experience gained in a two-month session or on the success that had attended it. A plea of that sort would have justly drawn ridicule on itself. The proper interpretation of the Assembly's action was to be sought in the widespread feeling among Moderates, no less than among Extremists, that the reforms fell short of expectation and of the capacity of the intelligent classes in the country, and in the natural desire of the first Assembly, as soon as it found its feet, to give public expression to that feeling. The Secretary of State seems to have overlooked two significant facts in connection with its resolution: first, the exact terms of the resolution were formulated by the Home Member, Sir William Vincent; second, it was passed without a single dissident or perhaps with one dissident. Surely the members of Government and non-official Europeans would not have assented to a proposition which was based upon a few months' experience of a new constitution.

The fact is that no one who lives amidst the realities of India and feels every day of his life the ever-increasing dissatisfaction of very large sections of the community, will agree to see the situation develop for ten long years along sinister lines, unless the need for delay could be justified on solid grounds. The ordinary Britisher in India would have doubtless liked an indefinite prolongation of the old régime, but once it was decided to abandon it, a good many persons must have felt that a full measure had better chances of success than a half measure, and that an administration based on two opposite ideals and looking opposite ways was foredoomed, if not to fail, at any rate to breed discord and discontent. It could have been easily foreseen that the pressure of the several houses of legislature with direct constituencies behind them would prove irresistible and that the existence of a large and powerful movement outside the legislatures which cried aloud for complete swaraj was bound to create a similar movement inside the legislatures as well, which, if not handled in a statesmanlike spirit in the beginning, might greatly aggravate the political situation later on. In not heeding the advice of the men on the spot Lord Peel and his advisers have not killed or materially weakened the

movement. It is only gathering momentum and seeking appropriate forms of expression. At our next election while each province will doubtless have its local issues, the candidates for the Assembly and the Council of State all over the country will certainly make constitutional advance the principal plank of their platform. The Government of the day will perhaps have the hardihood to resist even a demand made on behalf and with the consent of the electorates. In this case their triumph will be short-lived and the result will be what it has been under the British constitution in every conflict between the bureaucracy and rising nationalism. It is the old old story, "I will not give to reason but I must yield to compulsion."

The despatch makes the observation that the possibilities of the present Act are not fully exhausted and that the constitution is elastic. It can only mean that, on the one hand, the people and their representatives have not yet made full use of the powers conferred on them and that, on the other, if further powers were desired some of those at least could be conferred without Parliamentary legislation. Both these statements are true in part, though in our judgment they do not form a conclusive reply to the Assembly's request. For instance, the Legislative Councils have not insisted on the dismissal of Ministers whom they had defeated by decisive majorities. Ministers too have not acted together and asserted their collective authority as against the other half of the Government or the Governor. The Act provides for the transfer of more subjects in the Provinces by the Secretary of State in Council, but does anyone entertain a hope of Lord Peel taking the initiative in face of the clear recommendation of the Joint Select Committee of Parliament to the contrary? The authorities, whether in England or India, do not appear to have awakened to the truth that the most effective means of regaining the confidence of the country is of their own accord in doing things which could be done without invoking the sanction of Parliament. So far, however, from adopting a forward policy of that kind, the present Secretary of State seems to be bent on resuming even in detail the vexatious and harassing control of pre-reform days even in cases of agreement between the Executive and the Legislature in India. For him to speak of the unexhausted possibilities and of the constitutional advance that could be made by executive order is little short of mockery.

The other grounds adduced in Lord Peel's despatch are the inexperience of the electorates and of the Ministers. The electorates are, it is true, quite new to their task and responsibilities. The end of this year will put them to a severe test. Are they going to benefit by the Act which has created them by choosing those who have faith in it as their representatives or will they give their confidence to those who would seek the political salvation of India through wrecking the Councils and the constitution? It is

difficult to say, but the education of the electorates is a never-ending process and there is no instance recorded in history of political advance having been strictly regulated by the amount of wisdom or commonsense manifested by voters at the polls. There is no known standard by which to judge the fitness of electorates to bear responsibility. A student of human affairs who assigned full value to the terms of political science and did not know the large allowances to be made on account of human nature would perhaps pronounce the people of Great Britain unfit to judge of political issues if he watched the phenomena of a General Election. Our present electorates are small in comparison with the population. They will have to be widened at frequent intervals. There will thus be large accessions of untried electors for a long time to come and it is both futile and dangerous to arrest our march for that reason. As to Ministers, all the information at our disposal goes to show that they have done well in a novel and trying position and have nothing to fear from a comparison with the official half of the Government. At the time of the Assembly's demand for advance in September 1921, this statement as to the competence of Ministers could not obviously have been made. Lord Peel, however, had some experience to go upon when he wrote his despatch and we, who read it now, cannot attach any value to his doubt and hesitancy on that score.

In conclusion, we offer a few propositions to our readers in the broad light of political experience and not in the half-truths of political parlance. The provisions of the Act of 1919 do not embody the wisdom of an unselfish agency engaged in the political education of the world's peoples and have no relation whatever to the character of India's intelligentsia or their capacity for self-government. They represent a very human compromise between those who hold and those who seek political power and are no more than what the former found it absolutely necessary to yield to the latter. The Conservative Government refuse further advance to-day, because they believe that the moment of greatest pressure is gone and they can cry halt with impunity. Inevitably the reaction in India will soon be such that if the politically-minded classes who now seem to harken to the gospel of despair are led instead by those who understand constitutional forms and usages, the Assembly's wish will be fulfilled before the ten-year period is over and the position of India as a loyal and contented member of the British Commonwealth established on the basis of justice and brotherhood.

THE SERVICES COMMISSION.

THE decision of appointing a Royal Commission on the subject of the superior civil services in India has roused so widespread and deep a feeling of indignation and exasperation, that it was only natural that the Legislative Assembly should move the adjournment of the House to consider

this decision of the British Government, as it did on the 26th Jan. For what India to-day resents in this matter so strongly is the fact that this decision of the British Government has been arrived at in the teeth of unanimous opposition, not only on the part of the Indian Legislature, but of the Indian Government and even of the services themselves, at least in their higher branches. The attitude of the Government of India in this matter is indeed an open secret, and the Leader of the House, when challenged on that point, merely stated that a salutary rule made it impossible for him to divulge when and whether there was consent or dissent as between Whitehall and Simla. The European members of the Assembly, such as Sir Montagu Webb and Mr. Spence, all deprecated the appointment of this Royal Commission on the ground that public opinion in India was solid against it; and it was left to Col. Gidney and Mr. Jahiruddin Ahmed to raise their solitary voices against the motion for adjournment.

What then is the necessity of that Commission? We are told that it is to enquire into the organization, the financial and general conditions of the superior civil services in India and the best methods of ensuring and maintaining the recruitment of Indians and Europeans, having general regard to (1) the maintenance of the present standard of administration, (2) the declared policy of increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration, and (3) the experience gained of the operation of the Government of India Act. Now if an enquiry on these lines of the services is deemed necessary by Lord Peel, how can he almost in the same breath declare, as he did in the just published despatch of November 2nd, that from a general political point of view no enquiry into the experience gained of the operation of the Government of India Act is at all needed? If more time and experience are required in the one case, more time is needed in the other. The services have just had substantially better terms given to them, so that it cannot be pleaded that the urgency of their case demands immediate redress. Again, if something is needed to inspire suitable English candidates with the requisite confidence to the career of the I. C. S., one fails to see how the findings of a Royal Commission can provide this, if at the same time the legitimate political aspirations of Indians are left in suspension. Until the latter are satisfied, no steel-frame rules about the services can be devised, however definite and rigid, so as to withstand the cumulative pressure of popular demands and natural development. The services themselves, we believe, recognize that their ends are badly served by still further exacerbating inter-racial feeling at this juncture and that the passions which cannot but be fanned further into flame by the enquiries of this Royal Commission, will but tend to make their work in India still more difficult.

There seems certainly so nothing ludicrous in the spectacle of an Inchcape Committee trying

desperately to find a way, not merely towards economy but towards retrenchment, and at the same time of a Royal Commission being charged to safeguard the present standard of administration, without a word of reference to the financial and general conditions—not of the services, but of India herself. The efficiency standard of the present administration may be the 100% of perfection itself; the standard of the Indianized administration may go down to 50% or to zero: what is the good of an ideal theoretically attainable, if the means are lacking of translating it into practice? If conditions are such that we can have only half a loaf, what purpose is served by a disquisition on the nutritive value of a whole loaf? Nobody pretends seriously that a wholly Indianized service will be impossible: the only point ever raised is, that its efficiency will be somewhat less than the standard set by the British Administrators now in India. Even granting that latter point for the matter of argument, the real question is not a choice between a whole loaf and half a loaf, but a choice between half a loaf and no loaf at all; and therefore the first thing to enquire into is the financial capacity of India: but of that basic need there is no hint in the terms of reference of the Royal Commission decided upon by Lord Peel.

Sir Malcolm Hailey, on rising to reply, said that he had to meet, not facts, but suspicions. But that in itself, to our mind, damns the appointment of the Commission. For these suspicions remain: that a Tory Government is trying with the help of a Royal Commission, composed of men of its own way of thinking, to saddle India forever with a burden impossible for her to bear and to entrench securely in the heart of the services a sufficient body of men, who will make India safe for the I. C. S. It is well indeed, therefore, that the Assembly should have taken the first opportunity of voicing its protest, which is the protest of the whole of India, against this warrantable interference of the Secretary of State, who by his action has given one more proof of how greatly the spirit has changed—even if the letter is still being observed—since Mr. Montagu was thrown to the wolves.

Nothing now remains but for Indians to strain every nerve to get their point of view adequately represented before, and recorded by, the Commission which is to be set up; so that any advice which may be tendered by a majority of that Commission may be deprived of its deadly effect by the counterweight of the best opinion that India can produce and one proportionate to the excellence of the case which India possesses.

THE DELHI SESSION.

(FROM OUR PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)
DELHI, JAN. 26th.

AMENDMENT OF THE CR. P. CODE.

WITH the assembling of the Council of State on the 24th, the Parliamentary session here may be said to have got into full swing. The Legislative Assembly indeed has been at work since the 15th,

but its main business hitherto has been and still is the consideration of a Bill further to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1898. This measure being of a highly technical nature, it has made as a matter of course a very strong appeal to the members of the legal profession sitting in the Legislative Assembly and has evoked, clause by clause, subsection by subsection, all the weighty and searching criticism of which their forensic acumen is capable. But just because the nature of their business is so highly technical, the debates have not been able to arouse the general interest even of the members of the House itself, let alone of wider circles. This could not well be otherwise and it would indeed be tedious to go into the details of the debate: but it should be said that the drawing out of the consideration of this Bill is mainly due to an endeavour on the part of members to restrict the large discretionary powers of Government and to enlarge the liberties of the subject—although one cannot help feeling that even the most carefully drawn-up provisions are neither a guarantee of a sympathetic attitude with Indian popular aspirations on the part of the officials concerned nor an adequate substitute in its absence.

* * * * *

THE SINK OF WAZIRISTAN.

The Council of State has so far not overworked itself. After a—rather short—morning on its opening day and another—quite as short—morning on the day after (the 25th), it adjourned until the 29th: there being no business, until the Assembly has finished its consideration of the Criminal Procedure Code Bill. The first morning included answers to questions: and amongst the facts elicited there were figures for the cost of the Waziristan, &c. operations (fourteen and a half crores incurred in 1920-21 and seven crores in 1921-22); of the Fiscal Commission (thirty-three lakhs); and of the Inchope Committee (Rs. 80,000).

* * * * *

EMIGRATION TO MALAYA AND CEYLON.

Of tabled documents the most interesting were the draft notifications specifying the terms on which emigration to Malaya and Ceylon is to be allowed. These drafts make a continuation of the present Kangany recruiting possible and, as far as Malaya is concerned, the only new provision is one for the free repatriation (for sufficient reasons) of an emigrant within one year of his arrival in Malaya. Ceylon in addition is to be bound to the enactment of statutes making illegal (1) contracts for service exceeding one month; (2) the recovery from the emigrant of any part his emigration expenses; and (3) the recovery of any payment made in India to enable an emigrant to pay off his debt. The—significant—reason why these three provisions are not made in the case of Malaya is of course that in respect of emigration to Malaya all the three points mentioned are already illegal and have been so for years. Finally both draft notifications contemplate the appointment of an "Agent"—the term under which

a Consular Officer of India in these two Crown Colonies is being referred to. One only trusts that the appointment of such an officer will not remain optional but will be made by the legislature incumbent on the Government of India; for it is obvious that the presence of such an officer will do more to check abuses and safeguard the welfare of our fellow-countrymen abroad, than could tomes of the most precise and meticulous rules and regulations. And the only other hope one would express in this connection is that the posts of "Agents" abroad will not only be filled, but filled by Indians. The Standing Emigration Committee, to which Mr. Sastri has just been appointed an additional member, will meet to-morrow to consider emigration to Mauritius.

* * * * *

PURCHASE OF STORES.

On the second day of its present labours, the Council of State considered two Resolutions, the first of which dealt with the purchase of stores in England and was moved by Mr. Lalubhai Samaldas. The mover referred to the questions which inevitably are being asked in the British Parliament, whenever any order for India is placed elsewhere than in Great Britain, and to the general suspicions in Indian circles that tenders are "manipulated." Mr. D. T. Chadwick's reply was that the High Commissioner was nowadays so bound by the well-known order of December 22nd, 1921 that there was no question of orders being placed otherwise than purely and strictly on business lines; and he gave such an authoritative, definite and emphatic denial of the existence, to the contrary, of any secret or private instructions or of any correspondence on the subject between Whitehall and Simla, that the mover asked for leave to withdraw his resolution.

* * * * *

SERVICES COMMISSION.

The second resolution was moved by Mr. V. G. Kale and called for all the correspondence recently passed between the Secretary of State and the Indian Government "on the question of the improvement of the conditions and prospects of the Indian Civil Service and other Imperial Services, especially in connection with the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the matter". But a dramatic turn was given to the proceedings by Sir Malcolm Hailey who forestalled the moving of the Resolution by the announcement that the Royal Commission in question had been appointed and that its terms of reference included not only the pay, &c. of the Indian Civil Service, but also the extent of the application of the Preamble of the Reform Act to the Indianization of the Services. But Mr. Kale, in view of the strong feeling in the country against any further Royal Commission on the subject at this juncture, felt unable to follow the Home Member's invitation to withdraw his resolution and considered it of importance that the country should know how the very cogent reasons put forward on this side against further

Commissions, for which there was no money and which only tended to embitter feelings, had been met by the Secretary of State. Mr. Sastri made the point that the distinction between the Government of India and the Secretary of State for India was a real one, embodied in the Reform Act and in the convention which had grown up to the effect that, if the Indian Legislature and Government agreed, the Secretary of State, though disagreeing, would not interfere. This convention had been scrupulously observed by Mr. Montagu and the tendency should obviously be in the direction of further strengthening the independence of the Indian Government, as enjoined by the Joint Committee. From every point of view it was important that Indian opinion should know how far it was being espoused by the Indian Government and he therefore hoped that the full correspondence would be published. The resolution was eventually put to the vote and negatived by 15 votes to 10: but it was only to be expected that the matter would not be allowed to rest there, but would be taken up by the Legislative Assembly, as it did the following day. Feeling on the appointment of this Royal Commission is running very high and may well lead to startling developments.

* * * * *

COMMUNAL PRINCIPLE IN THE SERVICES.

The course run by two Resolutions moved the day before in the Assembly was a good deal more satisfactory. Mr. B. Venkatapati Raju moved that 25 scholarships of Rs. 4000 p. a. be granted for research work in any part of the world to Indians of promise, so as to fit Indians to replace by and by the foreign experts still necessary to-day. This motion was eventually agreed to unanimously. The other resolution was moved by Col. Gidney "that the present system of examinations for the I. C. S. be changed so as to give a fair chance to candidates belonging to different communities and provinces." Colonel Gidney professed that he was merely actuated by a desire to prevent monopoly, but speakers were not slow to twit him with the virtual and notorious monopoly which his community possess in certain branches of the public service. Mr. N. M. Joshi had no difficulty in showing that if certain communities were handicapped educationally, the proper course was, not to ask for a waiving of qualifications, but for special educational facilities. The idea of services being recruited, not according to competence and efficiency, but according to the 1001 sections of the people of this country is indeed ludicrous in its practical impossibility. Some of the speakers on the mover's side got lost in a consideration whether competitive examinations were the best test whereby to discover efficiency for the services, although the real point at issue was not, how the efficiency was to be ascertained, but whether efficiency was to be the basis for selecting candidates in future. Sir Malcolm Hailey read out the rules on the subject and admitted that it was difficult to say from

their perusal whether or not Government was in favour of communal representation—so nicely balanced was their judgment in the matter. Indeed it seemed so nicely balanced in the case of Sir Malcolm himself that when the division bell rang, it was not apparent whether the Government bloc would vote for or against the Resolution, or indeed vote at all. Perhaps the idea of a "change" turned the scale: anyhow the Government members eventually went with the Noes, with the result that the 48 Noes had it against the 27 Ayes of Colonel Gidney and friends.

* * * * *

COMMISSIONS IN THE ARMY.

One more resolution the Assembly attacked—that of Mr. M. Yamin Khan who wished "to get King's Commissions for Indians by direct recruitment and by promotion from the rank of Viceroy's commissioned officers in such numbers that all vacancies in the Indian Regiments be in future filled by such Indian officers only till all Indian Regiments are wholly Indianized." The mover tried to show that his proposal was not aiming at anything very drastic, since, if it took an officer 25 years to reach the rank of Colonel, it was clear that, even if his resolution was being given effect to at once, no elimination of the senior ranks of British officers in Indian regiments could be expected for another quarter of a century. He pleaded that at least as an ideal to work to, his proposal should be accepted by the Commander-in-Chief. Lord Rowlinson in his reply was sympathetic and courteous and but could only regret that the Government scheme should not have matured yet and still formed matter of correspondence between Whitehall and Simla. He also explained how for lack of education and attainments officers holding Viceroy's Commissions could not take the place of those holding King's Commissions. But when one considers that King's Commissions in the Indian Army are held by 3925 British and by only 68 Indian officers; that admission to the Navy and Air Force is confined to those of European descent; that there are only 23 Indian cadets at Sandhurst and none at all at Woolwich; that the Dehra Dun College at present prepares 38 boys and contemplates a maximum of only 70; one may well feel Lord Rawlinson's exhortation to be somewhat superfluous that India should not attempt to run, before it was able to walk; and can but echo a member's ejaculation: "Let us at least walk!" The debate on the subject shortly afterwards terminated suddenly on account of a meeting of the Executive Council, which made the presence of Government members in another place necessary; and so the matter had to be left for the time being.

"WITHOUT PRECEDENT."

"From what I have seen of the Legislative Assembly I can say that it has given a very good account of itself. . . . I do not, however, base any claim for further advance on the experience gained by the Assembly. To my mind the strongest argument in favour of it is the inherent weak-

ness of the present constitution."—Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru.

"The comparison always presents itself to me, steeped as I am in the traditions of the Government at Home based upon Parliamentary majorities, of the position of the Viceroy and his Government in India. I find myself in the difficulty, as perhaps may also have occurred to Lord Lytton and possibly to Sir Harcourt Butler, of being the head of a Government which is always in a minority in the Legislature unless the Government can manage to persuade the members to support it. I shall not dilate upon the difference in the position at Home, but it makes ours at the head of Government much more difficult than under the former system. We have not the advantages of whips who ascertain the feeling of members and duly report. Neither can we resort to various devices used for the purpose of persuading those who otherwise might be recalcitrant, but we remain watchful, hoping that members will vote as we wish and if not, as is sometimes the case, we must then determine the course we should pursue, and perhaps sometimes the most difficult problem is whether we should pursue any course at all."—H. E. Lord Reading.

IN Lord Peel's despatch on further constitutional advance perhaps the argument which will have the greatest amount of plausibility for the average reader is, that it is impossible for Parliament to entertain a proposal for the extension of a constitution which has been in operation for only nine months; it was nine months when the proposal was made: now it is two years; that it is altogether without precedent that the authorities should scrap, after so short an interval, a limited constitution designed to cover a period of transition in favour of a wider one. As it turns out, however, there is a precedent in British colonial history for such a rapid change, and, what is more, the change in question was effected on that occasion for precisely the same reasons for which a further constitutional advance is being advocated by Indian politicians. When, after the Boer war, peace was concluded at Vereeniging, the British Government promised to the Transvaal the grant of complete autonomy under the British suzerainty—not of course immediately, but at an early date. Immediately the military administration in the annexed territory was to cease and civil government to be established; then as soon as circumstances permitted, a representative system was to be introduced, leading up to full self-government. The intermediate stage of a representative constitution was prescribed by way of probation, and the ultimate grant of responsible government was to be the reward for the training the Boers would acquire in the art of democratic government during the period of transition. It will be seen what a close parallel this is to the famous announcement of August 1917 in regard to India. Three years after the treaty the Imperial Government announced that in its opinion the time had come, not yet for full self-government after the Canadian model, but for the convenient half way house of representative institutions under the control of the Lieutenant-Governor. A full fledged constitution had been demanded by the colonists, but was refused by the British Government in the following dispatch of the Secretary of State for the Colonies:—

The terms of peace to which I have referred contemplate representative institutions leading up to self-government. By self-government is meant, of course, the system under which not only legislation, but the very existence of the Executive is based on the consent of the majority in the Legislative Chamber. His Majesty's Government are aware that large sections of the people in the Transvaal have expressed the view that self-government in this sense should at once be granted; but they think now, as they did when the terms of peace were made, that some time, although not, they hope, a very long time, must still pass before the people of the colonies recently annexed after a long war should be entrusted with so great a control of their destiny.

In the mind of the British statesmen (it has also been mentioned in the correspondence of the time, I believe) the provisional constitution was to last for some three years, after which full powers of self-government were to be conferred on the Transvaal. In the meanwhile letters patent were issued on 31st March, 1905, granting a representative constitution. The latter provided for a Legislative Council of one chamber containing not fewer than six or more than nine members nominated by the Government, and not fewer than thirty or more than thirty-five elected members. And yet, within fifteen months thereafter, the Campbell-Bannerman Ministry, which had succeeded the Balfour Ministry, annulled this constitution (familarly known as the Lyttleton Constitution from the name of the Colonial Secretary) and introduced in the Imperial Parliament on 31st July, 1906, a new constitution bestowing full self-government on the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. The colonial history of England is thus not without a precedent, as alleged by Lord Peel, of one constitution being superseded by another within the course of a few months.

To us, who are now in the enjoyment of a constitution analogous to the Lyttleton Constitution in the whole domain of the Central Government and in that of the reserved services in the Local Governments, the two conflicting political theories which guided the respective policies of the Conservative and Liberal Governments must be of profound interest. The Conservatives were in favour of the gradual method, and the Liberals in favour of the *per saltum* method, in allowing political liberty to the Colonies. The former believed that if any Colony had outgrown the Crown Colony form of Government, it must pass through an intermediate stage of representative government before it could advance to responsible government. A representative government, in which the administration would be under the guidance of an independent executive must be, they said, a necessary preliminary, for a time, to a responsible government in which the executive remained in power only so long as it retained the confidence of the legislature and gave place to another as soon it had lost that confidence. That was the ordinary course of constitutional development and devolution which had been pursued in the British Empire. Canada, Cape Colony, Natal, New Zealand, Australia—all had attained the self-governing status by these steps

and had passed through the probationary stage in which England "held the citadel by means of the British Executive" and ascertained for the latter's guidance the true will of the colony by a democratic suffrage. Representative institutions must therefore precede the introduction of responsible government. Thus ran the Conservative theory. The Liberals, on the contrary, maintained that this was not the right course of evolution; that the only possible alternative to a Crown Colony government was full responsible government to be attained in one step. For the representative system, under which the elective members, being in a large majority, have to deal with a nominated Executive over which they have no control, can only lead to a maximum of friction between the representative Assemblies in the Colonies and the Home Government. Nor does such an intermediate stage afford any real training to the colonials, for it concedes power without imposing the sobering influence of responsibility. As Mr. Churchill epigrammatically put it in the course of a debate on the Transvaal Constitution, it surrenders the machinery of power but preserves the whole burden of responsibility and administration. The Liberal Ministers could quote in their support authorities like Adderley and Durham, now regarded as almost conclusive on the subject.

The hybrid constitution of transition times which was conceived only in the idea of training Colonists to self-government, Crown Government with embryo representative institutions in the womb, here [in Natal] as everywhere else, fails to satisfy or to control people. It excites an appetite without even preparing for its satisfaction, and provokes opposition without a vent for its action short of revolution.—*Sir Charles Adderley, afterwards Lord Norton.*

It is difficult to understand how any English statesman could have imagined that representative and irresponsible government could be successfully combined. There seems, indeed, to be an idea that the character of representative institutions ought to be thus modified in colonies; that it is an incident of colonial dependence, that the officers of Government should be nominated by the Crown, without any reference to the wishes of the community, whose interests are entrusted to their keeping. It has never been clearly explained what are the Imperial interests which require the complete nullification of representative government. But if there be such a necessity, it is quite clear that a representative government in a colony must be a mockery and a source of confusion. For those who support this system have never yet been able to devise or to exhibit in the practical working of colonial government any means for making so complete an abrogation of political influence palatable to the representative body. . . . The Crown must submit to the necessary consequences of representative institutions; and if it is to carry on the Government in unison with a representative body it must consent to carry it on by means of those in whom that representative body has confidence. . . . It was an unhappy consequence of this system that it relieved the popular leader of all the responsibilities of Opposition. . . . The colonial demagogue bids high for popularity without the fear of future exposure. Hopelessly excluded from power, he expresses the wildest opinions, and appeals to the most mischievous passions of the people, without any apprehension of having his sincerity or prudence tested by being placed in a position to carry his views into effect.—*Lord Durham.*

It would not be altogether unprofitable to take a few excerpts here from the speeches made on the Liberal side in the debate on the South African Constitution.

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Prime Minister, said :

Experience has proved in the past that an intermediate stage has not been favourable but the reverse. We have more than once thought we were doing well in the course of our colonies when we gave to a particular colony what is called a representative government, by which I understand a system of creating a representative body, but which does not give that representative body full power over its own affairs. We have introduced an intermediate system of that sort on several occasions, thinking it would be as it were a schoolmaster to bring the colony to a proper sense of the use of full powers, but it has been found to be exactly the reverse, to work in exactly the opposite direction, to breed friction and dissension between the governors and the governed, and to create sectional differences in the population, and I believe myself it is safer and better in every way to give responsible government at once, and that that therefore is the best form of education, if education is wanted, to which the population of a colony can be subjected.

Lord Loreburn, the Lord Chancellor, observed as follows :

You have at present Crown colony government. That is one alternative. Does any noble Lord think that they will long be content with Crown colony government in the Transvaal? It was given up by the late Government, on the ground that they felt that the pressure on the part of the population was so great that it could not, with propriety, be perpetuated. Broadly, Crown colony government is hopeless. But I understand it to be suggested that we should continue to act as a kind of Providence to the people of the Transvaal, not letting them govern themselves, but governing them wisely and so promoting reconciliation and amity in the future.

It comes practically to this, that nobody is an advocate of Crown colony government. What is the other thing suggested? Representative government by the Lyttleton Constitution. The difficulty of that, as of all other representative governments which are not responsible, is that the responsibility falls upon the Home Government, and the power of harassing abides with the Colonial Assembly. Let me just put this for one moment, in order that noble Lords may follow what a danger and difficulty there was. You were to have a representative Assembly with five or six nominated members and thirty to thirty-five elected members. The elected members could do as they pleased; they had an enormous majority. They were not permitted to displace a Minister, or to stop his salary, but they could stop supplies. That was the constitution of the Lyttleton letters patent. I say that was dangerous in the last degree. It would have created friction far more than anything else; it would have meant three or four years of friction or disturbance, and then all wise men would have said, after there had been an interval in which racial and every kind of feeling would have been exasperated, "The thing is hopeless. We must come to responsible government." Therefore, that remained the only course. . . . There is no human being who can suggest an alternative to responsible self-government.

Lord Elgin, the Colonial Secretary made the following remarks :

I can understand a denial of representative institutions, but I maintain there is nothing more impolitic, that there is nothing more cruel, than to insist upon an intermediate period of unrest, uncertainty, and intrigue.

Mr. Winston Churchill, the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, put the point thus :

That Constitution (i. e. the Lyttleton Constitution) conferred very great and wide powers. It conferred upon an overwhelming elected majority the absolute power of the purse and control over legislation. But it has always been my submission to the House that that constitution had about it no element of permanence, that it could not possibly have been maintained as an enduring, or even a workable, settlement; and I am bound to say that when I read the statement that this representative government stage would have been a convenient educative stage in the transition to full self-government, the whole experience of British colonial policy does not justify such an assumption. The system of representative government without responsible Ministers, without responsible powers, has led to endless friction and inconvenience wherever and whenever it has been employed. It has failed in Canada, it has failed in Natal and Cape Colony. It has been condemned by almost every high colonial authority who has studied this question. . . . I contend that the right hon. Gentleman's Constitution would have broken down in its first session, and that we should have been forced to concede grudgingly and in a hurry the full measure of responsible government which, with all due formality and without any precipitancy, the letters patent issued last week have now conferred.

The problems presented by the Montagu Constitution are in their essence similar to those presented by the Lyttleton Constitution and demand the same solution—the conferment of the Dominion status on India (in civil government if, owing to England's policy in the past, India is as yet unable to undertake her national defence). His Excellency the Viceroy and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru (who was till the other day probably the most influential member of the Government of India) have referred in no uncertain terms to the difficulties encountered by the Executive in working the present constitution. It is true that the constitution has not yet proved absolutely unworkable. On the contrary, so far the reforms have been worked with remarkable good-will on either side, though latterly one is beginning to have an uncomfortable feeling that the course of reforms would not in future be so smooth as before. With the authorities in England out of sympathy with the determination of the Viceroy to defer as far as possible to the Legislature, occasions will not be lacking when the inherent weaknesses of the present constitution will be exhibited and much friction and bitterness will result. If such a tone is once set, members of the Legislature will not take long in using all the apparatus of Parliamentary obstruction which the reforms have placed in their hands, and whatever the ultimate result of such a *dénouement* may be, it will really mean nothing short of revolution. By unnecessarily prolonging the transitional period of trial and by overriding the wishes of the Assembly in the meanwhile, Lord Peel is only furnishing "revolution fodder" to the Legislature. Is there no statesman even in the High Tory Government of the present day endowed with sufficient imagination to urge upon the British Parliament that the transition shall cease and that India shall be given, at least in civil administration, complete freedom to work out her destiny?

A STUDENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A PATHWAY TO SOCIAL REFORM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—Social reform is no longer the subject of controversy—at any rate in this part of the country—that it was in the days of Agarkar and Ranade whose efforts at social regeneration were opposed tooth and nail and by all means, fair or foul, by Mr. Tilak and his party who looked for political emancipation even at the expense of social regeneration. The Indian National Congress, which for many years studiously kept out social reform topics from its agenda, and other political organisations following its example, have begun to pass resolutions pressing for the removal of untouchability and for a reasonable treatment of our women folk. This is no doubt tantamount to a victory for social reform—a moral victory at any rate. But looking below the surface, we see that social reform has ceased to make any real headway and has almost come to a standstill. In my humble opinion, if the movement is to make any advance and achieve what it is intended for—social regeneration—we must change the methods followed so far.

My suggestion is that a conference should be held periodically to which chosen representatives of each leading caste should be invited to define our immediate objective and find out workable means to attain it. It will be a sort of round-table conference of the real leaders of the different castes—not of those who by their extreme opinions have lost the respect and allegiance of the general body of their castemen.

People from all communities will look up to this body and follow its deliberations with interest and regard. The power in social matters now usurped by one community or vested in a single individual like the Sankaracharya will be restored to it as a representative body. It will bring about harmony among the various castes by abolishing the privileges enjoyed by some and removing the injustices to which the others are subjected. Sitting shoulder to shoulder on a common platform with others, the representatives of the depressed classes will no longer feel depressed and will lay their case before others with earnestness and without bitterness. And it will be impossible for the representatives of other castes sitting round the same table to withhold sympathy from them or refuse to remedy their grievances.

A round table conference, like the one suggested above, will serve another great purpose. It will knock the bottom out of the mischievous part of the movement started by some of the so-called non-Brahmin leaders with a view to create bad blood and make life unbearable for a particular caste. It will provide us with a machinery which will work with the least friction and produce the best results.

I will anticipate a criticism. It may be said that such a conference will only perpetuate caste differences, that it is not calculated to abolish caste altogether. I admit that it is so and I do not quarrel over it. To me the abolition of caste is a distant goal. I fear the extremists of social reform are entertaining airy ideals like some of the non-co-operators. The caste feeling is still strong with us—with the best of our reformers even. I cannot think of five gentlemen of the Brahmin community who have given up caste altogether: that is, both in public and private life. Mr. V. R. Shinde of the Depressed Classes Mission—surely a social reformer if ever there was one—is still a Maratha—a liberal Maratha, if you please. What we want is rapid practical progress and I think it will be best achieved by the means suggested above. Problems like widow-marriage, dowery, infant marriage, &c. which are confined to certain castes only, should be attended to by the leaders of those castes. But problems of inter-caste importance such as untouchability, social dinners, the use of public schools, wells, &c. and the re-admission of converts or conversion to Hinduism, ought to be considered and solved by a common representative body. In the matter of inter-caste dinners, for example, there is a wide gulf between the meat-eating castes like the Marathas and the purely vegetarian castes like the Brahmins, Gujaratis, Jains and Lingayats. How is this

gulf to be bridged over? Not, surely, by ignoring it? A round table conference may be expected to suggest the best means or prescribe the limits within which interdining may be practised.

May I appeal, Sir, through your columns, to all social reformers to re-examine their ground and take my humble suggestion into their consideration?—Yours, &c.

G. R. HINGNEKAR.

Poona, January 29.

MISCELLANEA.

ROYAL COMMISSION.

DEMAND FOR PUBLICATION OF PAPERS.

RT. HON. V. S. S. SASTRI'S SPEECH.

THE Rt. Hon. V. S. S. Sastri in supporting Mr. Kale's motion said:

SIR,—It is a very difficult task to refrain from making any remarks on the necessity or otherwise of a Royal Commission. But I shall try to obey your ruling, as far as possible. The fact that the terms of reference are very wide or will be very wide, as indicated in a statement made by the Hon. the Home Member, is very important. The objections to a Royal Commission are greatly weakened by that fact. Nevertheless, the appointment itself of a Commission is so much at variance with public sentiment in India that it might be helpful to publish the papers as requested by the Hon. the mover of the resolution. I am not by any means sure that with the papers which will be submitted to the Royal Commission the papers now asked for would be published. As a matter of course, perhaps, their publication would be a point of significance in itself. The Hon. the Home Member took up a very natural position that he would not be justified in disclosing any difference there might have arisen between the Secretary of State and the Government of India in the course of that correspondence; avowedly or otherwise, the mere publication would disclose these differences and the Hon. the Home Member, with admirable self-restraint, resisted the temptation of enlisting the sympathy of India. But the public of India have a somewhat different point of view from that of the Hon. the Home Member, because the development of the Indian Constitution hereafter will necessitate for our purpose a complete discrimination to be made between the Secretary of State and the Government of India. We cannot afford to overlook that distinction. Anyway, it is of supreme significance to us that the Government of India should, as soon as possible, rise to its full stature as a Government over three hundred millions. Armed almost with unlimited authority but crippled constitutionally by having to consult the higher authority at the beginning, during the whole course and at the end of any important measure either of legislation or of administration, it is a thousand pities that the growth of the Government of India and its constitution should be delayed and hampered by the necessity of continued references to England. We who represent India have every right to ask that on all possible occasions the Government of India should be set fully upon its feet and should be able, in a regular constitutional manner, to set the wishes of the people of India above even the wishes of the Secretary of State in so far as their own views indicate that such a course is proper. Why, Sir, this distinction, repudiated with just emphasis by the Home Member, between the Secretary of State and the Government of India, is itself recognised by the declaration of August 1917. For, it is clearly stated, although in my view quite unnecessarily, that the future development of the Indian Constitution depends on the satisfaction afforded by progress here, both to the authorities in England and to the authorities in India—thus recognising the distinction between the Government of India and the Secretary of State and even the co-ordinates of the Government of India with the Secretary of State. But our interests lie deeper in this question. We desire, in expressing our disapprobation of the appointment of a Royal Commission, that it should take effect. But it cannot take any such effect if we beat the air and

attack anybody and everybody indiscriminately. We have got to concentrate on the party which we consider to have gone more decisively against the wishes of the people of India and we should like to know certainly what position the Government of India took up and how the Secretary of State either overrode their decision, or was in agreement with it. We cannot afford to let these facts be under a veil. They must be exposed to the public gaze of India. It has been recently stated over and over again, that the Secretary of State, in trying to set at naught the principle which was asserted by the Joint Committee that sat on the Bill of 1919, to the effect that when the Legislature and the Executive authorities in India were in concurrence, on any important subject, the Secretary of State should not, as a rule, interfere, unless imperial interests were involved. We should like to know whether the principle has been upheld, or been given the go-by in the conduct of the negotiations regarding the Royal Commission. It is for that purpose largely and not for the purpose of enquiring into the necessity of the Royal Commission itself, that we are concerned to ask that these papers be published. It is of importance to us to know whether this is also to be added to the list of cases in which the Secretary of State has set at naught that all-important principle of non-interference in cases of concurrence between the Legislature and the Executive in India. I am not, Sir, going into the other question of the Royal Commission itself, as you have ruled recently that it is not for us to raise the merits of that question and I do not do so. But I would rest my case for the publication of papers upon this ground, that the public of India are interested in knowing how far, in this particular matter, the wishes of the people of India, as represented by the press and public bodies, who have given expression to their views, have been represented in the negotiations either by the Government of India or by the Secretary of State.—
From *New India*.

CUT ME OUT

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

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

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

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

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.

HINDU LAW.

(3rd Edition.)

BY

J. R. GHARPURE, Esq., B. A., LL. B., (HONS.)
High Court Vakil, Bombay.

Price Rupees Ten, Postage Extra.

Copies can be had at:—

The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.

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

Books of Practical & Immediate Interest.

	Rs. A.
1. The Political Future of India. By Lajpat Rai.	5 10
2. Raymond Revised. By Sir Oliver Lodge.	5 4
3. Radio for Everybody. By A. C. Lescarbours.	6 9
4. A Vindication of Natural Diet. From Percy Bysshe Shelley.	0 7
5. The Philosophy of Nature Cure. Illustrated by Iris Chart & Spinal Diagram. By Clement Jeffery. M.A.	4 6
6. Mind Concentration & How to Practise It. By K. T. Anderson.	0 9
7. Mind Power and How to Get It. By K. T. Anderson.	0 10
8. The Mound. By Alice Perrin. A Story of India showing the influence of Buddha on an Englishman.	3 6

The Theosophical Publishing House,
Adyar, Madras.

AND

INDIAN BOOK SHOP

55 Medows Street.

Fort, BOMBAY.

Books of the Day.

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

These books can be had of:—

THE ARYABHUSHAN PRESS, POONA CITY.

HINDU LAW IN THE NEW ERA

BY

K. K. GOKHALE,

Sub-Judge, Jath State.

Crown 16 mo. pp. 80. Paper cover.

Price Annas Ten. Postage Extra.

Can be had of:—

The 'Aryabhushan Press,' Poona City.