

THE Servant of India

Acting Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY.

VOL. II., No. 23.]

POONA—THURSDAY, JULY 10, 1919.

[ANNUAL SUBSN. : RS. 4

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	265
ARTICLES :—	
The Reforms Bill. By Hirday Nath Kunzru ...	267
Spoliation of Indians' Rights	269
SPECIAL ARTICLES :—	
Some Dark Episodes in the Punjab Disturbances. By a Voice from the Punjab ...	270
Rabindra's Philosophy. By B. K. D. ...	271
SELECTION :—	
The Government of India Bill. By an Indian Publicist	273

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

SIR HORMUSJI A. WADYA, President of the Deccan Sabha, has sent the following cablegram to the Prime Minister and copies of it to Mr. Montagu and Lord Sinha: "The Council Deccan Sabha Poona dutifully offers loyal hearty congratulations to King-Emperor on final attainment of victorious Peace and their earnest prayer for His Majesty's long peaceful beneficent reign and continued greatness prosperity of his wide empire. While sharing universal thanksgiving and rejoicing they humbly beseech His Majesty graciously to proclaim amnesty to all political offenders, convicted, interned or under trial, and mercifully commute all death sentences, thus observing ancient traditions, satisfying public desire and promoting peace, contentment and good will within his realm."

It was certainly a very modest request that Syed Hasan Imam preferred to the Viceroy as counsel for Lala Harkrishan Lal and others to have their cases tried by ordinary courts. It is obvious that if the Viceroy were so minded he could grant the request, for section 4 of Regulation 10, 1804, provides that "the Governor General in Council shall not be precluded by this regulation from causing persons charged with any of the offences described in the present regulation to be brought to trial, at any time, before the ordinary courts of judicature, or before any special court appointed for the trial of such offences, under Regulation 4, 1799 and and Regulation 20, 1803, instead of causing such persons to be tried by courts martial, in any cases wherein the latter mode of trial shall not appear to be indispensably necessary."

NOW, it will be conceded by the most devoted

adherent of resolute government that it was not "indispensably necessary" to the maintenance of peace that the trials of some of the most prominent men in the Punjab should go forward under martial law. Under what circumstances the functions of the ordinary criminal courts could at all be suspended, under this regulation, will be best illustrated by the circular instructions transmitted to the magistrates in a letter from the Chief Secretary, dated the 11th April, 1805. One of the instructions runs thus: "If any person or persons, charged with any of the overt acts of rebellion specified in Regulation 10, of 1804, shall be apprehended by any military officer, when not in the actual commission of offences of that description, they are to be delivered over by the military to the civil power; and you are required to commit such persons to close custody and to adopt the necessary measures for bringing them to trial on a charge of high treason."

* * *

AS if to give point to the Deccan Sabha's message and to the criticism above made as to the continuation of Martial Law Commissions when the need for Martial Law had admittedly ceased, comes the staggering news of the conviction of Lala Harkishan Lal, Lala Duni Chand, Pandit Rambhuj Dutt Chowdhry and others and the sentence of transportation for life passed on them. Is it seriously meant that the country should believe that some of those who have been in the front rank of public men and addicted to peaceful ways turned their thoughts and activities all of a sudden to rebellion? We have a slightly different idea of 'rebellion,' 'armed revolt,' 'insurrection,' 'rising' and other words now being freely used from what presumably they convey to the Government and to the Martial Law Commissioners. The charges framed against the accused would only provoke a smile in India if the matter were not one of life and death. It is not possible to write of these sentences with the restraint due to a judicial tribunal from a publicist criticising its judgment. We will only say that it will yet be possible to do, to the distinguished persons involved in these trials something approximating to justice. Judicially, we believe there will be a reference to a higher authority, but politically we hope the Commission coming out to this country will make a searching inquiry into the conditions prevailing in the province in general and into the merits of all these individual cases, and arrive at

results which will satisfy the intelligent classes in the country.

THE personnel of the Joint Select Committee will be considered satisfactory, so far as the representation of the lower house is concerned. Sir Henry Craik is the only member who is distrustful of the reforms; all the others plead for an early enactment of the proposals contained in the Joint Report, and some of them are very keen on having those proposals enlarged. In Capt. Ormsby-Gore we have a very efficient member, who showed the best appreciation of the detailed provisions of the Bill in the debate on the second reading and pressed for the grant of fiscal autonomy, the widening of the transferred sphere and the making ministers independent of control in that sphere. The nomination of the House of Lords members might have been better than it is. That Viscount Midleton and Lord Sydenham are last-ditchers is well-known, and the President of the Committee, the Earl of Selborne, to judge from his speech on Lord Midleton's motion in October last, cannot be expected to throw his weight on the side of the popularisation of the Government of India. It will be remembered that Lord Selborne then questioned the suitability of establishing responsible government in India on the lines of the Dominions, and he objected to the changes proposed to be made in the central Government as too revolutionary and as calculated to increase opportunities of criticism without throwing any responsibility on non-official members.

AT a time when the crusade against the Press is at its worst in India, and when almost every week some newspaper or other is struck down under an Act which is as resistless in its application as comprehensive in its scope, it is useful to see how the Press is treated in Great Britain even in cases where, in the view of the Government, it has clearly overstepped the bounds of legitimate criticism and abused the proper functions of a public press. The *Daily Herald* recently published a State document marked 'secret,' whose issue, even on the confession of the Labour Party, "might easily have led to serious consequences." This is what the Secretary of State for War thinks of the circular in question. Says he:

"It is a confidential document, it has been stolen, and it has been published by a newspaper with the deliberate object of causing trouble and mischief at this critical time in the Army and among the workmen. The whole intention of this paper is to provoke an outbreak in the form of a mutiny or general strike, or preferably both together, in the hope that a general smash up and overthrow of society may result. That is the general and cheerful idea. Whether it is discharged, soldiers or police, or soldiers still retained at the colours, or workmen who are in the vital services, the object of this paper has been perfectly plain. It is to weave them all together and rouse them all at once to make a general overthrow on the Russian model."

It can well be imagined how such a paper would be dealt with in this country. Very few of

the numerous Indian papers which have been suppressed during the past ten years were charged, we suppose, with an equally serious offence of hitting the State in its vital part at a very critical time, and yet the British statesmen are not over-hasty in putting an end to this paper, although this is a time not particularly marked by a jealous regard for the rights of a free press even in England. Mr. Winston Churchill thus explained why the law was not set in motion against the *Herald*:

"I am asked, 'Why do you not prosecute this revolutionary organ?' My answer is simple. We believe that the structure of British society is sufficiently stable and sufficiently solid to enable us to allow in present circumstances even this unbridled license to continue;... We are anxious to preserve in this country a greater measure of free speech than exists in any other European country at the present time. We are prepared to run some risks, though I do not say we could go on doing so indefinitely. We may be wrong or we may be right. We may be right in general, but we may be wrong in a particular instance... I feel, however, that judged by every test that can be applied, no matter from what quarter of the social or political field, the improvement in our affairs, the settling down in these islands, has been so steady and continuous, that we can afford to view coolly these undoubted attempts which are being made to stir up strife."

Will Indian Governments ever take any risks?

THE Secretary of State was asked in the Commons the other day whether reforms on the lines of the Government of India Bill would not be introduced in Indian States. The reply given was of the usual sort: the conditions were different, and reforms proposed for British India might not exactly suit Indian India. What, however, we would like to know is whether the British Government will exert pressure in the direction of popularising the government in the States. The policy of non-intervention in the States as if they were foreign territory—such 'non-intervention' as is practised—must be upset, and a genuine attempt made to bring them into line with British India, where a beginning is being made in responsible government. As Dr. Vincent Smith says in his brochure entitled "Indian Constitutional Reform": "The time seems to have come when the affairs of the Protected States should no longer be considered as those of foreign territory. The changes in the relations between the Crown and Princes wrought by the Royal Titles Act and subsequent events have made the old-fashioned arrangements an anachronism and practically inconsistent with the altered conditions." We do not know what changes the author desires, but we are clear that the present policy will not serve.

THE commutation of the sentence of two years' rigorous imprisonment, imposed upon Mr. Kali Nath Roy, into one of three months, for which the country will feel grateful to His Excellency the Viceroy, affords relief which was sorely needed, but this must not be allowed to put out of sight the question of injustice in his case, which is far more serious. We hope an appeal will yet be made to the Privy Council.

THE REFORMS BILL.

BY HIRDAY NATH KUNZRU.

ON the 5th instant the Government of India Bill was read a second time in the House of Commons. The delay in its introduction had created an apprehension in the minds of some of those who are interested in Indian affairs that its second reading might have to be postponed till after the re-assembling of the House after the Whitsuntide recess. In such an event its enactment into law before the end of the year would have been well-nigh impossible. And as the time of Parliament next year is likely to be taken up entirely by Home Rule and the various schemes of domestic reconstruction, its failure to become law during the current year would have sealed its fate. But the keenness and energy shown by the Secretary of State has averted this catastrophe. It is believed in well-informed circles that but for his strenuous earnestness no time would have been allotted for the discussion of the Bill before Parliament adjourned for the Whitsuntide recess. It was the desire to stop its progress that led its opponents to make a motion asking for more time for the consideration of the measure. For the Bill is modelled upon the "Montford" report, which has been before the public in India and in this country for about a year, and the reports of the Reform Committees were made public three weeks ago. To ask therefore for the prolongation or adjournment of the discussion on the ground that sufficient time had not been given to members to understand the provisions of the Bill was manifestly destructive. The obvious object of the supporters of the motion was to destroy or reduce the chances of the Bill getting through both the Houses before the prorogation. This incident affords one more illustration of the value of Mr. Montagu to India and of the genuineness of his desire to start India on the career of responsible government with all practicable speed.

Just before the second reading of the Government of India Bill was taken up at 4 P. M. on the 5th instant there were about 150 members present in the house. The number was reduced to one-half when Mr. Montagu rose to make his speech. He was to deal with a subject which, as Col. Wedgwood remarked, was the most important that had ever engaged the attention of Parliament. It was not unreasonable to suppose that it might excite the interest of even a jaded House. The fast emptying benches, however, showed how vain the hope was and afforded an eloquent proof of the grave sense of responsibility which it is supposed to feel in connection with the affairs of "the great dependency" whose helpless masses are under its special protection. But whatever the apathy of Parliament where Indian affairs are concerned may be, the debate that took place is calculated to fill one with hope. The Bill itself is defective in many important respects. In

some places it is less liberal than the Montagu-Chelmsford report. To make it serve the purpose for which it is intended it will have to be substantially modified. But the tone of the debate showed that, with the exception of a few hopeless reactionaries, every one recognised the imperative need of moving forward and enabling India to control her own destiny within a measurable distance of time. Sir Henry Craik, Col. Yate and Brigadier-General Croft struck a jarring note. But their speeches carried no weight with the other members. They were merely the expression of their personal opinions, which are the result of inability to move with the times or hostility to Mr. Montagu. They harped on the illiteracy of the masses, declared the Morley-Minto reforms to have been a failure, and referred pointedly to the divisions of race and caste which afflict India at the present day. And if any reforms were to be introduced they preferred the scheme of the local Governments with its unitary executive to the "Montford" scheme with its hateful duality. They were blissfully unconscious of the fact that if all the charges they brought against the people of India were true, it only proved that the British Government had failed utterly to understand Indian problems and that indigenous talent alone could solve them. And their advocacy of the plan proposed by a majority of the local Governments, ought to be a conclusive argument against its adoption. For, holding the opinions that they do, it is impossible to believe, in spite of their professed love for India, that they would have approved of the views of the local Governments, had their acceptance involved the transfer of more power to the people of India than the system of dyarchy contemplates.

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.

It is impossible for me to deal with all the points requiring modification in the Bill. I can only point out the principal points on which the members of the various Indian deputations will have to concentrate their attention. The first objection to which the Bill is open is in regard to its form. It is hardly more than a skeleton. Nearly everything of importance has been left to be regulated by rules to be made under the statute by the executive. The experience of India in connection with rules framed under the Indian Councils Act of 1909 has been so bitter that she cannot be expected to regard the power given to the executive, which may be so used as to nullify the reforms, with equanimity. Mr. Montagu is quite alive to this objection. "The principle which," he said during the course of his speech, "it is intended to embody in these rules it is intended should be submitted to the Joint Committee which it is proposed to set up, and the policy of the rules, if not the actual wording of the rules, will therefore be carefully considered at the same time as the Bill itself." And this assurance was repeated later on in reply to Col. Wedgwood. It is not easy to draft all the rules in time to

admit of their submission to the Joint Committee. But Mr. Montagu's reply leads one to believe that no time will be lost in drafting them and that such of them as have to be framed by the Secretary of State will be placed before the Committee in the form in which it is proposed to issue them. I take it that the Indian gentlemen who will be invited to give evidence before the Committee will be placed in possession of these rules in order that they might be able to express their views in regard to them.

The second point that calls for attention is the fact that not an iota of power in the Government of India is proposed to be transferred into Indian hands. Even the statutory Commission is not empowered expressly to make proposals for the introduction of the principle of responsible government into the Government of India. I am not sanguine that the demand for the division of functions in the Government of India will be favourably considered. It is true that Parliament will probably support any measure to which the Cabinet gives its approval. But the composition of the Cabinet itself is such as to prevent Mr. Montagu from going as far as he himself would like. He can count on the support of his colleagues only up to a certain point. But the section relating to the statutory Commission can at all events be modified in such a way as to impose upon it the duty of reporting upon the changes which, upon an examination of all the materials before it, it considers desirable should be made in the Government of India. Several members of Parliament are in favour of this alteration, and I have every hope that Government itself will not be opposed to it.

Another matter of vital importance that should be noticed here is fiscal autonomy. The progress which Indians look for when they are responsible for the administration of departments that have an intimate bearing on the welfare of the people will involve greater expenditure and therefore higher taxation. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, that systematic efforts should be made to develop the material resources of India in every possible way. This requires that she should have the power to protect her industries against unfair competition and to bestow on them the fostering care that Governments in other countries do. This course, apart from being just, will not affect the interests of England prejudicially. As the Government of India will continue to be guided and controlled by English officials, there need be no fear that fiscal autonomy will be used wantonly to injure English interests. On the contrary, if the Government, the personnel of which will be predominantly non-Indian, proposes the imposition of protective duties in regard to any industry, it may be presumed that the case for protection is overwhelmingly strong. Captain Ormsby-Gore, who is a Unionist and who delivered the best speech on the Bill, had the courage and frankness to admit this. "One of the causes," he said, "of what an hon. Member from the Labour benches

deplored this evening—the poverty of industry in India—has been the maintenance of Free Trade in India against the wishes of its people. Let us see henceforth that the people of India should determine their fiscal system, and whether they want to adopt high protection, moderate protection, or even Free Trade, which I think would be folly in the case of India, let them to adopt it. It is for them to work out their own salvation." Captain Ormsby-Gore is not the only member of Parliament who holds this view. There are many who recognise the justice of India's claim for fiscal independence. Mr. Montagu personally can hardly be unsympathetic to such a claim, and it ought not to be difficult for him to persuade a Cabinet which does not regard Free Trade as a fetish to allow it.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

In regard to the provinces, the most essential thing is the power of the purse. Section 9 of the Bill employs language which is calculated to arouse uneasiness and which is contrary to the promise held out in the "Montford" report. The Governor is to be empowered to order such expenditure as may seem necessary to him "for the safety or tranquillity of the province, or for the carrying on of any department," and no proposals need be submitted in regard to expenditure on unspecified subjects which are "declared by rules under the principal Act to be a permanent charge on the provincial revenues." A self-willed Governor may so use these provisions as to reduce the ministers to a position of impotence. If the reform scheme is to be of any value the power proposed to be given to the Governor will have to be curtailed considerably, and the expenditure which is to be a permanent charge on the revenues will have to be clearly defined. If all that is intended is that the salaries of heads of Governments, members of executive councils and judges of the High Courts should not be voted annually it need not arouse Indian apprehensions. But strenuous opposition will have to be offered if, for instance, it is proposed to treat the salaries of all English officials in this way.

The Joint Committee will probably commence its work early in July. There is considerable speculation here in regard to its composition. It is understood that some Conservative peer will be chosen to preside over it and that Mr. Montagu himself will be a member of it. You may take these rumours for what they are worth, but whoever the chairman of the Committee may be, a majority of its members are bound to be selected from the supporters of the Government. The Committee can scarcely submit its report before September. Mr. Montagu has repeatedly promised that it will be open to it, not merely to recommend modifications, but also to consider the principle underlying the Government proposals and the relative merits of dyarchy and unitary executive. This will prolong unnecessarily the labours of the Committee. It is the opinion of many competent men that Mr. Montagu should have allowed the House of Commons to discuss the

principle of dyarchy during the second reading on which it is customary to discuss such a matter, and if the principle was affirmed, as it was bound to be, to ask the Committee to confine its attention to the details of the scheme. In order to expedite the work of the Committee it would be advisable for the Indian deputations to select some of their number to give evidence before it. Perhaps, this is required on other grounds also. The cause of India will be better served if only the best informed men appear before the Committee. It is not possible for the deputations to amalgamate, nor is it desirable that they should do so. Their views will make a stronger impression if, while remaining distinct, they show unanimity in the main points which should be urged before the Committee. If they do so, I am hopeful that many of the changes demanded by Indian public opinion will be incorporated in the Bill. Many of the Indian leaders who are here have had interviews with Mr. Montagu, and they are all deeply impressed by his readiness to listen to suggestions and his earnest desire to make the Bill a genuine instrument of progress.

London, June 12.

SPOILATION OF INDIANS' RIGHTS.

REFERRING to the anti-Asiatic legislation now before the South African Parliament, Lord Sinha observed on June 10 that the position of Indians in South Africa was far worse than it had been before the war. If India and South Africa were to be parts of the Empire such humiliating restrictions as were mentioned in the message (relating to the proposed legislation) must not be imposed upon Indians. Unfortunately, this sense of broad imperial citizenship is not shared by all the men at the helm of affairs, and to an enquiry made by Mr. Bennett in regard to the indirect right land-ownership possessed by Indians, the unsatisfactory reply was returned that Indians had acquired the right only by evading the law, and so no privation could possibly result. Now, what is the law the provisions of which Indians are supposed to be evading? The Gold Law of 1885 no doubt forbids Transvaal Indians to hold fixed property in their names, but this does not mean and never meant an absolute bar against land-ownership of every form. For the Republican Government itself showed a way out to the Indians. If they could not have land registered in their own names, the Republic pointed out, they could make Europeans nominal owners and take from the latter mortgage bonds for this property, thus rendering themselves owners except in the name. The convention was that mortgage bonds, being not fixed but moveable property, could be held by Indians and land acquired through them. If this is an evasion of the law, the Government itself was answerable for bringing it into vogue; but whatever the legal aspect of the matter may be, it is indisputable that, despite the Gold Law, the then Government of

South Africa did not intend rigidly to exclude Indian settlers from all possession of land, and that while laying an embargo, it also placed within the reach of Indians a means whereby they could acquire land in an indirect manner. This mode of indirect ownership of land, which has behind it the sanction of the Government, was followed in later times by another under which two or more Indians could form limited liability companies and thus acquire a collective ownership in the name of the corporations. Legally, the companies were supposed to possess an individuality separate from that of the constituents, and what individual Indians could not do in their own right collectively they could. This is another convention which has grown up in South Africa and is recognised by the law courts. As Mr. Bisset said in committee, the decision of Judge Ward in 1916 was that these companies were legal, and there are other decisions also recognising their validity. The Bill which has passed the committee stage deprives Indians of this indirect right of becoming registered owners of fixed property on the plea that this right has enured only because of the circumvention of the Gold Law by them. The present Bill is supposed to be based on the settlement of 1914, but, as more than one member remarked, these companies were in existence at the time of the compact, and if "vested rights" are protected under it, the contemplated withdrawal of a right recognised by Government and sanctioned by judicial authorities cannot be justified. And the Bill, it should be remembered, disallows both the modes of acquiring indirect ownership of property mentioned above, for in committee an amendment was adopted by which Indians were debarred from holding mortgages on property "otherwise than as security for a *bona fide* loan or investment in the ordinary course of business." Here the violation of the settlement which confirmed all existing rights is patent inasmuch as the Boer Government had itself suggested this other method of owning fixed property.

The question of trading rights on mining areas also arises out of the Gold Law. As was pointed out by Mr. Alexander in the course of the discussion, the whole idea (of the Gold Law) was to prevent an Asiatic from getting mining rights on gold areas, and not that of prohibiting them from trading. Mr. De Wet, Minister of Justice, himself admitted in committee that "in the old legislation there had not been a single restriction on Indian trading; there had been the question of living in certain parts or residence, but trading had never cropped up." Formerly all Indians were entitled to obtain trading licenses on paying the prescribed fee, though since 1908 the right has been circumscribed in various ways. The Acting Prime Minister, Mr. Malan, himself said: "The (Gandhi-Smuts) agreement not having been made law, the receivers of revenue had not the right to refuse trading licenses to Indians who applied for them; in fact, the court had held that licen-

ses could not be refused, and even the Municipalities, which so strongly protested, could not refuse the granting of licenses." The present Bill is said to be founded upon the definition of "vested rights" in a letter, now published by Mr. Gandhi, in which Mr. Gandhi secured Indians in the enjoyment of their existing rights by the settlement of 1914. This letter has been interpreted to mean that Mr. Gandhi agreed that no further licenses should be granted to Indians. As a matter of fact, the letter, written by Mr. Gandhi in his individual capacity and not as a spokesman of the Indian community, the question of trading rights not being made an issue of the Passive Resistance movement at all, was only meant as a precaution against restrictions being placed "upon the movement or the trade of British Indians in the gold areas." Or, in the words of Mr. Duncan, late Colonial Secretary of the Transvaal, "the agreement was a protective agreement under which an undertaking was given that . . . the Gold Law would not be put into force against the Indian community." In committee an amendment was passed extending the prohibition to take out new licenses, originally restricted to the mining areas, to the whole of the Transvaal. But later information is that although the House of Assembly carried a private member's amendment enabling municipalities to refuse trading licenses to Asiatics without assigning any reason, the Senate has rejected it. What exactly the effect of this is remains somewhat obscure, but it is clear that if the Union Government goes back from the settlement of 1914 and withdraws any of the rights secured by Indians, this country will not put up with it, and we trust the present Government of India will be with us in defeating the project of overthrowing the compact as Lord Hardinge's Government was with us in bringing it about. Should it unfortunately be necessary to fight the race prejudice of the Europeans in South Africa, Lord Sinha who has already uttered a solemn warning to imperial statesmen with all the authority which attaches to his position as a member of the British Cabinet will render us inestimable assistance and will be able, we presume, to arrest an untoward development of the situation. In any event, the Indians in this country will not rest till their fellow-countrymen in the Transvaal are saved from the danger threatening them.

SOME DARK EPISODES IN THE PUNJAB DISTURBANCES.

THE mad excesses of the infuriated mob on the 10th April at Amritsar, on 12th April at Kasur and on the 14th April at Gujranwala, together with minor disturbances at other places, no doubt form a dark page in the otherwise brilliant chapter of Punjab's loyalty and devotion to the Empire during the fateful years of the great world war. These excesses have been deplored and condemned in the strongest and most unequivocal terms by Indians fevery shade of opinion. It is an axiomatic

truth that peace and order are the first requisites of progress, and so far as the maintenance of order is concerned, Government can always rely upon the active and willing co-operation of every sensible man. There is, however, a line of demarcation to be drawn. In times of panic and excitement, there is always just a possibility that forces of law and order might unintentionally lapse into the very evil which they have been requisitioned to guard against; that the physical and military force, which the authorities on the spot might have invoked in perfect good faith to check disorder and disturbances, might get out of hand and control. At such a time, no useful purpose is gained by trying to throw the veil over what are regarded as the unhappy blunders and bunglings of the administration and consigning those sad events into the limbo of oblivion. For the heart of the populace, which is aggrieved by what it conceives to be a wanton act of aggression, refuses to be soothed even by the healing balm of Time, until it has had an impartial and independent enquiry into the wrong that it supposes has been done. And it is with this object, now that the Right Hon'ble Mr. Montagu has promised an enquiry into the causes of and measures taken to cope with these disturbances, that I refer to two of the most distressing incidents that have taken place in the process of quelling the disturbances and riots that disfigured the otherwise placid annals of the two cities of Amritsar and Gujranwala.

TRAGEDY AT JALANWALA BAGH, AMRITSAR.

I will first deal, by referring to official and semi-official accounts, with the tragedy at the Jalanwala Bagh, Amritsar, on the 13th April, when the mob attending a prohibited meeting were fired on by troops. After the serious disturbances by the mob on the 10th April, a semi-official report says that "the troops on the following (11th) afternoon marched through the city and occupied places of vantage." The first press communique issued by the Punjab Government reports that "on the 11th (April) no collisions occurred between the police or the troops and the mob either at Amritsar or at Lahore, though the shops remained closed." As to the incidents of the following date, the communique states: "At Amritsar, the day (12th April) passed off quietly. The troops marched round and into the city and found the streets almost deserted." As to the incidents of the 13th April, a semi-official account (published by the *Civil and Military Gazette* of May 10th, 1919, page 4) states that "the District was proclaimed under the Seditious Meetings Act and notices were posted and proclamations made by beat of drum in the city, forbidding meetings. In spite of this, 6000 persons assembled in Jalanwala Bagh and speeches were being delivered, when the troops arrived to disperse the meeting. Troops fired, causing casualties." The *Civil and Military Gazette* account published in its issue of 16th April thus speaks of the incident: "An attempt to hold a proscribed meeting at Amritsar was frustrated,

after the arrest of some ring-leaders. The General, with only Indian troops and police, gave the order to disperse. As the crowd refused to go, the order to fire was given. There were heavy casualties among the mob, several hundreds being killed and injured, and there was no further trouble."

Now none of these accounts attribute any act of violence to the mob or explain the necessity of firing. On the other hand, the Indian version is that the proclamation by beat of drum about the prohibition of meetings was not announced except in certain quarters of the city, and even where it was made it was not properly understood by the common people, and certainly not by the villagers, who had come to Amritsar on the occasion of the Vaisakhi fair. Further, although the meeting held at Jalanwala Bagh on the 13th April afternoon was no doubt political, many village folks went there thinking it was a gathering of a Khalsa Diwan, by no means an uncommon occurrence in the city of the Gurus. As a matter of fact the import of the prohibition order was so little understood that two students of the Khalsa College (one a Matriculate and the other an Intermediate student) who were unwittingly in the crowd lost their lives in the firing. It cannot certainly be said that the students of the Khalsa College, who have always been to the fore in recruiting for the Indian Defence Force and whose attachment and devotion for their European staff of the College in the days of trouble at Amritsar have been handsomely acknowledged by the authorities, would have knowingly attended a proscribed meeting.

The next question is whether in dispersing the mob, the provisions of Sections 130 and 131, Criminal Procedure Code, were borne in mind. The official estimates have put the casualties between two to three hundred, but the popular version places the death-roll at a figure considerably above this estimate. The Seva Samiti of Amritsar is said to have burnt several hundred corpses. Then, can it be said that in giving and carrying out the order to fire, "as little injury to person and property, as may be consistent with dispersing the assembly and arresting and detaining such persons" (Section 130 [2] Cr. P. C.) was used? It may be remembered that martial law was not proclaimed at Amritsar till the 15th April morning, and in such circumstances the powers of a commissioned military officer must be regulated by Section 131, Cr. P. C. In this case was it so difficult for the General to communicate with the District Magistrate before giving the order to fire? Was "public safety so manifestly endangered by the mob," in spite of the presence of troops, supported, it is said, by machine guns, that there was no alternative to giving the order to fire? These are questions, which the committee of enquiry promised by the Secretary of State can alone throw light upon, and until this is done it is difficult to stop the rumours that have trickled down country through the practically gagged silence that so long prevailed in the province and

which has not yet altogether disappeared. One thing, however, is clear. The dark clouds that have settled over the province are sure to pass away sooner or later, perhaps sooner than later. There can be no doubt that British statesmanship which, as Lord Morley once reminded us, has not yet failed in any part of the world, will not fail in India. And it should be the duty of all truly loyal citizens to help in the rehabilitation of this British statesmanship.

AEROPLANE BOMBING AT GUJRANWALA.

The first detailed and graphic account of the bombing from aeroplanes at Gujranwala appeared in the *Civil and Military Gazette* of May 1 (page 4), from which the following excerpt may be of interest:

"Meanwhile, the few women and children left in the station had taken refuge in the Treasury, an ancient fortified building of an antique pattern. *The crowds were already giving up the contest as not good enough*, when several aeroplanes arrived from Lahore and drove the evil-doers hastily to cover. However, it is satisfactory to know that by bombs and machine-gunning several casualties were inflicted, though not nearly as many as the ruffians and hooligans deserved. Still the effect was decisive, and the people hid themselves in their houses, and during the night a large number of them fled into adjoining villages." (The italics are mine.)

The first question is whether bombing in these circumstances, when the crowd was already dispersing, was at all necessary. But this is not all. It should be remembered—a point which Mr. Montagu was apparently not aware of, while replying to Colonel Wedgwood's question on the subject—that all this took place on the 14th April and by order of the civil authorities, and that the military command had nothing to do with it. Martial law, we must bear in mind, was proclaimed in the Gujranwala district two days later, *viz.*, on the 16th April (*vide* Martial Law Extension Ordinance II of 1919). The question arises, is bombing by aeroplane in any circumstances justified against unarmed population of a non-enemy town? Section 130 or 131, Cr. P. C., evidently has no application in this case. I leave this point, which is of considerable interest, to experts on International Law to answer.

A VOICE FROM THE PUNJAB.

RABINDRA'S PHILOSOPHY.

THE writings of Rabindranath Tagore have become very popular, and there is a true and wide-spread desire to study the philosophy embodied in them. For the author is not merely a poet, but also a philosopher. In the expressive language of Carlyle, he has dived beneath the surface of things and seized the truth at the heart of the Universe. Rabindranath is a seer, with his vision opened to the realities of the world. He has had a perfect revelation of God, and he stands before us as the supreme flower of humanity.

A seer and a mystic, Rabindranath has not ceased to be a man among men. Dowered, as he is, with the joy of joys and the love of loves, he

has taken his full share in the affairs of his fellow-men. He has shared with them the burden of their life, has suffered with them in their sufferings, and has worked among them for their welfare and their enlightenment. God, according to him, can be seen not in the silence of the forest or the solitude of the mountain, but rather in the work of the stone-breaker and the toiler for the wife and children.

Rabindranath is thus a practical man and a philosopher, a poet and a patriot, a dreamer and a worker, and his message has for us a special meaning and significance.

We, therefore, welcome a new publication by Messrs. Macmillan & Co., entitled "The Philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore" by Professor S. Radhakrishnan. This book aims at interpreting Tagore's philosophy in a manner and a language suited to the intelligence of ordinary readers. It is true that Tagore has in his "Sadhana" expounded 'the teaching of ancient India, as revealed in our sacred texts and manifested in the life of to-day.' But the ordinary readers find it difficult to follow the exposition or even its language. Hence the value of Mr. Radhakrishnan's book. No doubt the meaning of 'the living words that come out of the experience of great hearts can never be exhausted by any one system of logical interpretation.' Yet, Mr. Radhakrishnan's book has this advantage that, as the author tells us in his introduction, Rabindranath has seen the book and expressed his appreciation of the interpretation contained in it.

With these introductory remarks, we propose to touch on the salient features of Rabindranath's philosophy, using his own words as far as possible, and only making a few alterations where necessary.

The great problems which engaged the mind of man from time immemorial, and which have a perennial interest for him are:—(1) What is the nature of God? (2) What is the relation between God and Man? (3) What is the meaning of the great world in which we live? How is it related to us?

Let us see what Rabindranath has to say on these questions, and what conclusions he has reached in respect of them.

(1) To begin with the first, the nature of God. Most philosophers have described God only in negative terms. The Vedas have to content themselves with saying, He is not this, He is not that. But that cannot satisfy us. We want to know what He is. Rabindranath at once tells us that He is the spirit of abounding joy, immortal bliss, Ananda, Amritam. "From joy are born all creatures, by joy they are sustained, towards joy they progress, and into joy they enter."

This will become clear to us when we understand the nature and working of joy.

First, we must bear in mind that joy is not a passive principle, it is an active and a creative force. Its very nature is to realize itself in forms. When a singer is filled with joy, his joy will pour

forth in the form of a song. Similarly, the joy of a poet will seek expression in the form of a poem. Thus joy, which is without form, will by its very nature, body forth and translate itself into forms. Where the joy is infinite, the forms will be numerous. Thus the Divine Spirit of Joy, by its very nature, expresses itself in a world of manifold forms. In other words, this world is only God's joy made manifest.

Secondly, the nature of joy is such that it must have a duality for its realisation. When the singer has his inspiration, he makes himself into two; he has within him one self as the singer, and the other as the hearer. And he can realize the joy of this song, only because he can hear what he sings. Without the duality, the realisation of joy would not be possible. So also in the case of love. Love cannot be realized, unless it makes itself into two, viz., the lover and the beloved; and it is their union after the separation which makes the realization of love possible. Just as the singer has the hearer within him and the outside audience is merely an externalization of that hearer, so the beloved is only an externalization of his own other self in the lover. In the same way, the Immortal Joy has made himself into two. Our soul is the loved one, it is his other self. Our soul is separated from him, but this has not been from alienation, but from fulness of love. Just as, when the father tosses his child up from his arms, it has the appearance of rejection, but in truth it is to clasp the child all the closer within his arms.

Thirdly, just as it is the nature of joy to have two for its realization, so also it requires a communion between the two for the perfection of that realization. For instance, the singer translates his joy into song, but its realization is complete only when the hearer translates the song back into the original joy, for then the communion between the singer and the hearer is complete. The Infinite Joy has manifested itself in various forms, and we fulfil our destiny when we translate those forms back into their original Joy, when we go back from the world to the world's Soul, the Infinite Love, which is manifesting itself in various finite forms of law.

Man is on his journey from law to love, from discipline to liberation, from the moral plane to the spiritual. To reach that plane, he shall, according to the Buddha, deceive none, entertain no hatred for anybody, and never wish to injure through anger. He shall have measureless love for all creatures, even as a mother has for her only child, whom she protects with her own life. Love is the ultimate meaning of everything around us. It is truth: it is the joy that is at the root of all creation. Only through the heightening of our consciousness into love, and extending it all over the world, shall we attain communion with the Infinite Joy.

Rabindranath thus defines the relation between God and Man, and says that Man can best fulfil his duty and destiny by entertaining deepest love

for God and for all forms in which God has manifested Himself.

(2) Coming now to the relation between man and man, we find that in certain countries man is looked upon by man merely as his food. Such people are called cannibals and savages. But there are other forms of cannibalism, not so gross, but not less heinous, which are to be found even in civilised countries. For the essence of cannibalism lies not in eating human flesh only, but in regarding man merely as a body, merely as a means of satisfying our appetites, our lust or greed or love of comfort. This spirit of cannibalism has in civilised countries given rise to hovels and brothels, slavery and indentured labour, exploitation of foreign countries and degradation of foreign races. But in treating others in this inhuman manner, men are only deadening their own consciousness and losing their own humanity. It is a spiritual suicide.

Civilization must be judged and valued, not by the amount of power it has developed, but by the love of humanity it has evolved and given expression to. Whenever some ancient civilization fell into decay and died, it was owing to causes which produced callousness of heart, and led to the cheapening of man's worth. Whenever a powerful ruler began to look upon the people as mere instruments of his power, or compelled weaker races to slavery and tried by every means to keep them down, man struck at the foundation of his greatness, his love of freedom and fair play.

Civilization can never sustain itself by cannibalism of any form. Man must learn to regard man not as body only, but as spirit as well. This spirit is truly known only by love. When we define a man by the market value of his service, we know him imperfectly. We look upon him as an alien and an outsider. We are unjust to him, even cruel; and we entertain feelings of triumphant self-congratulation, when owing to some cruel advantage on our side, we get out of him more than we have paid for. But when we know him as spirit we know him as our own. We at once feel that cruelty to him is cruelty to ourselves. To make him small is stealing from our own humanity. And in seeking to make use of him solely for personal profit, we merely gain in money what we lose in our spiritual vision, the vision of the whole truth, which gives us our highest delight and which reveals to us the deepest harmony that exists between man and man and between man and the world.

(3) This brings us to the relation between man and the world. As explained above, God is the spirit of joy or love (for according to Rabindranath love is only the play of joy), and love gives itself spontaneously in endless gifts. But gifts may be valued for their usefulness, or for the love out of which they come, and of which they are the visible tokens. In the first case, we use things when required, and throw them off when no longer necessary. In the second case, we treasure them up and en-

shrine them in our hearts as things of permanent interest and worth to us.

The question is, In what manner do we accept this world, which is a perfect gift of joy to us? Do we cherish it as a thing of deathless value to us, or do we make use of it only to satisfy our wants. The answer is, we feed and clothe ourselves from its stores, we scramble for its riches, we use its forces to gain more power for us. But is this its true meaning for us? True, the world is very useful to us, and satisfies our wants, but our relation to it does not end there. It is the relation of love. We are attached to the world with numberless threads which extend from the earth to the stars. We are glad that we are in it. In fact, our love of life is really our wish to continue our relation with this great world of ours. It is so dear to us; it fills us with such a deep longing, for it is the sweet symbol of the Eternal Love.

Wherever there is a bit of colour, a note of song, a grace of form, there comes the call for our love. It is a call to us, not a command. It seeks for love in us, and love can never be had by compulsion. Compulsion is not the final appeal to man, but joy is. And joy is everywhere; it is in the earth's green covering of grass; in the blue serenity of sky; in the reckless exuberance of spring; in the severe abstinence of grey winter; in the living flesh that animates our bodily frame; in the perfect poise of the human figure, noble and upright, in living; in the exercise of all our powers; in the acquisition of knowledge; in fighting evils; in dying for gains we never can share. Joy is there everywhere, it is superfluous, unnecessary, nay it very often contradicts the most peremptory behests of necessity. It exists to show that the bonds of law can only be explained by love; they are like body and soul. Joy is the realization of the truth of oneness, the oneness of our soul with the world, and of the world-soul with the supreme lover.

B. K. D.

SELECTION.

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

A CRITICISM.

BY AN INDIAN PUBLICIST.

THE debate in the House of Commons at the second reading of the Government of India Bill was chiefly confined to the general policy of Indian constitutional reform. The papers, too, have allowed their meagre comments to turn on the broad considerations of political expediency that underlie the proposed legislation. Though the Bill has been read a second time, none of its cardinal principles is yet irrevocably settled. Even dyarchy, which is its most cardinal feature, is liable to the examination of the Joint Committee of Parliament. The scope of the measure may be enlarged or curtailed, though the Secretary of State passionately protested against the latter course, while question of what should be put into the Bill and what should be relegated to the rules still awaits final decision. The Indian deputations will urge that responsible government should be introduced into the Central Government, and certain subjects left to be administered by a Minister removable by the Legislature. If this improvement be conceded, the Bill will have to undergo fundamental altera-

tion. Perhaps it will be necessary to accept generally the delimitation of frontier between the Bill and the rules as foreshadowed by the Secretary of State. One exception needs to be made. It is not the pedantry of logic, but the essence of draftsmanship, which required that the status and privileges of the Legislative Houses should be determined by the Bill. The limits to the power of interpellation and discussion of matters of general interest, and the question whether the President and Vice President of the popular Houses should be elected or nominated, ought not to be kept to the rules as laid down in 9 (6). No first instalment of provincial autonomy can be substantial which seriously restricts the facilities of criticism and debate or the right of obtaining information from members of Government, while for the growth of conventions and wholesome traditions it is essential that the Legislature elect their own chairman.

Turn now to some of the important details of the Bill which seem open to exception. Clause 30 forbids the Legislatures in India to repeal or alter any rules under the Act. It is an extraordinary provision. The Secretary of State in Council makes some rules, the Governor-General in Council makes others. The arrangement is proper to start with. But is it proper to withhold from autonomous Legislatures the power to amend them subsequently? Natural growth is impossible so long as external authority is requisite, not to sanction, but even to initiate change. For every small improvement in the rules which experience may prove desirable, it is highly inconvenient to wait till it should please the Secretary of State in Council or the Governor-General in Council to effect it. Of course no one will dispute that in respect of some rules of great constitutional importance the sanction of superior authority must be made a condition precedent. To separate that category is easy. For the rest the Legislatures concerned should be endowed with competency, subject, if necessary, to the sanction of the Governor or the Governor-General, as the case may be, but not to that of the Governor in Council or the Governor-General in Council. When the Dominions got their start, some had power given them to incorporate territories and some to establish Upper Houses, when they thought fit. There is such a thing as excessive and intolerable rigidity. We do not overlook clause 9 (7); but it relates only to standing orders governing the procedure of the Councils.

POWER OF THE PURSE.

The next great objection is to the restriction on the power of the purse. To an Englishman unacquainted with Indian affairs the first idea of a constitution would be the right of the people to control taxation and expenditure. In the Colonies representative institutions had the power of the purse before the beginning of responsible government were thought of. It is quite time India had this rudimentary right of a free people. Dyarchy involves a certain definite limitation on the power of the purse. The Joint Report of Lord Chelmsford and Mr. Montagu hit the limitation with a fair degree of accuracy. The Bill, however, in sub-clause (2) (b) of Clause 9, proposes to give the Governor power to authorise expenditure not allowed by the Legislative Council if he considers it necessary "for the carrying on of any department." This power extends to the transferred functions as well as the reserved. We cannot reconcile ourselves to such a drastic limitation of the financial control of the legislature over the departments entrusted expressly to it. Mistakes as regards the transferred subjects the elected leaders of the people must have the liberty to make and rectify. Where they are so serious as to interfere with "the safety or tranquillity" of provinces, they will fall within the reserved group, and if they do not, the sub-clause in question contains a sufficient safeguard.

Sub-clause (2) (c) of the same clause excludes an undefined portion of the expenditure from the purview of the Council. The contribution to the Central Government and the interest on public debt will be the most important items in this category. Put it is also usual to make permanent provision, not depend-

ent on the annual vote of the legislature, for the salaries of high officers appointed directly by the Crown. These would be the head of the Government, the Auditor-General, the Executive Councillors, and the High Court Judges. We trust the list will not be allowed to go further in the rules that may be made for the purpose under this Bill.

Sub-clause (5) invests the Governor with power to block the progress of a Bill, clause, or amendment after certifying that it affects the interests of a specified reserved subject. Now the power to block legislation is new to the Indian constitution. The non-official majority may, under existing rules, refuse leave to introduce a Bill; but if that majority is agreeable and lets a Bill go through, the head of the Government can only refuse his assent to it at the end. Why is it necessary to invent this extraordinary power to interfere with the legislature? Let it be noted that this power is not applicable where the legislation proposed concerns exclusively a reserved subject or a transferred subject; it is to be exercised only in the case of "mixed" subjects. The anomaly cannot be justified except on ingenious grounds.

Exception has been taken by every section of Indian opinion to the suggestion that the salary of the Minister should be determined in future by the Governor or other authority. In fact Indians are extremely sensitive on the question of the comparative status of the Executive Councillor and the Minister. If anything, the advantage and precedence should belong, in their judgment, to the latter. It is almost unpardonable ignorance or disregard of the feeling of those directly concerned to persist in the discrimination, see 3 (1). We fail to see any object in the provision. Indians will watch with the utmost jealousy any inequalities or disparities that may lie in the instrument of instructions to Governors. Let us hope that the draftsman of the instrument will remember this fact when drawing it up.

THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.

In the forefront of our observations on the Government of India part of the Bill must be placed the view that some of its functions must be "transferred" to the legislature and entrusted to a Minister responsible to it. On this point all the deputations from India are agreed. They are convinced that it does not violate the declaration of August, 1917, in the letter or in the spirit, but goes against one of the limitations laid down by the authors of the Joint Report without adequate grounds. We have not the space required for a full treatment of the subject; it has been argued at length in the Indian Press. It is complained that the whole matter of the popularisation of the Central Government is not only put off indefinitely but evaded even in the statement of the scope of the periodical commission for recommending further steps. The Bill does not meet this complaint at all, see 28 (2). The language used here and in 28 (2) is by no means satisfactory: responsible government is spoken of only in connexion with the provinces, not in connexion with the Central Government. The point must be cleared up beyond doubt or controversy.

There is something in the argument that racial distinctions should not be made, if they could be avoided, in the terms of a statute. The one-half proportion, unanimously desired by the progressive Indian opinion, in the Executive Council of the Viceroy, will therefore have to be pressed when the rules come to be considered.

Strong exception must be taken to the very wide language of clause 20 (a). It deals with the power of Governor-General in Council to take away certain classes of legislation from the scope of the Legislative Assembly and by certificate bring them within the sole jurisdiction of the Council of State. A law required for the safety and tranquillity of the country or any part thereof is fit matter for such treatment. But why should the same treatment be allowed to every law which may be essential "for the interests of British India or any part thereof"? We can hardly conceive of a law which will not come within the description. The Legislative Assembly

could be made to die of inanition, if the Governor-General were so minded. The Joint Report used the words "good government," and people in India criticised even these as too comprehensive. What could have induced the draftsman to adopt the indefensibly wide language of the Bill?

As regards emergency legislation, for which the same certification procedure is provided in 20 (a), let it be remembered that the Governor-General now has power to make ordinances which are valid for six months. The proposed Council of State legislation is therefore superfluous. If it be thought that the interests of the people would be better safeguarded by having emergency legislation discussed in the Council of State, which includes a certain number of elected representatives, than by having it passed as an ordinance by the Governor-General—a position which certainly is correct—then the ordinance power must be abolished. Where the emergency is of a nature that touches peace and tranquillity, the case is covered by the earlier part of the clause. Where the matter involved is public money or a taxation proposal, it is proper to let the Executive take action first and then seek the ratification in due course of the legislature. We are unable for this reason to support the provision in question for emergency legislation. On the whole, then, it seems sufficient to restrict the Governor-General's power of certification to cases where the peace and tranquillity of British India or of any part thereof are involved.

The next point is the question of the Indian Civil Service and other Imperial services. The rule-making power, it is proposed in 24 (2), may be transferred to the Governments in India by the Secretary of State within prescribed limits. This is satisfactory, so far as it goes. We trust, however, the aim will be to leave the Governments in India, acting with their legislatures, to regulate their own services. It is an anomaly that a great Government should be compelled to conduct its administration with the aid of services regulated and recruited and safeguarded by outside authority. Such a position is incompatible with the very idea of authority. The inheritance of the early days of the Company, however, cannot be worked off in a day. It is noteworthy that the subject of pensions is dealt with by itself in 24 (3), that the rules regarding them can be varied or added to only by the Secretary of State, and that it is not proposed to authorise him to devolve any part of this power on the Governor-General in Council. It is not easy to explain this discrimination; under safeguards, which could be provided without much ingenuity, the rules as to pensions should likewise be made alterable by the India Government.

The purposes for which a Public Service Commission is to be appointed permanently by clause 26 are not clearly stated. In para 55 of the Despatch of the Government of India dated March 5, one of the purposes is stated to be the protection of the Service from political influence and the difficulties arising from Ministers' control. We realise the need and note with satisfaction that the Commissioners will be appointed and controlled by the Secretary of State. As in the United Kingdom, these Public Service Commissioners should conduct public examinations of two or three grades and regulate admission to employment under Government without the suspicion of partiality or bias. It is to be hoped that this consummation is definitely contemplated. Otherwise jobbery might establish itself firmly and bring inefficiency and corruption in its train. No greater calamity could be imagined.

The creation of new provinces is provided for in clause 12. No objection need be taken to this innovation. But it is hard to understand the partitioning of a province so as to bring into existence a subordinate administration under a Deputy-Governor with status and powers to be determined by the Executive. Is such "part of a province" to be kept within, or taken out of, the jurisdiction of the provincial Legislature? The provision is so vague that it opens the door to all the sorts of conjecture. For instance, if the people of a district had become chronic passive resisters, they could be deprived in

part of their constitutional privileges by being placed under a Deputy-Governor with low status and powers. More precision is needed if this provision is to stand. In any case the entire clause 12, even as to the part relating to the creation of a Governor's province, requires to be amended by making a resolution of the legislature concerned a condition precedent to executive action. The carving out of a new governorship or deputy-governorship should not be possible without consulting the wishes of the people directly interested in the recognised constitutional manner.—*India*.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

IS INDIA CIVILISED? By Sir John Woodroffe. (Ganesh & Co. Rs. 2-8.)

RIGHTS OF CITIZENS. By S. Satyamurthy. (Ganesh & Co.)
SIR SANKARAN NAIR'S MINUTES OF DISSSENT. (Ganesh & Co. As. 8.)

FOOTSTEPS OF FREEDOM. By James H. Cousins. (Ganesh & Co.)

MOULTED FEATHERS. By James H. Cousins. (Ganesh & Co.)

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

IT was enquired of the Congress delegates in England whether they would accept anything less than the reforms proposed by the Congress-League. Their definitive answer to such an inquiry ought to have been, in discharge of the mandate given by the Congress in a specific resolution, an emphatic 'no'; but they boggled sadly at the negative which loyalty to the Congress resolutions required of them. They merely contented themselves with saying: "It is not at all a question of acceptance or rejection. Our business is to get as much as we could now possibly get and agitate for the rest." Where then was the use of the hard-and-fast mandate with which the Congress is supposed to have charged its deputation if its attitude was after all to be so milk-and-water as is now revealed in the answer of its accredited representatives? "Take what you get and work for more," is what every party has been saying; no one has surrendered his claim to the remaining rights of self-government. The plain truth is that the fact of the Congress mandate is now forgotten by most people, and those who once plumed themselves upon the Congress having bound its delegation with a narrow mandate now desire nothing so much for the mandate as the oblivion into which it has fallen. Mr. Tilak, who by the bye is not included in the Congress deputation and not recognised as a Congress spokesman, is even more explicit than those who speak on behalf of the Congress: he has told English audiences that though he requires certain improvements in the Reform Scheme officially put forward he will accept whatever is conceded in the end. It may be observed in this connexion that Mrs. Besant declared on her arrival in London that the insertion of a time-limit in the Bill, of which so much was made in the Bombay and Delhi sessions of the Congress, though desirable, was not a *sine qua non*. Thus there is an all-round approximation to the Liberal view.

* * *

A BILL now before the Legislative Council of the East Africa Protectorate provides for the inclusion of women over twenty-one in the franchise, and the measure is now under the consideration of the Colonial Secretary. This is an additional reason why the franchise should be extended to women in India.

GET GOOD SIGHT.

By removing the cause of bad sight. Don't commit the common error and take to spectacles as the only remedy for eye-trouble—they will correct your sight. But what you want is something to cure your eyes viz.—the Actina Treatment. Actina has succeeded where Specialists had failed, simply because it assists and not opposes Nature. It is essentially a natural treatment and the hundreds of testimonials are proof that it is a successful treatment. To use it is simplicity itself—remove the two screw caps from the Actina Instrument releasing the powerful vapor, which applied to the eyes and inhaled through the mouth and nostrils sets up and maintains a good circulation in all parts of the eye, removes congestion and restores in the organ to perfect health. It is just as effective in other catarrhal Diseases such as Hay Fever, Asthma, Bronchitis, Headache, Sore Throat, Influenza, Deafness etc. Invest Rs 25-8 in an Actina and save specialists' fees. Valuable booklet entitled "Prof. Wilson's Treatise on Disease" containing particulars of Conditional Trial Offer and convincing testimonials post. free from Rai B. S. Bhandari M. A. Batala (India).

2

THE ACTINA WAY.**JUST A WORD**

or two to remind you to send your order To-Day for our famous

COSSI SILK SUIT PIECES

Worth the price, and a piece guaranteed for one suit complete.

Price Rs. 8 per piece.

Order from:—**GOOD LUCK COMPANY, BENARES CITY.**

INDIAN REFORMS

This hand book on the Reforms contains the text of the new Reforms Bill now under discussion in the British Houses of Parliament, together with Mr. Montagu's memorandum and speeches thereon. It opens with the Memorandum of the Nineteen and records the various schemes subsequently adumbrated by representative bodies and individuals. It contains the schemes of Sir W. Wedderburn, D. H. the Aga Khan, Gokhale, Lord Islington; of the Congress, the Muslim League, and the Moderate Conference; Summaries of the Montague-Chelmsford proposals, the Southborough Committee's Reports on Franchise and Division of Functions and the Government of India's Despatches on the same and on the Reform proposals in general. Sir Sankaran Nair's two masterly Minutes of Dissent on the Government of India's Despatches are also included. The book concludes with the full text of the Reforms Bill as presented to the Parliament.

PRICE RUPEE ONE.

To Subscribers of the "Indian Review," Annas 12.
Ex. G. A. NATESAN, & CO., MADRAS.

DR. BAILUR'S MEDICINES.

HIVA-JWAR!
Ague pills.
Price As. 8,
Per bottle.



BALAGRAHA
CHURNA.
Epileptic powder.
Price Re. 1.
Per bottle.

Ask for our catalogue for other medicines & Particulars.

Liberal commission for Merchants.

Dr. H. M. BAILUR,

Dispensary BELGAUM.

Ramchandra Govind & Son,

BOOK-SELLERS AND PUBLISHERS, KALKADEVI, BOMBAY.

INDIAN CURRENCY AND BANKING PROBLEMS

BY MOHAN LAL TANNAN, B. COM., (Birmingham), BAR-AT-LAW, F. R. E. S.
Lecturer in Banking, Sydenham College of Commerce and Economics, Bombay.

AND

KHUSHAL T. SHAH, B. A., B. SC. (Econ. London), BAR-AT-LAW.

Professor of Economics, Maharajah's College, Mysore.

Crown Octavo. Nicely bound, Gold-lettered, nearly 350 Pages with Index. Price Rs. 5.

GOVERNANCE OF INDIA Price Rs. 3.

BY KHUSHAL T. SHAH, B. A., B. SC. (Econ., London), BAR-AT-LAW.

Professor of Economics, Maharajah's College, Mysore.

(1) Higher Accounting With Auditing Notes. BY S. R. Davar.

Officially recognized by the Government of Mysore for use in Colleges and Schools of Commerce and recommended as a text to the Students of the Premier College of Commerce in India.

A book specially written for the use of Professional Accountancy students as well as that of Accountants, Legal Practitioners and Businessmen Price Rs. 6-8.

(2) Elements of Indian Mercantile Law. BY S. R. Davar.

Recognized and Recommended as text-book by the Government Accountancy Diploma Board, as well as by the Premier College of Commerce for the University, Commercial and Accountancy Examinations *Specially written for the use of " Commerce " and " Accountancy " students as well as that of Businessmen and Accountants. Rs. 6-8-0.*

(3) Business Organization. An excellent book for the use of students of commerce and businessman, particularly those in charge of the management of large enterprises such as public companies, Mill Agencies, etc, BY **S. R. Davar, BAR-AT-LAW.**

(In Press. Expected to be out shortly.) Price Rs. 6. net.

Twentieth Century English-Marathi Dictionary :—Pronouncing Etymological, Literary, Scientific and Technical by N. B. Ranade, B. A. 2 vols. half Morocco bound. **Rs. 25.**

Shah and Haji's (Profs.) Guide to Economics :—In form of question and answer very useful to students of Economics. **Rs. 4.**

Shan's (Prof.) Guide to Indian Administration :—Very useful to Intermediate Arts students. **Rs. 1-4-0.**