

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. VII No. 25.]

POONA—THURSDAY, JULY 24, 1924.

{ INDIAN SUBNS. Rs. 6
{ FOREIGN SUBNS. 10-8

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
INDEX OF THE WEEK	289
ARTICLES :—	
The Debate in the Lords	291
The Statistics Bill. By E. R. Bakhale ...	292
The North-West Frontier.—V. By Professor Gulshan Rai, M. A., LL. B.	293
A LETTER FROM LONDON	294
REVIEW :—	
Labour and Geneva. By Dr. H. O. E. Zacharias, Ph. D.	297
MISCELLANEA :—	
India, A Dominion.—Mr. Sastri's Speech at the Queen's Hall	299

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

India at Inter-national Conferences.

THE nomination of Sir Dadiba M. Dalal, India's High Commissioner, to be India's representative at the Inter-Allied Conference is an event of far-reaching significance. Hitherto the responsibility of voicing Indian aspirations and sentiments at international gatherings has invariably been entrusted to non-Indians, the latter only being supported by Indian advisers. This fact naturally lowered very much India's prestige at such assemblies, apart from the fact that Indian feeling was at times not properly represented. At the Inter-Allied Conference it is true, an Indian is an exponent of India's views, only because India's High Commissioner happened to be an Indian, but it is something that he was not deliberately passed over because of his nationality, as seemed very probable. Even now, Lord Hardinge has for the second time been selected to lead the Indian representation at the League of Nations for no other reason than that an Indian is supposed to be disqualified to fill this position. Lord Hardinge's selection is particularly open to exception, as it is well-known he has narrowed very considerably in his outlook since his retirement from India. It is a matter of common knowledge now that an attempt was made by Indian representatives to bring the British Cabinet's decision on the Indian position in Kenya before the last Assembly of the League of Nations, but it was turned down by the head of the delegation, viz. Lord Hardinge. Now it is impossible to imagine any Indian being opposed to invoking the arbitrament of the League of Nations on a question on which India is shaken to her very depths. This year also, we are sure, Lord Hardinge will prevent the Kenya wrong

being brought up before the bar of the League of Nations, and Indians therefore have every reason to resent her interests being represented at these important conferences by European statesmen. Apart from the national indignity it involves, such an arrangement entails grave practical disadvantages, and it must cease at once.

* * *

IN the first number of the *Progress of Education*, the editors of which we congratulate on their success in bringing out a useful bi-monthly magazine, is printed an interview with the Minister of Education in Bombay Presidency, Mr. Jadhav. As the editors say, "people have naturally begun to lose patience" at the inactivity of the Government in the matter of giving effect to the Compulsory Education Act which was passed more than a year and a half ago. They no doubt expected to have a reassuring statement from the Minister, but the latter has given them very little hope. The present standstill in this respect the Minister seems to ascribe to the fact that the elections to the Local Boards are to be held in November, and the new bodies may not carry on, he says, the policy of the present bodies if the latter introduce compulsion. Surely, Mr. Jadhav is not serious when he talks in this fashion. Does he really fear that men elected on a wider franchise and possessing greater independence than at present, will lay aside compulsion at the first opportunity they get? This is a slander upon the public men of this Presidency, which the Minister thinks fit to cast upon them merely with a view to exculpating himself from his criminal neglect. Even if they were opposed, he is armed with bludgeon powers to make them introduce compulsion, and the question is not one of the willingness of local boards to introduce compulsion so much as of the Minister's keenness to see it introduced everywhere. But rules to be framed under the Act are not yet ready, for which omission none else is responsible but the Minister himself. In the municipalities also the Minister is doing nothing to get a move on, and the local boards' elections will not serve him as an excuse there. Instead of showing any desire to make up in future for his past dereliction of duty, the Minister significantly draws attention to the fact that there is no provision in the Compulsory Education Act for the time-limit of ten years for bringing the whole Presidency under the operation of compulsion.

It was rather unwise on his part to have adverted to it, for it would mean that he would put compulsory education in force only when he is legally compelled to do so. Really, however, no legal coercion would be needed if the Bombay Council were strong. The Swarajists who often indulge in futile obstruction have proved impotent in the matter of holding the Government to its plain duty. And to such a weak Council the insertion of a time-limit would not have availed much, for Mr. Jadhav would in any case escape responsibility during his lustrum; the Minister in the tenth year of office would suffer, if at all. But no delinquent need fear when dealing with such a woefully feeble legislature as the present Bombay Council.

* * *

Congress President-ship.

TIME has now arrived for making final nominations for the office of Congress presidentship for this year. In a sense we are not competent to make any suggestion on this head, but in another sense we are. The decision of the next Congress will, if any single event can, decide the fate of non-co-operation, and in this question, which has dominated Indian politics for the last three years to the exclusion of every other subject, we cannot possibly disinterest ourselves. Our only wish therefore is that the Congress should be presided over this year by a person who exercises a decisive influence in Congress circles. The only one who can claim this position is of course Mahatma Gandhi, and, in our humble opinion, he alone should be invited to guide Congress deliberations this Christmas. We mean no disrespect to others, but if the Congress choice falls upon a "Centrist," who belongs outwardly to the ranks of thorough-going non-co-operators, but whose innermost sympathies are with the Swarajists, and if, under his leadership, the Swarajists extract some more party advantages or inflict a defeat upon non-co-operators, the latter will naturally feel that their programme has not had a fair chance, and though vanquished in the Congress they will still conduct their propaganda outside, thus blocking all other activities as before. If, however, the author of non-co-operation, who really stampeded the whole country into this movement, presides over the Congress and even he has to yield to the Council-goers, well, it will be accepted by non-co-operators as a *coup de grâce*, and such acceptance will give a chance to work other than of the non-co-operating variety. On the other hand, if the non-co-operators triumph, well, then again the country will know where it stands. In any case the present suspense will be broken, and no one can do so as effectively as Mahatma Gandhi.

* * *

East African Committee.

THE Hansard of 23rd June gives *in extenso* the terms of reference to the East African Committee which is to inquire into the method of applying the principle of native trusteeship to Kenya Colony and other countries in East Africa. Land policy is ex-

cluded from the scope of this Committee because Mr. Thomas intends to appoint another Committee to investigate land questions alone. Native education will be similarly excluded, in view of the Standing Committee on Native Education in Tropical Africa set up by the Duke of Devonshire. Co-ordination of policy among the various Governments in East Africa on such important matters as transportation, cotton growing, &c. will form a subject of inquiry, but not the actual amalgamation of territories or their federation under one head. The other subjects will be:—

- (1) the steps necessary to ameliorate the social condition of the natives of East Africa, including improvement of health and economic development;
- (2) the economic relation between natives and non-natives with special reference to labour contracts, care of labourers, certificates of identification, employment of women and children;
- (3) the taxation of natives and the provision for services directed to their moral and material improvement.

If adequate provision is made in other ways for a searching inquiry into the land and education policies of the East Africa Governments, the Committee is given wide enough scope and there are included in its membership men who can be relied upon to protect native interests. From the personnel of this Committee will be drawn a small Commission to visit East Africa for the purpose of studying on the spot any of the local questions that will come up before the Committee.

* * *

HOW is this Committee received by the whites in East Africa? Their accredited organ has no earthly use for this varied agglomeration of Mr. Thomas's advisers and it says the people of Kenya (of course of the paler races) "have a greater practical knowledge of the implications (of native trusteeship) — and its limitations—than Mr. Thomas and his advisers." Africa does not want any counsel; "Africa needs to be left alone for a bit," and what is more important, whatever the Committee may say or do, the whites, we are told, are determined, to assert their existence "as the real and final factor in East African policy." The arrogance and impertinence of this last sentence are really hard to beat. It is an axiom with these good men that if whites at all inhabit a country, they must dominate it. This desire of domination is behind the demand for the annexation (bless the mark!) of two highland districts of Tanganyika Territory, Arusha and Moshi, to Kenya. Under the League of Nations, "Tanganyika is destined to become nothing more or less than a native state to be developed along the lines of the West Coast Protectorate. This may be alright," says a white planter, "for the native because in doing so the administration will be making a black man's Paradise." But what of the whites—can they be doomed for the rest of their lives "to be mere non-entities in a native state?" And so they must become part of Kenya, where of course they can rule the roost. There they may not have self-government in form but they have it in fact. Another advantage to be secured by being amalgamated with Kenya will be that their labour supply would be under the Kenya Native Registration Ordinance, "which would mean a far more satisfactory position"—of course far more satisfactory for the whites, but quasi-slavery for the natives.

THE DEBATE IN THE LORDS.

THE reply which Lord Olivier gave to Viscount Peel's question in the House of Lords was, like the proverbial curate's egg, good and bad in parts. On the question of the services, e. g., which loomed the largest in the original question, it was satisfactory for the Secretary of State to have declared that European recruitment had already ceased in certain transferred Departments. He also exposed the bogey raised by the die-hards that, on account of political agitation and unrest, the avenues to the employment of Britishers had been completely closed and that a vigorous canvassing would be needed to attract Europeans to the Indian services once again. But at the same time Lord Olivier gave expression to his opinion, in advance of the Central Legislature, that a drastic improvement in the conditions of service had become necessary. It would have been more respectful, to put it no stronger, if the Secretary of State had maintained silence on this point till the Legislative Assembly had pronounced its opinion on it. In fact it now appears from the Secretary of State's speech that the Government's announcement to defer taking action on the Lee Report till the Central Legislature has considered it, is due at least as much to the inability of Government to arrive at a decision on the subject earlier as to its anxiety to act in accordance with constitutional propriety. On the whole it is rather disquieting that Government should be contemplating the casting of too heavy a burden on the treasury without a corresponding improvement in the rate of Indianization.

On the question of reforms again, Lord Olivier's statement is not particularly reassuring. With a view, probably, to placate the reactionaries, he has narrowed down the scope of the Reforms Committee in drastic fashion. According to him, the Committee is merely to ascertain whether, for the curing of the defects experienced in the working of the constitution, an alteration in the fundamental structure of the Act is necessary, and if it reports that structural changes are required, and if the Government of India shares that opinion, then for the first time the question will arise for the British Government as to whether further constitutional advance would be justified. It may be that Lord Olivier's answer has been cast in this form to disarm Tory opposition, but it must be remembered at the same time that the Labour Cabinet has not yet given any indication that it would view with favour proposals for a radical revision of the Reforms Act. On the contrary it is becoming more and more plain that it cannot, in the circumstances in which it is placed, initiate any legislation to which a serious opposition from other parties is apprehended. And, since to anything like sweeping changes in the constitution, the Unionists are certain to take violent objection, it follows that the Labour Party cannot really have in view any big plans for India. If such is the case nothing is gained by the

Labour Government in going about its business in this diplomatic manner. The Indian public would better appreciate its position if it expressed, officially, full sympathy with India's aspirations and at the same time frankly declared its impotence to give effect to its convictions on Indian matters. If, on the other hand, Lord Olivier really means to confine the Committee's investigation to the removal of defects actually felt, no one in India would worry overmuch about the Committee's proceedings. Again Lord Olivier's statement that the question of revoking the transfer of departments made over to non-official control in Bengal and the Central Provinces, is being seriously considered by the authorities in India, will hardly convince competent observers here that he has fully grasped the realities of the situation in this country. We do not mean to say that such action would be contrary to law. In fact it would be fully justified if there were any party in India of the fixed opinion that the non-co-operation principle required, on its part, a continuous opposition of every Government measure, irrespectively of the latter's merit. The Swarajists no doubt often professed in the past, and occasionally do profess now, allegiance to this principle, but it does not require an extraordinarily penetrating insight to see that a large majority of these professing non-co-operators have already dropped this cast-iron formula of "uniform, consistent and continuous opposition" and are in fact in a fair way to becoming ready to assume ministerial responsibility. It will not do for statesmen of Lord Olivier's varied experience to ignore this patent fact and adopt, in the case of passing moods and temporary aberrations, drastic remedies intended for permanent popular distempers.

Mr. Das's support of the resolution praising the motive of a political murderer exercises the minds of Englishmen far more deeply than Indians excepting perhaps Mahatma Gandhi, who apparently now sees as if in a flashlight that the much-vaunted devotion of the majority of Indians to the principle of non-violence is not even skin-deep. They may not believe in Ahimsa as Mahatma Gandhi understands it, but this is not to say that any politician of any consequence, at all believes in the expediency or practicability of violence as a means of political emancipation. Lord Peel fears that Mr. Das's statements might have a very deplorable effect on Indian opinion. He may well put away his fear: Mr. Das's statement has had absolutely no effect on public opinion, except that it has awakened Mahatma Gandhi out of his day-dreams. If Indians as a whole do not believe in the principle of non-violence, they at any rate believe in its inexpediency at the present moment. This ought to suffice politicians if it does not suffice moralists, and surely Lords Peel and Curzon are not numbered among the latter. Lord Peel even speaks of taking legal proceedings against Mr. Das. What has Mr. Das done to bring himself within the meshes of law? He does not commit

violence ; he does not incite to violence. What is his crime ? Mr. Das himself first started speaking of a prosecution being launched against him. It was, one felt, a clever move on his part to attract popular sympathy. We should personally have liked Mr. Das to express more disapprobation of the murder than praise of the murderer's motives, but is it an offence to refrain from expressing one's detestation of political crime ? Parnell steadfastly refused to condemn outrages in Ireland, but one has not heard of his being judicially brought to heels for this offence. And it is inevitable that in a vast country like India some people of Parnell's mentality should arise, who would not countenance crime but who would not go out of their way to condemn it either. We in India know it is possible to take Mr. Das too seriously. Lord Peel and men of his ilk only flatter him by devoting an exaggerated importance to his utterances. Lord Olivier has done well, not to condone him, which no one wants to do, but to damp down Lord Peel's suggestion that Mr. Das could be prosecuted for taking up the attitude he has done towards political murder.

THE STATISTICS BILL.

"Whatever opinions we may have on the condition of trade or other matters connected with fiscal reforms, there is one thing which we want and that is the possibility of having at our disposal correct statistics on which we can base perhaps very different conclusions."—*Mr. J. Chamberlain.*

IN these wise words Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the Leader of the Opposition, heartily supported the Census of Production Bill brought forward by the Liberal Government in England in 1906. The principle underlying this and similar measures which provide for the compulsory collection of industrial and labour statistics has been so universally acknowledged that there is practically no industrially developed country in the world which has not its Statistics Act. Complete and reliable statistics alone give a people and its Government a correct idea about the economic position of its country and are a great and powerful factor in ascertaining the potential value of its earning capacity. Moreover, in the sphere of labour, no general averages of wages can be arrived at unless full and accurate statistics are available. In India where industrialism is rapidly advancing, the collection of statistics, industrial or otherwise, is not a very strong point with the British Government. We, therefore, welcome the attempt of the Government of Bombay in trying partially to remove this defect by bringing before the local Legislature a Statistics Bill which provides for the compulsory collection of industrial statistics.

Such a useful piece of legislation should not ordinarily evoke any opposition. But, unfortunately, the Bombay capitalists have raised a and cry against it. It is contended that the Bill is unnecessary, that its scope is too wide, that statistics may be collected under the Industrial Disputes Act, that the Bill will not fail to divulge

trade secrets, that it is inquisitorial in its nature, and that the taking of power to enter factories and have access to public records is an invasion on public liberty. Not one of these contentions can hold water if the Bill is read, analysed and assimilated property.

The rapid growth of industrialism in the Bombay Presidency which none can deny, and the failure of the voluntary method of collecting statistics are, in our opinion, a sufficient justification for the introduction of a Statistics Bill. No country in the world has successfully worked out the voluntary system; and the Labour Office in Bombay after having tried it for four years has to admit its failure. They found it hard to collect figures regarding rents, prices, family budgets from house-holders and dealers; for the census into wages in the cotton mill-industry, a little over 50 per cent. only of the mills in Ahmedabad supplied them with the necessary information; not four out of 53 municipalities responded to the appeal of the Labour Office for the supply of information which they wanted for a wages census conducted for various classes of work-people in towns; and, lastly, the Engineering Employers' Federation definitely refused to furnish statistics for a census of wages in the engineering industry. Regarding the scope of the Bombay Bill, suffice it to say that it is not so wide or comprehensive as the Statistics Acts of about fifty countries. Critics of such legislation all over the world have always brought forward the argument that it would divulge trade secrets; but everywhere these fears have proved false. In the House of Commons when the Census of Production Bill was being discussed and this very argument brought against it, Mr. H. H. Marks humorously remarked that he hoped that some provision would be made against the disclosure of trade secrets by persons *other than* officials (*italics ours*), meaning thereby that the trade secrets were always safe in the hands of the Governments. But as a matter of fact, no Statistics Act has ever attempted to get at the trade secrets of the employer. What it seeks to obtain from them is certain statistical information which would help one in ascertaining the industrial advance of a country and the growth and prosperity of the industrial classes.

Any student of labour legislation will see that the contention that statistics can be collected under the Industrial Disputes Act is untenable. In the first place, the latter Act is invariably intended to avert, as soon as possible, an impending trade dispute and to settle it amicably immediately it arises. Now these objects can only be achieved if the Court of Enquiry and the Board of Arbitration have sufficient data available to them at a moment's notice. An Industrial Disputes Act would defeat its own object if it provided for the collection of statistical data for its purposes after the dispute has arisen. Secondly, such general statistics as those relative to the cost of living, rents, etc., cannot be

collected under the disturbed conditions of a trade dispute. No country has, to our knowledge, provided for the collection of statistics under the Industrial Disputes Act and, also no country which has an Industrial Disputes Act, is without its Statistics Act. The latter is a natural and necessary complement to the former. The functions of the two Acts are such as that provisions relating to them cannot be inserted in one statute.

We shall deal with the remaining two contentions in the next issue.

R. R. BAKHALE.

NORTH WEST FRONTIER.—V.

BUT there is another objection the majority in the Bray Committee raise. They rely on the opinion of one of the Frontier Officers, Mr. Merk, that

"Thousands of our subjects are constantly visiting independent territory, many thousands of the hillmen regularly migrate to our districts, whole clans live for half the year on this and for the other half of the year on that side of the border; where the residents within and without the frontier are not men of the same clan or of the same tribe, they are connected by the intimate ties of common race, of marriage, neighbourhood, and of an association, territorial and social, which has endured for many generations. In short, there is no impassable gap or gulf, difficult to cross, between British and independent territory; the frontier is in reality only an arbitrary line drawn through the limits of a more or less homogenous population. That being so, it will be readily understood what an infinity of questions, of disputes, and disagreements of business arises from the daily intercourse of these people."

This quotation from the statement of Mr. Merk is given by the majority in the Bray Committee in support of the argument of *inseparability*. In a recent session of the Council of State, in answer to a question put by the Hon'ble Lala Ramsaran Dass, the Government replied that the number of people visiting the settled districts of the North West-Frontier Province in the winter season from (a) the tribal area adjoining the settled districts and under the jurisdiction of the Deputy Commissioner was 15,000; (b) from the tribal agencies of South Waziristan, North Waziristan, Kurrum, Tirab, Khyber, and Mohmand country was 22,000; (c) from Afghanistan, 35,000. Now the argument is that since 72,000 people from Afghanistan and from tribal areas visit the settled districts in the winter season, therefore the civil administration of the settled districts containing a population of 21 lacs of people should be put under the Foreign and Political Department. In order to control one foreigner the Government needs to deprive 30 of its own subjects of the benefits of a properly carried on full civil administration. If Switzerland is visited every year by a large number of visitors, tourists, political refugees, and dangerous revolutionaries from all parts of the world, the administration of that country, in the opinion of the majority of the Bray Committee, I imagine, should be run on lines chalked out by the Foreign Office. I believe the Government's first responsibility is towards the 21 lacs of people living in the settled districts of the Frontier Province. The first necessity is to have an effi-

cient Civil Administration in the settled districts. No foreign or political considerations should be allowed to impair the efficiency of that administration. If by keeping the tribal tracts and settled districts, full justice cannot be done to the people of the settled districts, then separate arrangements must be made for the tribal areas. A new machinery must be devised to control the tribes. The Punjab too is visited by a large number of Pathans in the winter season. They not only visit this province, but they also visit such far off provinces as Bengal and Bombay. Would that be sufficient reason for the interference of the Foreign and Political Department in the Civil Administration of these provinces? The remedy lies not in combining the settled districts and the tribal tracts in the same province and putting them under the control of the Foreign Department, but in re-amalgamating the settled districts with the Punjab, and in setting up a separate administrative machine, under the control of the Foreign Department for the tracts. The 30 lacs of Pathans in Afghanistan are already under the separate and independent rule of the Amir. The Foreign Department has no control over them. These 30 lacs of Pathan subjects of the Amir are the kith and kin of the Pathans in the tribal areas, and of Pathans in the settled districts. And yet the work of administration goes on in spite of the fact that the Pathans of Afghanistan are independent in a separate kingdom of their own. Both sides of the Durand line are occupied by one homogenous people. If this arbitrary line could not impair the administrative efficiency of the independent governments of the Afghans and the British, I fail to see how another arbitrary line drawn along the boundaries of the settled districts of the Frontier Province could interfere with the work of administration, when the two Administrations on both sides of the line are to be subordinate to the same Central Government. This objection of *inseparability* is, I believe, an imaginary objection, an objection based on unwillingness to disturb the existing order of things.

The right course is to re-amalgamate the five settled districts with the Punjab. The tribal Agencies of South Waziristan, Tochi Valley, Kurrum, Khyber Pass, and the Malakand Agency, consisting of Swat, Buner, Bajaur, and Chitral, should like British Baluchistan be under an Agent to the Governor-General. When the people of these tribal areas become after some time accustomed to a civilised and settled form of government, the tracts inhabited by these people should be constituted into regularly organised British districts. These districts can also then be amalgamated with the Punjab. There is no harm if the boundaries of the Punjab run along the boundaries of independent Afghanistan. The boundaries of Burma already run along the boundaries of independent Siam and independent China. The boundaries of Assam also run along the boundaries of independent Tibet.

The chief weapon in the hands of the Foreign

Department, that on which the majority in the Bray Committee, is perhaps the control they exercise over 72,000 transborder men who visit the settled districts in the winter season. The Foreign Department, whose advocates the majority in the Bray Committee seem to have become, will perhaps argue that it is through the presence of these 72,000 transborder men in the settled districts during a part of the year that they manage the entire trans-border areas. These trans-border men have lands in the settled districts. They have property there. They have contracts and other commercial transactions with permanent residents of the settled districts. The district officers working under the supervision and instructions of the Foreign Department, while deciding in courts of law the disputes between trans-border men and the permanent residents of the districts, put such a pressure on the trans-border men as to induce them to render such help to the political agents in the tribal areas as would enable them to bring the tribal areas more and more under the grip of Government. It is for this reason perhaps that the Foreign Department wants to keep under its control the settled districts. By sacrificing the interests of the non-Pathan permanent residents of the settled districts, and by unduly favouring in British Jirgas and British Courts of law the trans-border litigants, the Foreign department perhaps expects to conciliate the Pathans. By establishing a Pathan rule in the five settled districts of the Frontier Province where actually they are in a minority, they perhaps hope to demonstrate to the entire Pathan race that it is to their advantage to live under British rule. Does the Foreign Department of the Government of India, by adopting these methods, expect to attract Pathans of the tribal areas India-wards? This policy has been followed during the last 20 years and more. Let us see how far the Government have gained in their objects. Let us see how far Pathans of the trans-border have been attracted India-wards. I would ask the readers of these articles to read the North West-Frontier *Border Administration Reports*. They will find in these reports ample material to show that it is absolutely futile to follow the policy of controlling the trans-border tribes, by personal influence, persuasion, threats or bribes, of the district officers, who are engaged in actual day-to-day administration of justice between permanent residents of the districts and trans-border tribesmen. Ever since the separation of the Frontier districts from the Punjab, the policy of the Frontier Administration has been to "depend upon keeping the tribesmen in good temper". In pursuance of this policy it has become the practice to refer more and more cases, civil as well as criminal to the Jirgas, the majority in which usually consists of Pathans. As cases are now referred to the Jirgas with greater frequency, the police have become lax in the investigation of these cases. Offences are therefore not properly investigated. As the tribesmen *must be kept in good temper trans-*

border offenders are now on account of political considerations repatriated with greater frequency. This naturally results in the trans-border offenders going unpunished. How is this policy of Government interpreted by the tribesmen? The trans-border people have never lived under a settled government. They do not know what is the right of law. They do not understand what is peace and tranquility. In their opinion Might is Right. Too frequent re-patriation of trans-border offenders, and too many references of judicial cases to Pathan Jirgas in reality lowers the prestige of Government in the eyes of tribesmen. It encourages the trans-border men to commit raids and decoities in the settled districts, and it encourages the wilder spirits in the settled districts to harbour trans-border offenders.

GULSHAN RAI.

A LETTER FROM LONDON.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

LONDON, JULY 3.

THE Seamen's Hospital Society is a very deserving institution. As its name indicates, it makes provision for the medical and surgical treatment of merchant seamen who have become temporarily disabled from illness. The Society has already established several hospitals in this country for this purpose, among which is the Tilbury Hospital, where cases of sickness and injury in the district of Tilbury Docks are dealt with. Lately, the Society has been endeavouring to extend the Hospital premises at Tilbury, and especially to make provision for Indian and Ceylonese lascars. Representations were made to Sir George Lloyd, when Governor of Bombay, and as a result of his efforts, Mr. P. G. Singhaney of Bombay generously donated a lakh of rupees for the building of a special ward. On Friday last this ward was opened by the Duke of York, the occasion being the first time that a member of the British Royal family had been at Tilbury since the famous day when Queen Elizabeth reviewed the Royal army there, when there was very grave fear of the invasion of England by the Spanish forces already about to embark upon the adventure that brought disaster to the Spanish Armada and made the name of Drake a household word in English history for ever after.

RECEPTION TO LORD WILLINGDON.

A large and distinguished company sat down, under the presidentship of the Duke of Connaught, at the Hotel Cecil, under the auspices of the British Indian Union yesterday, to do honour to Lord and Lady Willingdon on their return to this country. Lord Willingdon has done much since his return here to restore the balance of opinion rather rudely disturbed by Sir George Lloyd, whose reactionary views, covered with a volume of smooth words, are scarcely concealed. Lord Willingdon is taking every advantage of his 11 years of governorship and of the fact that his

arrival from India is more recent than that of his successor as Governor of Bombay to give authority to his favourable opinion on the subject of Indian constitutional reform. It was, therefore, with singular pleasure that the large gathering welcomed him back to England. Among the principal guests were Lord Olivier, Mrs. Besant, Mr. Sastri, Sir D. M. Dalal, the Maharaja of Navanagar, the Maharaja of Rajpipla, Sir Alfred Mond, Mr. Montagu, Sir P. Rajagopalachariar, Mr. T. Rangachariar, the Earl of Midletod, Sir Ali Imam, Sir Dinshaw Petit, Sir M. M. Bhownaggee, Mr. A. Yusuf Ali, Sir Thomas Bennett, Sir Edward Boyle, Sir N. P. Burt, Mr. Shanmukham Chetty, Munshi Iswar Saran, Katherine, Countess of Cromer, Lady de la Warr, Lady Emily Lutyens, Lady M. Egerton, Lord Erleigh, Sir K. G. Gupta, Lady Cynthia Mosley, Sir Stanley Reed, Sir Campbell Rhodes, Mrs. Phillip Snowden, Sir Dorab Tata, Dewan Bahadur Vijayaraghavachariar, the Dowager Countess of Wemyss. The names of Sir Benod Mitter and Sir Grimwood Mears were on the guest list, but I did not see them, possibly on account of the crush.

In proposing the toast of the principal guests the Duke of Connaught remarked that they had not made the mistake common to many Englishmen, of hiding the human touch, which, after all was the most useful in this world. This country had great cause for gratitude to those Britishers who, like Lord Willingdon, had gone out, often at great inconvenience to themselves, to occupy high posts of administration in the overseas Empire.

ANGLO-INDIAN UNDERSTANDING.

Lord Willingdon had a splendid reception on rising to reply. He paid a powerful tribute to the great courtesy of the Indian people even when labouring under a great political stress. The British Indian Union, he said, was an organisation entirely after his own heart, for he and Lady Willingdon had done everything in their power to create better personal relations between Indians and Britishers. He believed that the relative absence of such relations was the bedrock basis of most of our difficulties in India. The ideal of every man was surely to secure friendship, goodwill, and a spirit of brotherhood among all the nations of the world. They could not make a better beginning than in the British Empire itself. It was not the colour of a man that counted, but character, and he could honestly say that no distinction of a racial character had ever entered his mind in the conduct of any of his administrative duties. The England-returned Indian did not find in India that same fine courtesy and friendly treatment that he had encountered in this country, and this was due to old traditions maintained by a remnant of Britons in India, who still held the view of the superiority and inferiority of races, and not, as he held, of the superiority or inferiority of individual character. The British Empire contained a large number of races which were developing rapidly, and they would find it difficult to hold the

Empire together unless they established once for all entire equality of opportunity. Both Britishers and Indians in India suffered from characteristic reserves and both, in their different ways were responsible for the aloofness that was so potent a breeder of misunderstanding between the two countries. They ought increasingly to realise the human side of the problems that had to be solved, and nothing would more effectively conduce to such a solution that the provision and multiplicity of opportunities of social and personal intercourse between the two peoples. If this were done, he did not believe that there was any instinctive opposition between them. Mutual tolerance, mutual goodwill, and mutual friendship would be of inestimable value in India, and if they could achieve these things, East and West could continue to work together for long years to come, to each other's mutual advantage.

Lord Olivier, in felicitous terms, proposed the health of the chairman, and the Duke of Connaught replied briefly, saying that he was ever ready to do anything to show what a warm corner the interests of India had in his heart, and that he agreed with every word that Lord Willingdon had said.

ALGERIA AND INDIA.

The *Westminster Gazette* contains an interesting special article by an anonymous writer, who contrasts the conditions prevailing in French Algeria and those obtaining in British India. He compares the prospects and opportunities of the natives of the two countries, and comes to conclusions favourable on the whole to the British policy. But he points out that the Algerians are on such better terms with the French people, both nationally and individually, than are the Indian people with the British, and he attributes the distinction to the aloofness and assumption of racial superiority on the part of Britishers in the East, a view supported by more than one correspondent to the *Westminster*. The view held by the writer is that there can be no good-will towards us until the British attitude in India towards the people of the country changes from that of racial superiority to one of equality and human mutuality. Thus, by another road, he comes to the same conclusion as the Duke of Connaught and Lord Willingdon.

U. S. A. IMMIGRATION ACT.

Nor are we the only people to have to learn this lesson of the greater tolerance. The United States, which can teach us many things that are good, has also learnt many things that are bad, and not the least of these is racial intolerance. The latest manifestation of this is, of course, the Immigration Act, which came into force on July 1. The Japanese Government has publicly announced that Japan "can by no means concede that the question is closed." The *Times* regards this declaration as a gloss on the official Note of protest delivered at Washington a month ago, in which the United States Government was advised that the provisions of

the Act "made it impossible for Japan to continue the undertakings assumed" in the Gentlemen's Agreement. This means that Japan will no longer continue to refuse passports to her citizens desiring to proceed to Canada and Mexico. The importance of this lies in the fact that no quotas have been reserved for these countries, since it has been found a practical impossibility to guard the whole of the long land frontiers and thus prevent illicit immigration. The only way that America would be able to prevent an infiltration of Japanese from the neighbouring countries—if it could be done at all—would be by requiring every Japanese entitled to reside in America to carry identification documents and deport all found not be in possession of such documents. But Japan would certainly resent this bitterly. It would be the addition of insult to injury. Already there have been one or two ugly incidents at Tokyo, for which the Japanese Government have been obliged to apologise to the United States' representative. But this could not go on for ever, and with the breeding of bad blood would come incitements to the arbitrament of war. As a matter of fact, one cannot be altogether sorry that it is Japan this time that is the sufferer. In the first place, it is clear, from the episode, that mere political independence is not sufficient to raise an Asiatic State to the rank of equality with the proud white nations of the West. Japan was inclined to forget this. She was quite content, apparently, so long as the other Asiatic countries were treated as racially inferior. What she now resents is not so much the limitation upon her emigration as the fact that she has now been thrust down again to the level of the other Asiatic peoples. Perhaps this experience will help her to understand better the attitude towards her of those other Asiatic peoples that have latterly been inclined to regard her as a traitor to Asia and to dislike her accordingly. Moreover, it is no use, as her Foreign Minister has done, to declare that she stands for the policy of "live and let live." As one of the London evening papers pointed out last night, she never recognised this policy when the question of Korean rights was in issue. Nor has her treatment of China done her much good in the eyes of the other peoples of Asia. So perhaps Japan's treatment under the American Immigration Law, which is absolutely indefensible from any practical point of view, and can only be regarded as a studied insult intended deliberately to be put upon Japan by the Americans, who have publicly declared for a white Nordic race, whatever that may mean, in obedience to the behests of Mr. Lothrop Stoddard and others of his way of looking at things, may do her a great deal of spiritual good and eventually restore her to the political, if not to the moral, hegemony of Asia. I hope in a later letter to refer to a recent book on the attitude of Christianity towards the race-problem by Mr. J. H. Oldham. He advances a noble and a statesmanlike concept of the relations of the races,

as one would expect from so great-hearted a friend of the non-white races.

It is interesting to note that he is a member of the East African Committee set up by Mr. Thomas to watch and advise the Colonial Office on the interests and welfare of the native population. The Committee is as yet incomplete, but it is to be presided over by Lord Southborough, and will include besides Mr. R. N. Barclay, M. P., Capt. Reginald Berkeley, M. P., Mr. John Harris, M. P., Mr. T. E. Harvey, M. P., Sir Sydney Henn, M. P., Mr. E. D. Morel, M. P., Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore, M. P., Mr. N. Snell, M. P., and Dr. Andrew Balfour, Sir Henry Birchenough, Mr. C. Roden Buxton, Sir Hugh Clifford, Sir N. Rider Haggard, Lt. Col. F. D. Hammond, Mr. W. R. Himbury, as well as Mr. Oldham. Even though there is no direct Indian representation on this Committee, I should be quite content to leave Indian interests in the native question to be dealt with by men like Mr. Roden Buxton, Mr. Morel, Mr. Snell, and Mr. Oldham. The personnel of the pending Royal Commission to visit East Africa has not yet been announced.

INDIANS IN EAST AFRICA.

Meanwhile, Mr. Thomas has stated that he is not going to take any notice of the demands of the white settlers in the Tanganyika Highlands, who dislike the native trusteeship policy which the League of Nations enforces in that mandated territory and who have little belief in British protestations as to the substitution of a similar policy in Kenya, for incorporation of that area with Kenya. I think that, whatever criticisms one may have of Mr. Thomas on other grounds, he is quite genuine in his desire that the new policy shall be applied in Kenya. It is because he is so strongly committed on this question that I somewhat fear that he may do some injustice to the Indian settlers owing to the manner in which the anti-Asiatic local administration, together with the Kenya white settlers, will seek to confuse the issue.

The question of the use of Gujarati, under the Profits Tax Ordinance, that has so long agitated the Tanganyika Indians, is, I understand, about to be referred to the Government of India Colonies Committee. I doubt whether the Committee will be able, this year, to do more than prevent any further steps being taken to proceed with the Immigration Bill. I believe that they have succeeded in convincing Mr. Thomas that some of the representations made to him by the Kenya Government on this subject cannot be supported by the facts. The matter is, I have reason to believe, likely to go back to Kenya for further consideration. It is very unlikely that the Committee will go on to the question of Fiji. Indeed, they cannot very well do so until the Kenya franchise question is definitely cleared up.

Mr. Sastri, whose oratorical efforts are everywhere in request, is going to the north this week on a lecturing tour. I am glad to say that his health has improved.

Sir All Imam and his lady are At Home to a large company at the Hotel Cecil on the 18th instant in honour of the Indian Delegation now here.

REVIEW.

LABOUR AND GENEVA.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS—INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE—SIXTH SESSION, GENEVA, 1924. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE. Geneva, 1924. 12x8. pp. 447.

THE Report before us covers the whole of the activities of the International Labour Organization between October 1922 and December 1923, and in many instances brings the tale down to May of the current year. The International Labour Organization, it is perhaps not unnecessary to remind our readers, is a part, though doubtless the most important part, of the League of Nations. It is almost autonomous and only depends on the League central for its finance; but in its constitution and administration is run on entirely distinct lines. This fact can perhaps be brought home to the reader most strikingly by stating that Germany has been a full member of the Labour Organization from its very beginning, whilst as far as the League proper is concerned, it of course still maintains in unabated orthodox vigour the rule of unapproachability toward this pariah nation. Again, the League Assembly consists of Government Delegations only (three apiece for each State Member); whilst the Labour Conference consists of four delegates per State Member, of whom two represent the Government, one the employers and one the workers of each State Member. Finally, whilst the League constitution contemplates joint action as the outcome of its decisions, the Labour Organization merely obliges its States Members to "bring within 18 months before the authority, within whose competence the matter lies, for the enactment of legislation or other action" (art. 405 of the Versailles Treaty) such Draft Conventions and Recommendations", as the annual general meeting of the Organization (called the "Labour Conference") shall have adopted by a two-third majority vote of the delegates present.

This provision is a most skilful device for ensuring that all questions of moment to Labour shall at least be placed before the legislature of every country and be given a chance there—without at the same time interfering with the sovereign powers of each State, to order its own affairs: powers of which all States, needless to say, are hypersensitively jealous. But that even the best laid plans of men and mice oft gang a-gley, is only too well illustrated by this instance. The framers of the article in question clearly looked upon ratification by each State Member of "Conventions" and "Recommendations" as the first step and their consideration by each Member's legislative authority as the next step. In practice the process has been reversed, inasmuch as States Members do not seem to look at all upon ratification as a start—a *terminus a quo*—, but on the contrary as the goal—the *terminus ad quem*. With the result, e. g., that the first "Convention" passed (at Washington in November 1919) has even yet not been ratified by more than five States out of a total nominal membership of 57: and even out of these five States only one, Czechoslovakia, really counts, since three (Greece, Roumania and Bulgaria) were

only required under the terms of the Convention to put it in force as from July 1924 and one, India, is a "special country" in which, as the Versailles Treaty (art. 405) hath it, "climatic conditions, the imperfect development of industrial organization or other special circumstances make the industrial conditions substantially different." Seeing therefore that not one of the big industrial nations of the West for whom the Convention was primarily meant has ratified it, one might be tempted to say that practically nothing has been done at all so far;—and seeing further that the Convention itself treats of the Eight Hour Day, the very foundation of all those "humane conditions of labour", which the charter of the International Labour Organization wishes to ensure: the question may well be asked, whether this Organization has after all not been completely frustrated?

To understand the problem, it is necessary to bear in mind that the birth of the International Labour Organization itself no less than the formulation of its first Conventions, was due to that ascendancy of Labour, which had naturally resulted from its role during the War and was only further emphasized by the great trade boom which followed immediately upon peace. "After the enthusiasm of 1919 and 1920", says the Director in the Report before us, "came the period of hesitation, doubt and reserve at the end of 1921 and 1922." The period of "under-production" was only too soon followed by the period of "under-employment": labour, after having been at a high premium, became a drug in the market. As a consequence, all the big capitalist States, which when Labour was scarce had readily promised any and every "humane condition of labour", thought twice, when the ratification of the Eight Hour Day came up, whether it was really quite wise or, ahem, necessary, to agree so unreservedly to so sweeping a principle. Great Britain, the greatness of whose industrial importance is the measure of the greatness of its culpability, set the pace by speciously pleading that already eight hours' work was the rule in most of its industries, but that its vigorous application everywhere demanded a close preliminary study and very delicate handling, and made indiscriminate and mechanical ratification quite impossible. France and Belgium put forward the bogey of competition: for even though these States asserted that they had established satisfactory labour conditions, how could they bind themselves to maintain them, when there was no guarantee against the competition of less humane neighbours? And the principal "neighbour", Germany, retorted that if she had to pay the fantastic Reparations demanded of her, her "workers of necessity would have to work a good deal longer than other people, in order to produce the surplus. Thus the vicious circle became chronic and the practice of the Eight Hour Day which had been the rule in the West, when the Washington Convention to that effect was passed, slowly vanished out of sight, when all that seemed necessary was to assent to it in theory too.

It is only when one grasps this economic development of the last five years, that one is able to judge fairly, whether the International Labour Organization has been a failure or not. The mere fact that it has not achieved what it started out to achieve is thus not the only evidence to be considered: as relevant it is to ascertain whether it at least prevented worse evils befalling labour. The Organization may have been primarily intended as

an engine to pull labour up the incline of humane conditions: is it a failure, because its powerful brake action has prevented the train from rolling down the steep gradient and smashing up at the bottom? To be sure this is not a rôle that leads itself to panegyrics and to much smug boasting; on the contrary, it is a rôle that seems to provide a natural butt for arm-chair critics and cynics, whether passively ignorant or actively malevolent: but no unprejudiced person, let alone one of goodwill, can possibly read the pages of this Report, for instance, without realizing the incalculable amount of true success achieved by the Labour Organization of the League. This success is primarily due to "the League way" of doing things—a way, which lacks every melodramatic element, that would endear it to the sensation-loving multitude, and which consists in never accepting a "No"; again and again reminding a recalcitrant world of the things it undertook to do; meeting every excuse and subterfuge politely, patiently; answering it with infinite pains, as if the "difficulties" were genuine; confronting the obstructionist—and that before the whole world!—with such result of unanswerable researches; all the time as "your obedient servant" and with unruffled persuasiveness offering the other cheek, if only thereby the job in hand can be furthered. The real stroke of genius about the League is not the bringing together of statesmen and representatives and experts from all the corners of the world: but the establishment of a permanent Secretariat, which is paid to go on doing all the donkey-work, when the pyrotechnics have come to an end, and to follow up in daily grey prose the rosy poetic licence of its masters, "the honourable members" I for one can only say, that the more I study the massive tomes of authoritative information issued year in year out regarding the work of the League in all its branches, the more profound grows my admiration for the magnificent and eminently worth-while work of the international company of men and women, composing this organization, whose motto might well be: *Perseverantia omnia vincit*.

I have spoken at length about the ratification of the first Convention, on account of its fundamental character. As a matter of fact, this Convention has fared worst and the rate of ratification of the other Conventions &c. has been very much better. The subjects dealt with by the rest of the Conventions and Recommendations passed by the succeeding four Conferences are as follows: Weekly Rest, Unemployment, Emigration, Night Work of Women, Protection of Women before and after child-birth, Employment of Children, Night work of Young Persons, Industrial Hygiene, Seamen's Code, Protection of Agricultural Workers and Systems of Inspection. And the influence of all this activity? Why, India alone supplies a magnificent answer to that question. As the Under-Secretary of State for India only recently stated in the House, "labour legislation latterly adopted in India is inspired by the work of the Conference". The Factories Amendment Act of 1922 and the Mines Act of 1923 are admittedly the outcome of the Conventions on Hours of Work, Weekly Rest, Night Work of Women and Employment of Children; whilst the Workmen's Compensation Act is an indication of the pressure exerted by the Unemployment Convention and those on the subject of industrial hygiene. The record of governmental response in India to the stimulus of Geneva on the whole has been good: but it

is quite certain that with the—for an alien bureaucracy natural—desire of letting sleeping dogs lie, the Government of India would never have stirred, had it not been for the initiative forced upon it by the International Labour Organization. And if, alas, there are still many *lacunae* to be filled in the Labour Legislation of this country: the steady moral pressure exerted by this International Labour Organization is an earnest that the day cannot be indefinitely postponed for the enacting of Maternity Benefits, Sickness and Unemployment Insurance and Old Age Pensions for the workers of India.

And what is true of India, is, *mutatis mutandis* true of all countries, from China to Peru; and everywhere—if only the facts were known—the common people would rise up and call Geneva blessed. Once more therefore we would ask our readers to study the Report before us: and not it only, but the periodicals issued by the office, particularly the weekly "Industrial and Labour Information" and the monthly "International Labour Review", which it is quite safe to say, have become altogether indispensable to anyone who aspires to know anything about the economic problems of our day. For the International Labour Office's function is not merely diplomatic and legislative: it could not fulfil its purpose, without being at the same time a scientific body, engaged in research, in the compilation of facts and the rendering of them accessible to all students. For all this a good library is of course a first necessity, but it will perhaps come as a surprise to read that already it comprises 1,35,000 volumes in no less than 29 languages, made readily accessible by up to date author and subject catalogues on the card index system. Already outside research students consult and work in the Library and as time passes there is little doubt that the Library will more and more become one of the most important libraries on its subjects. In addition no less than 2000 periodicals are received by the office, while its correspondence is of course world-wide and if to all this one adds an international staff composed of 29 nationalities and welded into a coherent whole by scientific method, humanitarian aim and the wholesome discipline of a first class Civil Service: it must become obvious that here we have a unique environment for the training of public servants of the very best type. All the more must one deplore that no Indian is numbered amongst the staff. Already competitive examinations are held in Warsaw, Prague, London and Geneva; is it quite out of the question, once in a way to hold an examination in Bombay? People, who can stand the rigours of Simla, will surely be proof even against the climate of Geneva. But even more than thinking of the League as a permanent career, one must say one cannot lay down this volume without an earnest wish that our people and their Government may soon awake to the wonderful possibilities and great desirability of selected Indians of our Services being seconded for, say, three years, to work in all the branches of the League Secretariat and International Labour Office and thereby attaining to that world outlook and international grasp of affairs, which, alas, is still so much lacking in a country which is still oscillating between the *Swadeshi* patriotism of the parish pump and the slave mentality coming of a mere imitation of Anglo-Saxondom.

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

MISCELLANEA.

INDIA, A DOMINION.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

MR. SASTRI'S SPEECH.

LONDON, 26th JUNE.

A CROWDED and enthusiastic demonstration filled the Queen's Hall last night, in support of the constitutional movement to secure Dominion for India. At this meeting, the Rt. Hon. V. B. Srinivasa Sastri, P. C. said:—

"I propose to deal with a detail, but a detail of capital importance. India is divided into nine Administrations, with a Supreme Government at the head. When the constitution under which we are now ruled was framed in 1919, the Administrations were endowed with what is called dyarchy, which really is qualified home rule. The Supreme Government, which had control over these separate Administrations, was left still with autocratic power. We contemplated at the time that a serious mistake was being made, our opinion being that all the Governments in India, supreme as well as subordinate, should develop along popular lines, *pari passu*. Our advice was rejected,

"The intensity of the present agitation in India has caused the Government of India to appoint a very influential Committee, which, as to its personnel, I wish to say I approve of almost entirely. We fear, however, that the terms of reference to this Committee are somewhat restricted and that it is likely that the mistake of 1919 will be repeated. When I left India it was widely whispered that the authorities there were quite willing to advance the Provincial or Local Administrations to full autonomy, but were quite keen on keeping the Central Government as before unregenerate. I cannot conceive a greater blunder. It will be evident to you that you cannot have nine autonomous administrations built upon popular electorates functioning under a Central Government which continues to be entirely bureaucratic or autocratic. (Hear, hear.) What appears on the face to be an incongruity will in practice be found not merely an incongruity but a perpetual cause of friction and misunderstanding. (Hear, hear.)

"In certain international matters we have acquired an almost independent status; we enjoy a right to a place amongst the original members of the League of Nations. (Applause.) But hitherto the Indian Delegation has been peculiar in its composition, our delegation, alone amongst the delegations to the League, has year after year been led by an individual who is not an Indian. (Shame.) We feel this is possible because the Government continues to be autocratic; if it was answerable to the people they would not send to the League, to be the object of notice by the entire world, a delegation of which the leader is always a European. We have representation in all such International bodies, as the Postal Conference, the Labour Conference, the Opium Conference. In most of these bodies still it is a European, a retired Viceroy, a member of the Indian Civil Service, or some person of that stamp, who is supposed to be alone capable of representing India in the eyes of the world. This is a libel upon the intelligence and capacity of the people of India. (Applause.)

"This time last year there was discussed in this country a question of supreme importance concerning a dispute between a Crown Colony and the great Empire of India concerning the rights of the nationals of our country. The decision given by the British Government ran clearly and decisively against all the representations made by the Government of India, and by the Secretary of State for India here. The little Crown Colony prevailed, the sole reason being that in the Councils of the Empire India is regarded as a subordinate administration which cannot speak with a voice which must be heard, which can be

told to shut up, and which must shut up. (Applause.) There are many other questions with the Crown Colonies and Dependencies of the Empire that India will have to bring before the British Government in future years. Do you think that India will submit to be treated in that way, to have its Government of 300,000,000, having vast resources, do you suppose that India will consent for another time, never mind several times, to have its Government put aside with contumely like that? It is impossible.

"There is another point of even more practical moment. It is conceivable that in the future constitution of India when it is finally framed, we may follow the Canadian rather than the Australian model; it is possible that we shall leave all the residuary powers in the hands of the Central Government, so as to leave it strong, with power at any rate to give superior counsel and guidance to the other Administrations. There are several subjects described in our Code as "All-India subjects," railways, post office and telegraphs, and so on. Take for instance our glorious code of criminal law, based upon the Indian Penal Code and Criminal Procedure, which take it are examples to the world, our Law of Evidence, or Law of Property. These are matters which statesmen may consider that the Government of India alone should be competent to deal with, on which we cannot afford to have many divergent Governments taking different lines in future.

"Take again the important question of redistribution of the Provinces, which is likely to be a very troublesome and delicate problem. Our present Provinces are haphazard, due to the way in which the East India Company built them up to suit their own convenience, and they will have hereafter to be split up and replaced by more homogeneous Provinces, in order that autonomy may have some real meaning and validity. If that were to be the case, very complicated and vexing questions might arise which no people would allow to be settled by a Government which was not answerable to them. (Applause.) It is necessary, therefore, to consider now whether we shall leave the Indian Government as it is or likewise reform it, so that like the Provincial Administrations, it will be also a Government of elected representatives. There is no difficulty in deciding what the popular wish would be, but I have an apprehension that those placed in superior authority here are too willing to follow the Government of India here. It is possible this may be decided otherwise. I hope and trust that this mistake will not be made, for I am sure we in India cannot afford any longer to have our supreme Government absolutely unanswerable to the people and continually saying we will look only to Whitehall and Westminster for the source of our inspiration, we will continue to certify as heretofore. This is a serious danger, which with your assistance and enlightened guidance it is possible for us to prevent the Governments of India and England from perpetrating. I implore you to consider this matter. We shall put forth our best efforts in this direction, and if we have the democracy of England sympathising with such democracy as there is in India, our united efforts must prevail. (Applause.)"

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.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA LOAN.

FIVE PER CENT BONDS 1933.

Issued at Rs. 98-4-0 per cent and repayable
at par in 1933.

FIVE PER CENT LOAN 1945-55.

Issued at Rs. 99 per cent and repayable at par
not earlier than 1945 and not later
than 1955.

Both Issues are free of Income Tax.

Subscription opens on 28th July and the loan will be closed without notice as soon as total subscriptions amount to 15 crores.

Full details including terms on which War Bonds can be tendered, may be ascertained from any Bank, or Treasury or from the Dy. Controller of the Currency, New Customs House, Bombay.