

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. VI, No. 50.]

POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 11, 1923.

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

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	585
ARTICLES:—	
French Frightfulness	588
Special Division Offenders	589
Congress Politics. By V. N. Naik, M. A.	590
The Fiscal Commission's Report.—II. By R. M. J.	591
State vs. Company Management of Railways. By Economy	593
MISCELLANEA:—	
Mr. Joshi's Report on the Geneva Labour Conference	595

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

LIKE Saul seeking his father's asses, Mr. Das is searching for a policy for his new party. The very designation of the party ("Congress-Khilafat-Swaraj") in which the points which they have in common with their rivals are mentioned, instead of the distinguishing features of their policy, shows that he is hard put to it to define what his party is to stand for. They also swear by non-co-operation, and in inscribing it on their standard, they have given up the last chance of having any coherent policy of their own. Mr. B. C. Pal in the pages of the *Englishman* draws a realistic picture of the efforts made by Mr. C. R. Das during the last two years to wrest the leadership of the Congress from Mahatma Gandhi for old politicians. If he himself joined the movement of non-co-operation, it was merely a "strategy", Mr. Pal tells us, whereby to effect a reversion to older methods. And yet when he has now an excellent opportunity of jettisoning this cargo and starting afresh, he again harks back to a principle from which all this time he was seeking to shake himself free. It may be that this also is another "strategy", but it is likely that in these manoeuvres he will overreach himself. Besides, such tactics are now altogether unnecessary. The fact that Pandit Motilal Nehru's resolution on Council entry at the All-India Congress Committee in Calcutta Mr. Jayakar moved an amendment for the deletion of the clause "in strict conformity with non-co-operation" which occurred in that resolution, shows that even leading Congressmen now do not mind if they are found advocating a policy which cannot conceivably be made to harmonise with the principle of non-co-operation.

Mr. Das's Quandary. THE only policy which at present seems to bind together the persons of widely differing temperaments comprised in this new party is that of Council entry. But here also a community of principles and ideals is attained by deliberately drawing a veil over the many points of diversity that separate one section of the party from another. These differences are irreconcilable, and the moment Mr. Das sets out to formulate a detailed plan of work which his party should pursue in the Councils, he will be faced with another split no less serious than the one he has already caused. On the question of civil disobedience even now the party have commenced to speak with two voices. While one section—and we suppose by far the larger one—views with disapprobation even the talk (it may be no more: the *I. S. Reformer* feels assured that it is merely a device to get more money and volunteers) of a revival of civil disobedience, that led by Mr. Das complains on the contrary that the Congress is not pushing on with civil disobedience with as much celerity as is desirable. In his valedictory speech to the All-India Congress Committee Mr. Das said:—

In spite of repeated attempts to make civil disobedience practical, the majority has passed a resolution which makes it difficult, if not impossible. Supposing war breaks out to-morrow, in my opinion it would be the duty of every Indian—Hindu or Mahomedan or of any other faith—to withdraw all co-operation with the Government and to start civil disobedience at once. The war of Turkey is the war of Asiatic freedom.

He also out-Khilafatists the Khilafat Conference inasmuch as he blames the Congress, which is working hand in hand with the Khilafat Conference, for not taking sufficiently drastic action in support of Turkey. On these points the Working Committee of the Congress has had no difficulty in showing that his criticism is altogether misplaced. Presumably Mr. Das raises these points, not because he intends through his party to embark on civil disobedience sooner than the Congress, but merely to show his devotion to the Congress cause. Mr. Das's and his friends' quandary is, that if they emphasize their differences from the majority, they cannot hope to be popular; and that if they are to retain their popularity, they must go on emphasizing policies which by their nature are incompatible with the formation of their new party. A pretty dilemma!

THE one anxiety of Mr. Das thus is seen to be to pose as the champion of even more heroic methods than those of Direct Actionists.

the majority Congressmen. Following his cue, another member of this party, Pandit Kapil Deva Malaviya, writes in the *Independent* to disabuse those who regard Mr. Das's followers as Moderates of that stupid idea and says: "They (the Majority party in the Congress) are Moderates; we are Extremists." Nor is it the purpose of the new party founded by Mr. Das to return to constitutional methods. No, they do not propose merely to rely upon "that ethereal something known as public opinion." "We are for direct action and that of an aggressive and compelling variety. The Satyagrahi is a theoretical direct actionist, while we are practical direct actionists." As an instance of the different ideals which animate these parties, Pandit Malaviya mentions what their respective methods of work among peasants and labourers will be. "The Congress is willing to ameliorate their social condition. We are not satisfied with that Seva Samiti tendency of the Congress and propose to use *Labour organisations for the discomfiture of our foe.*" "We are out to inflict loss on the Government." If indeed Messrs. Das and Nehru are actuated by the spirit of these remarks, men like Hakim Ajmal Khan Saheb, Mr. Stokes and Mr. Jayakar have no place in a body bent only upon mischief-making.

IT was the Maharashtra party who after the Amritsar Congress, originated the theory of the Congress mandate in order to facilitate their entry into the Councils. At present it is on this very party that that theory will react with the worst boomerang effects; for the Congress mandate is now such that it prevents rather than promotes the Council entry. If in practice it is now found that they do not suffer that theory to affect them prejudicially, it is merely because their regard for obligations publicly incurred is none too deep. Soon after the Congress of Amritsar they found that, under Mr. Gandhi's leadership, things were going ill for them and forthwith they embraced a theory the very opposite of the one formerly held by them, viz. that the Congress resolutions have no binding force even for Congressmen! After repudiating their liability to abide by the Congress decision if it should run counter to their convictions, they were again placed in an embarrassing position by their leader Mr. N. C. Kelkar, who declared on his and on their behalf that though they favoured Council entry the Maharashtra party would accept the Congress decision on the matter, whatever it be. Those like us who ardently desire non-co-operators to revert to constitutional methods have cause for sincere gratification that even such a definite pledge will offer no serious obstacle to the entry of these people into the Councils. Mr. Kelkar advises his followers in the columns of the *Mahratta* to go to the electorates to tell them that now they should not withhold the vote as in 1920. This is no doubt a sign of returning wisdom, but we are afraid the electorates will not think much of these quick-

change artists who espouse one doctrine to-day and its direct negative to-morrow.

A Split. DISCUSSION is now afoot as to whether the formation of Mr. Das's party can fittingly be described as a "split," doubt being cast on the applicability of the expression by the declaration of its founder that the new party will still remain within the Congress organization. Non-co-operation papers, of course, invidiously call it a "split", a "fissure", a "defection", and so forth, but leading members of the "Congress-Swaraj-Khilafat" party themselves do not put too fine a point on it either. Mr. N. C. Kelkar, for instance, roundly calls it a "split" and that word may therefore be used without fear of hurting anybody's susceptibility. It may, however, be questioned if the new party may or can for long remain part of the Congress, supposing the latter body is able to maintain its policy unchanged for another year or two. At present Mr. Das cannot associate with the majority party in most of the resolutions passed by the Congress. Where the divergence of view extends over such a wide range, after one or two heavy defeats the minority party may give up the ambition of converting the majority to their view, not because of their faint-heartedness, but because of the realization that, beyond a certain stage, active participation in a body inspired by ideals with which they are out of sympathy merely leads to unnecessary friction, without serving any useful purpose. But there is a further circumstance which must be taken into account. The new constitution of the Congress limits its delegates to a certain number, and the minority party may be prevented from having any part or lot in its transactions, even if it desires to do so. In these circumstances it is somewhat of a waste of energy to debate as to whether the Congress has or has not been split.

IT is really amusing to read the imprecations which non-co-operators of both revisionist and anti-revisionist sections call down upon Mr. Rajagopalachar for proposing a resolution repudiating any debt that may hereafter be incurred by Government. It is characterised in prints of either school as childish, quixotic, irresponsible, impudent, mischievous, and so forth. It appears to us, however, to be a natural outcome of the theory of non-co-operation and doubtless not nearly so harsh as some other emanations from that theory. The Congress does not by this resolution repudiate past debts. These it accepts without demur, whether rightly or wrongly incurred; it only gives notice to the world that the country will not hold itself responsible for the repayment of future debts. If there is anything wrong in giving such notice, it is that the Congress takes itself too seriously, that it regards itself not only as representative of the nation and thus enti-

The Maharashtra Party.

Repudiation of the Public Debt.

tled to speak in its name, but a complete master of the situation; but is it more presumptuous to pass such a resolution than to declare that the Congress is at war with the Government or that swaraj has already been attained in fact, if not in name? If even after such a declaration, India's creditors still continue to lend her money, it is but the part of charity to warn them that they do so at their peril. The warning will become ridiculous if in this war there is a certainty of not the Government, but the Congress being worsted. Do those who pour ridicule on the resolution feel such an inward consciousness? If so, the object of their censure should be he who declared war on Government, and not his *chela* who in simple faith carried out the implications of that step and performed but one function of the *de facto* Swaraj Government. If, on the contrary, critics of this resolution are certain of victory in the immediate future, no conceivable objection can be urged against the resolution.

Civil Service
Commission.

COMMENTING upon Lord Peel's decision (of which, happily, the news is officially declared to be unfounded) to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the grievances of the services, the *Times of India* condemned the appointment, saying that a Royal Commission was not needed even to inquire into the Indianisation of the services, since a statutory Civil Service Commission was going to be appointed for the purpose. Here our contemporary has fallen into the too common error of supposing that the Civil Service Commission provided for in the Government of India Act is to be charged with the duty of examining the question of the extended employment of Indians in the public services. In point of fact the Commission's duty will be very different from this. The purpose of this Commission is to entrust the selection of persons for appointment to the services to an independent body of men who, having no political interests to serve, have no claims to consider but those of personal merit. In the Dominions the Civil Service Commission, like judges, hold office during good behaviour and are only removable upon a joint address of both Houses of Parliament. They are given a substantial salary, devote all their time to their work, and hold no other office under the Government or elsewhere. The appointing body being independent of all executive departments, the public officials appointed by them are saved from the sense that they owe their appointment to either political party. The same authority that selects in the first instance also deals with promotion, reduction in status, or dismissal. Thus the Civil Service Commission referred to in the Act of 1919 is a very useful body, and it is difficult to understand why there is such unconscionable delay in appointing it, but it is intended to perform duties wholly different from those which the *Times of India* contemplates.

FRENCH FRIGHTFULNESS.

1923 has opened with anything but the Tranquillity which Mr. Law was sighing for. The so-called Reparations question has definitely led to the dissolution of the Anglo-French partnership of the Versailles Treaty: and into what unplumbed depths of further tribulation French isolated action is rushing the world, will only too soon become manifest. This Reparation spectre has so long haunted Foreign Politics, that the average newspaper reader may have dismissed the end of the Conference at Paris last week as merely "another scare"; if so, the latest news of Foch's army moving across the Rhine must have brought it home to all that War has recommenced. The four years' armistice has come to an end.

Only one short year ago the Washington Conference promised to bring a distracted world back to "normalcy" by laying its axe at the very root of all outstanding evils: militarism. Once all warlike preparations were ruthlessly cut down, it seemed evident that not only would unproductive waste of money be eliminated and a first chance given to Continental governments to balance their budgets, but also would thereby the ever-growing mutual suspicion and hatred of France and Germany be enabled to die down. As we pointed out even before the Washington Conference met, such hopes were ill-founded and M. Briand's, the French delegate's, speech eventually proclaimed to a rather startled America that the French not only would not disarm, but proposed to bring her naval resources up to the level of those of her army. Since then Mr. Lloyd George was engaged in cajoling the French into a little more reasonable and merciful frame of mind: with the only result that the French Chamber replaced Premier Briand, who was thought to be weakening under Mr. George's blandishments, by Premier Poincaré, who could be depended upon as a mono-ideaed die-hard. Thus ended the Cannes confabulation and thus was sealed, months ahead, the failure of the Genoa and Hague Conferences. Private conversations between the two Premiers, Mr. George and M. Poincaré, at London and at Paris, advanced matters no whit; and now, when Mr. Law has replaced Mr. George in England, the deadlock, so far from having been removed, is merely now acknowledged to be irremovable.

No serious student of the situation has had any doubt for the last two years that a compromise between the English and the French attitudes was quite impossible. For the English wanted to make Germany pay; whilst the French wanted to make Germany incapable of ever paying. England wanted the money of a competitor; France the destruction of an enemy. Whilst it would be idle to assess the relative moral obliquity of either attitude, it is a fact nevertheless that the English attitude gradually improved; that the first idea of bleeding white a dangerous rival soon gave way to a conviction that more money can be made off a

prosperous German customer, than can be wrung out of a starveling Hun tributary; that the sportsman-like temper of the British people revolted against the idea of going on kicking a defeated enemy who is "down and out"; and that finally the general disillusionment of a country, which had become less fit than ever for heroes, went right back to the cardinal point of "war-guilt" and discovered that the common people of all lands had been fooled and that Germany no less than England had "stumbled" into this last war; and that the only thing to do now was to see to it that this war remained indeed the last.

The last English elections fought and won by scores of pacifists on this very platform prove best of all the present temper of the English people towards their German ex-enemies; and, as if to underline this revolution of Anglo-Saxon feeling towards Germany, we now hear the news of the Australian elections, which have resulted in the defeat of that arch-imperialist and loudest of war jingoes—Mr. Hughes. England after all never broods over wrongs inflicted on it: its tradition is to fight over them, but once the fight has ended—whether in England's victory or in England's defeat—England accepts the facts and tries to make the best of them by forgetting and forgiving all the incidents of the "scrap". Thus Englishmen can now join wholeheartedly with Americans in their "Independence Day" celebrations; thus can they turn a Louis Botha into a corner-stone of their British Empire; thus can an Ulsterite Bonar Law send a veteran Nationalist "Tim" Healy as first Governor-General to Ireland to destroy the last vestige of Dublin Castle.

Unfortunately French characteristics are the very opposite of this sturdy British political "horse sense." The French love to nurse their grievances, their insults, their hatreds. They know only too well, when they are beaten; they cherish the memory of it and they look forward to a time when they will be able to take a tooth for a tooth and an eye for an eye. The whole of those forty-three years from 1871 to 1914 were devoted by France to "Revanche": to prepare a revenge for the defeat of France at the hands of Prussia in 1870-71. And now that their desire has come true and Germany lies in the dust, now that the Germans are left with no weapons of defence, but their bare fists: now, the French butcher merely remarks that the time has come when he can safely proceed to have his pound of flesh and that from the heart. France is a self-contained empire and cares nothing for co-operation with the world outside, least of all with Germany. They disdain the very idea of reconciliation. Hence the blockade; hence the occupied territories; hence the dismemberment of Upper Silesia and the annexation of the Saar; hence the flood of "fonctionnaires" let loose on Germany; hence "sanctions" and "retorsions"; hence the word "go" to the Army moving forward into the Ruhr.

Only a month or two ago a confidential agent of M. Poincaré, M. Dariac, Chairman of the Parliamentary Budget Commission, was sent to Germany to report on what further steps to take. The *Manchester Guardian* deserves much credit for having published this secret report in all its nakedness of unashamed phraseology and for having thus made known to all the world the cynicism with which France compasses the industrial death of Germany by proposing to occupy the Ruhr and so to manipulate a customs barrier to be set up, as to kill German industrial life altogether, depending as this does entirely on the coal and iron of that Westphalian district. These plans of course are nothing new, but what is new is that Mr. Law apparently has agreed on behalf of England not to oppose them, if France takes isolated action in that sense. Only this will explain the on the whole friendly tone of the French press towards England after the breakdown of the Paris Conference last week. If our diagnosis is right, Mr. Law is seeking "tranquillity" and purchasing French support at Lausanne by washing his hands of the whole painful Reparations Question; as if tranquillity and irresponsibility could be purchased at so cheap a price!

The suggestion has been made that the present German Government, dominated as it is by Stinnes and German Heavy Industry in general, has really sold itself to its confreres of the French Heavy Industry; that a gigantic Combine is to exploit the coal and iron (and therefore *all*) industry both of France and Germany; and that this Combine, though its controlling agents will be Frenchmen, will find a sufficiency of room (and profits!) for Stinnes and Friends. On the face of it, Capitalism is quite capable of such attitude and Herr Stinnes the last person in the world whom one would suspect of refusing thirty pieces of silver. And what lends colour to this suggestion is that the *mark* has not dropped as much, as one would have expected it to drop, if German Heavy Industry was really scared. All the same, on our part, we do not believe that things have gone so far and that there exists a cut and dried agreement. We rather incline to the opinion that German Heavy Industry is sitting on the fence, very much prepared to come to terms with French Heavy Industry, but not having done so yet.

Quite apart from this, Stinnes and Friends are not the only factor: there remains the population of workers in the Ruhr—and outside it. Again, on the French side, there are not only the Industrialists there are the Militarists too, and they, just now, in full command. What with them on the one side, and German workers on the other, it is almost inconceivable that there will be no collisions—and once they have started, nobody can know where they will stop. Revolt will almost inevitably develop into revolution—Bolshevik first, Fascist after; or *vice versa*. All this unfortunately is obvious; as obvious as it is that French militarism is out to

provoke this very thing : for only then does it expect to be able to reduce Germany to impotence, when it has reduced Germany to barbarism.

This is the aim and principle of the War which the French Government are to-day entering upon. To-day they may still deem themselves a self-contained empire ; to-day they may still deem themselves free from interference by England. But the day, even now, is passing. The execration of a whole world France may rate lightly still to-day ; slow or fast, it is bound to translate itself eventually into acts against a France which has become the enemy of the world. British Labour cannot be expected to countenance Mr. Law's ignoble shortcut to tranquillity ; nay, all labour the world over, is sure to rise in defence of their outraged German brethren. Best of all, that Nemesis which presides at the heart of all things will sooner rather than later cause to recoil upon France's head the devilry she is guilty of towards the German nation. Japan, which by the force of the nature of things has recently been compelled to let go her prey and retire completely [both from Siberia and from China, undoing all her ceaseless work of the last seven years : Japan, we say, is a portent of the bankruptcy and frustration which is bound to be France's portion too in the end. France too will soon enough learn, that no nation "liveth unto itself nor dieth unto itself." The death of Germany can only end in the death of France ; for the law of life is not only to live, but to let live.

SPECIAL DIVISION OFFENDERS.

IN Madras a Government Order has been issued empowering Criminal Courts to recommend certain prisoners for ameliorative gaol treatment and laying down certain rules with a view to guide magistrates in the performance of this duty. The G. O. closely follows the pronouncement made by the Home Secretary of the Government of India in the Council of State on September 20th last year, and it is therefore to be presumed that rules similar to those now announced in Madras will be made for every other Province. We must repeat what we have said often before that in framing these rules Government have gone on a wrong tack altogether. For the special treatment to be meted out thereunder is available only to a prisoner "in whose case owing to his status, education, and habits of life, rigour of the ordinary prison arrangements appears too severe, involving in fact for him a heavier punishment than they impose on the general run of prisoners." In other words, the criteria of inclusion in the special division offenders are the status, education, and mode of living of the prisoner. Mr. O'Donnell had also mentioned in the Council of State the character of the prisoner and the nature of his offence as factors entering into the selection of any offender for differential treatment. The Madras Government has out out the first and relegated the second to a place of lesser importance (" regard may also be

had to the nature of the offence"), thus sharply contrasting its rules with the rules of prison treatment in England. The basis of preferential treatment in England is not the social status or the habit of life of the offender, but the nature of his offence and his antecedents. Under Section 6 of the Prisons Act of 1898, prisoners convicted of an offence and sentenced to imprisonment without hard labour are at the discretion of the Court treated as offenders either of the first or second division, the magistrate being given the power to extend this special treatment in all cases where there "is evidence of good character over a considerable period of time, and when it is clear that exceptional temptation or special provocation has led to a merely temporary deviation from the paths of honesty, or to an act of violence not in consonance with the natural disposition of the defendant." "The second division," the Prison Commissioners wrote in 1903, "was intended to meet the case of persons guilty of offences not implying great moral depravity." In 1910 Mr. Winston Churchill introduced a new rule (Rule 243 A) enabling the privileges of the first division to be extended to prisoners of the second and third divisions "whose previous character had been good" and who had been convicted of offences "not involving dishonesty, cruelty, indecency, or serious violence." It will thus be seen that in England it is neither status, nor education, nor mode of living which determines the classification of prisoners, but good character more than anything else. The principle on which the classification of offenders proceeds in England is sound ; it is altogether unsound in India.

An assurance was given that the new rules would as far as possible conform with the existing practice in England. This test is not satisfied, for the Madras rules fall short of the provision in England in several particulars. For one thing persons convicted of sedition are placed *ipso facto* in the first division of offenders in England (and in Ireland too where sedition was at least as rampant as in India). In India it is not to be so. Secondly there is no provision in India corresponding to Rule 243 A, and in the absence of it there is no possibility of any offender sentenced to rigorous imprisonment being granted any ameliorations in his gaol treatment, however creditable his antecedents and however free from moral turpitude his offence. If passive resistance breaks out in India, those engaged in the movement will have to suffer the rigours of ordinary prison life and will not be entitled to the mitigations to which passive resisters in England are entitled. Rule 243 A was meant especially in England for persons committed to prison for passive resistance. Thirdly, in India the magistrate is to be given the power to nominate offenders for special treatment, but all such nominations are to be subject to confirmation by the Local Government. This is done for the purpose of attaining uniformity, but it will result, we fear, in a consider-

able shrinkage of the concession. If a magistrate excludes any prisoner from the special division, Government will not at all consider the case; further if however he includes anyone, his "proposal" will go up to Government and will be either sanctioned or turned down. In England the magistrate's order of inclusion is final, and his order of non-inclusion is subject to reversal. For when it was found that Courts used the power conferred upon them too sparingly, the Criminal Jurisdiction Act was passed in 1914, giving the visiting magistrates of prisons the power to place prisoners in the second division in the absence of any direction by the Court. While, therefore, the tendency in England is to extend the scope of special treatment, in India the tendency is apt to be very strong in the opposite direction. Lastly, the "privileges" to which special division offenders are entitled are not as great in India as they are in England. In this connexion we strongly deprecate Government's decision not to allow newspapers for the use of prisoners of this division, on the ground that they would be used for propaganda purposes. Necessary measures may be taken to prevent such perversion, but there is no reason to ban newspapers, which for such prisoners as are likely to be accorded special treatment are absolutely necessary. We are told that even Mr. Gandhi is shut out from the news of the world by this method. Surely no propaganda was apprehended in his case. In England newspapers and books bearing on current events are allowed, if "unobjectionable." The allowance of letters and visits is greater in the case of first division offenders in England, namely, one every fortnight, though in the case of second division offenders, it is the same as in India, namely, one every month. But the subjects to which reference is allowed in letters and conversations are far more restricted in India than in England. The Madras rules limit these subjects strictly to domestic matters and specifically rule out a reference to politics and public affairs. There is no such restriction in England, and in the case of letters the Standing Orders of that country expressly state that "news of public events is not necessarily to be treated as objectionable." Parenthetically we may say that we have no objection to the exclusions mentioned in the Madras rules. Only the fifth category of exclusions, relating to persons convicted of offences directly involving criminal intimidation, must be understood in the sense of Mr. O'Donnell's speech: "Where there has been no violence there is not necessarily any exclusion."

CONGRESS POLITICS.

AS was made clear in the report of the Civil Disobedience Committee published just on the eve of the Congress at Gaya, those who opposed Council entry and those who favoured it had practically the same objective, viz. the winning of Swaraj by a

destructive plan of action. They were both for the boycott of Councils in order to render their working either impossible or ineffectual. There was only this difference. While some of them would eschew the Councils entirely and would have the electorates abstain from exercising their vote, others would have them make a full use of it in order to return non-co-operators in an overwhelming majority. Then the members, so constituted, may either withdraw, obstruct or do anything that would result in complete wreckage of the whole structure of reform. As we have now discovered, the Congress has favoured the first alternative, viz. that of having nothing to do with the Councils at all.

The arguments that Messrs. Das and Nehru advanced in favour of Council boycott and the method of procedure they advocated have, in the result, weakened their own position and the party they represent. Their place is no longer in the Congress, however much they may try to conceal their feelings and cover their eventual separation. No amount of cajolery, sophistry, fanciful history and false philosophy in the address of the President could persuade the Congress to endorse his view. How much did the President praise the leader of non-co-operation! What strange and garbled use did he not make of the facts of history to belittle the importance of law and order! What superhuman efforts did he spare himself to prove that the writer on "New Democracy" from whom he quoted meant by local centres and neighbouring groups nothing but the village panchayats of which India had already known so much! And in his opinion self-government was nothing better than the rehabilitation of these village communities. The President of the Gaya Congress seems to us to be a prototype of the geometer of the revolutionary era in Europe to which he has referred in his rigmarole of an address. We wonder if he has really understood the author of "New Democracy" from whom he has quoted so freely. He even impressed into service a quotation from Hegel. Perhaps he was ignorant of the fact that Hegel's philosophy of the absolute had led directly to the building up of the theory of the State current in Germany before the great war of 1914. Strange as it may seem, while running down Western culture and Western methods all along the line, he has quoted approvingly from Western writers from the very first line of his address to the last in support of the case he seeks to make out. The President's mind seems to be a medley of many disjointed opinions hastily imbibed and hardly digested. It all seems to be such a crude business. And it has convinced none. The President tried to please all and he has pleased none. His advocacy of communal rights; his praise of village government in preference to democracy, the ballot-box and parliamentary system; his diatribe against the middle class; his curious interpretation of nationalism, nationality, freedom and revolution; his advocacy of antediluvian methods;

his praise of revolution as a means for the attainment of freedom and his blame of the same as barren of results in the same breath; the confused jargon in which he sketched the form of government which is to be the foundation for his swaraj; his championship of khaddar as the symbol of swaraj and the discredit he throws on it as a means towards swaraj; his praise of non-violent non-co-operation as the only means of attaining swaraj and his willingness at the same time to lower the flag and prolong the day to ten or twenty years when it would come—all these read like the frantic efforts of one who is out to defend the indefensible.

The opinion of the delegates went right against the Presidential speech in every point. By an overwhelming majority and in no mistaken terms has it thrown aside his plea for Council entry. No amount of camouflage on the point of law and order in order to cover the violence of non-violent non-co-operation could save Mr. Das's advocacy from the fate it deserved. Mr. Das may extol to the seventh heaven the great *guru* of whom he yet proclaims himself to be a loyal *chela*. The Congress considers him and his like as no better than renegades. Mr. Das, by his advocacy of a principle and method which the verdict of time has proved to be futile and ruinous, has driven the Congress to the advocacy of a still wilder policy. He has thus helped to make confusion worse confounded.

It is to be seen if the country is going to take seriously the pseudo-patriots that would rush it to the brink of a precipice. The Congress has no leadership worth the name. The so-called leaders having failed it during the last three years, it has spewn them from its mouth when they talked of going back upon principles and methods that themselves had declared eminently sane and practical. Being taught by these very leaders to treat every one who opposed them as traitors, the people would have nothing short of the policy of the most fanatical among them. That is what Mr. Rajagopalachariar is. And it is he that has dominated the mob-assembly, which in its turn is being rough-riden by the most fanatical element in the Khilafat camp.

Only one good result has come out of all that happened at Gaya in December last. And that is this. No longer does the Congress shelter under its roof people who praise and dispraise in the same breath. It is only the double-distilled non-co-operators that have a place there. And this had to come. Because it is only thus that the country will be thoroughly disillusioned of the charm and efficacy of that *mantra* of swaraj. The Congress will have now no excuse to plead if its work fails to attain swaraj, as it is sure to do.

Meanwhile all this means a clear call to those who see its danger to work up, consolidate and unite their forces for the great struggle that lies ahead of all of us. Men of the temper of Messrs. Das, Nehru, Jayakar and Malaviya can have no

place in the Congress any longer. Let them lead back, if they can, their Ishmaelites into the path of sanity and constitutional action. To fight the wild element that threatens to sweep and submerge us all, there must be a force powerful enough both to convert and to offer effective resistance. Let the sane elements coalesce to raise up this strong barrier and to go on with this mission of conversion. The truth has to be firmly grasped and fearlessly proclaimed in every town and village that the real enemy of all progress—and a more dangerous enemy because it comes as a friend—is non-co-operation. It will inevitably mean despair, ruin and return of a strong, arbitrary and reactionary regime. The surest remedy against it is co-operation and coalition of all who believe in sanity, wisdom and a steady advance. The fire threatens to burst forth once again. Scotch it before it flames up into a conflagration. That is the lesson of Gaya to the Liberals as also to such as have dallied too long with the uncertainties and eccentricities of a hopeless and ruinous policy.

Wisdom and courage are the needs of the hour. And organization and driving power to make them tell. Shall we be loyal to our country and to the cause we have all at heart, or shall we sacrifice them both to the fanatical, antediluvian, revolutionary and destructive method of non-violent non-co-operation?

V. N. NAIK.

THE FISCAL COMMISSION'S REPORT.—II.

THE argument developed in the first article* on this subject is briefly as follows. The economic *débaclé* in this country mainly came about recently, during the last forty or fifty years. It was the new era of railways and steamships which flooded the country with cheap machine-made goods, killed the handicrafts and threw millions of people on to the soil, where they created the new problem of excessive fragmentation and subdivision of holdings. A policy of active initiative on the part of the state in industrial matters could have prevented this *débaclé* and placed India on the right path of economic advancement, as the State in Japan actually did during the same forty or fifty years. Had the State in India, for instance, insisted on constructing railways only out of plant and stores manufactured under its own direction or otherwise within the country, the foundation of the new industrial order would have been securely laid and the superstructure would have arisen under private initiative, sympathetically encouraged by the State. But the State failed to do it. Though actively initiating reforms in agricultural matters for instance, the State chose to follow a policy of *laissez faire*, if not of actual hindrance, in industrial matters. That is why we are backward today, both industrially and agriculturally. As a matter of fact, our agricultural ills themselves will

* Article I. appeared in the issue of 23rd December, 1922.

not be cured until we lighten the extreme pressure on the soil to which ultimately most of them can be traced.

It is entirely wrong and misleading to say, as one often hears it said, that India has always been and will always be mainly an agricultural country. So far as history goes, all countries, and not India alone, were mainly agricultural countries. And even the most industrialised country of to-day viz. England, claims agriculture, strange though it may seem, as the leading *single* industry. India was known of old as much for her handicrafts as for her agriculture, and to-day, like the United States or France or Japan, she can be as much an agricultural as an industrial nation in the modern sense of that term. But the very basic industries of the new order, viz. the iron and steel and the machinery-making industries have not yet been naturalised on our soil. Chapter IV. of the Industrial Commission's Report lays the right emphasis on this subject, but when it comes to make definite recommendations, one fails to see any which may confidently be expected to lead to the firm establishment of these "key" industries. Nowhere, for instance, would one come across a suggestion that the State should, at least from now, make definite efforts at getting the railway stores it needs manufactured within the country itself. On the other hand, the Commission lays it down as its definite opinion that Government itself should undertake manufacturing operations only in exceptional cases like that of the production of munitions. Nor is there any enthusiastic recommendation to be found as to how Government could encourage the manufacture of these important articles by private enterprise.

Beyond pointing out the basic importance of the iron and steel and machinery-making industries in modern industrial organisation, the Industrial Commission cannot be said to have done anything to help to solve the vital problem of how firmly to establish those basic industries in this country and through them to bring about the growth of manifold other modern industries. That Commission, however, has laid down one important principle, viz. "that in future Government must play an active part in the industrial development of the country, with the aim of making India more self-contained in respect of men and material." If the State earnestly acts upon this principle, it can very much widen the definition of the "active part." The question of tariffs then becomes a much less important one. In fact, it is arguable that a State seriously bent upon modernising the industry of a country may be able to do so without the help of any protective tariff whatsoever. It can work national enterprises like the railways itself, itself manufacture the materials required for them, get the youth of the nation trained in theory and practice in them, do spade-work with regard to the industrial survey for the nation, organise industrial exhibitions to spread the knowledge of improved processes

and methods, offer concessions with regard to land, forests, railway-rates, etc., make loans at low rates of interest to promising new enterprises, even offer bounties, subsidies, etc. and not resort to a protective tariff at all. Nay, it would be better to do without a protective tariff under such circumstances, for two reasons: (1) to keep up the stimulus of foreign competition; (2) to prevent the consumer being forced to pay a higher price in order to benefit the producer.

On the contrary, if the State does not accept the principle of playing an active part in industrial modernisation or merely adopts a lukewarm attitude in the matter, then, on the one hand, a protective tariff will do precious little to bring about that industrial modernisation and yet, on the other, it is the only thing that can be wrung out of the unwilling hands of the State. It will now be clear why the Report of the Industrial Commission requires to be considered along with that of the Fiscal Commission.

The Industrial Commission have given a very good description, in the fourth chapter of their report, of the industrial deficiencies of India, and the remedies they have suggested, whether one thinks them adequate or not, are obviously for the purpose of making up these deficiencies. The Fiscal Commission were aware of the Industrial Commission's Report as they have referred to it in their own report. On the majority of the members of the Fiscal Commission, however, the Industrial Commission's Report appears to have been thoroughly lost. The diagnosis of the industrial condition of India, made by the majority, is merely to this effect: "That the industrial development of India has not been commensurate with the size of the country, its population and its natural resources, and that a considerable development of Indian industries would be very much to the advantage of the country as a whole." What "considerable development" the majority have in view is seen from the following: "India for many years to come is likely to concentrate on the simpler forms of manufactured goods and these are precisely those in which the United Kingdom has the smallest interest." So that the majority do not contemplate in their "considerable development" the growth of a large iron and steel and machinery-making industry in India nor a further rapid growth of the Indian textile industry. The minority of the Fiscal Commission, including the President, have done good service to the country by making an emphatic protest against this very narrow path of industrial development chalked out before the country by the majority.

The main question before the Fiscal Commission was to decide which policy would be the best for India—Free Trade or Protection? The Commission have decided in favour of "Protection to be applied with discrimination along the lines indicated in this Report." The qualifying clause used in this declaration of policy is either redundant or hypocritical. It is redundant if it is

meant to convey merely what it says, because there is no reason why the Commission should assume that if they declared in favour of a protective tariff, the Government of India would straightway impose protective duties indiscriminately on all imported goods. It is hypocritical if the lines along which the discrimination is to be made are so laid down as to emasculate the policy of protection very thoroughly. The general conditions which the Commission, or rather the majority Commissioners, require to be satisfied by industries before protection can be granted are the following :—

(1) "That the industry possesses natural advantages," "such as an abundant supply of raw material, cheap power, a sufficient supply of labour, or a large home market;"

(2) "That without the help of Protection it is not likely to develop at all, or not so rapidly as is desirable;" and

(3) "That it will eventually be able to face world competition without Protection."

The Tariff Board, the institution of which the Commission recommend, is to be satisfied with regard to these three conditions. The third of them is so obviously ludicrous that one wonders how a sane body of persons—most of them not theoretical economists but hard practical men of business—could be induced seriously to put it down.

The second condition is of such a nature that a Tariff Board, believing in a policy of State initiative but not believing in a protective tariff, could never be convinced by the claimants for protection. They would recommend the State to grant concessions, technical assistance, etc. or even a bounty or subsidy to the particular industry, but resist a protective tariff. They might desire the public to know clearly the special assistance given by the State; they might want that assistance to take such a form that it should automatically come to an end after a definite period. Protective tariffs, they might urge, seldom come to an end in that way so far as the history of other countries showed.

Even the first condition would present great difficulties. First, there is a little point about its interpretation. The natural advantages specified are "an abundant supply of raw material, cheap power, a sufficient supply of labour, or a large home market." Does the "or" indicate that any one of these four advantages possessed by itself will do? If so, the condition is hardly worth the name. If, however, as seems probable, the "or" is to be understood in the sense of "and", then the condition along with its implication might well become very hard to satisfy and might even be injurious to the best interests of the country. Imagine, for instance, that such a Tariff Board were sitting in Great Britain about the year 1760 discussing the claims for protection advanced by the cotton industry of Lancashire, the jute industry of Dundee or the oil-crushing industry of Hull. All the three claims would of course be summarily set aside, for neither cotton nor jute nor oil-seeds grow in England or Scotland. So these wise gentlemen would have done their best to discourage

the growth of these three industries in Great Britain, putting them down as unnatural in the best interests of the country!

R. M. J.

STATE vs. COMPANY MANAGEMENT OF RAILWAYS.

HOW THE WIND IS BLOWING.

IT is nearly fourteen months since the Report of the Indian Railway Committee of 1920-21 was published in India and the Government are still considering the most important of the recommendations of that Committee, viz. those in connection with the future management of Indian railways. The delay that has already taken place has caused considerable apprehension and suggests the probability of the Government coming to a decision, so far as they are concerned, otherwise than in consonance with the declared Indian opinion. There are at least four other indications which tend to confirm the apprehension. The Committee at great expense of time, labour and money collected a large volume of evidence, both in England and in India, from no less than 169 witnesses representing a variety of interests, and it was on the basis of the material contained in this evidence that the Committee made their recommendations. One would have thought that the material which sufficed the Committee would have enabled the Government to come to a final decision in the matter. But it appears from the letter of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, which was published in the newspapers some months ago, that the Government has been calling for further views from apparently the very bodies who have already had an opportunity of placing their full views before the Committee. The result can only be a repetition in a varied form of what must already have accumulated in the archives of the Government of India during the last 10 years of discussion. The publication of the Government letter which called for a lengthy reply from the Chamber would have helped towards a clearer understanding of the circumstances which led to the reference.

The second indication which shews which way the decision of Government will tend is the anxiety of the Railway Board (a body conveniently treated as separate from the Government of India in this matter) to redress the balance of alleged one-sided advocacy by newspapers of State management by the issue *via* the Publicity Bureau of a leaflet setting out the arguments in favour of company management. An enumeration side by side in the same leaflet of the arguments in favour of State management would certainly not have detracted from the dignity which should attach to documents issuing under the *aegis* of a Government. As it is, the leaflet is a collection of untested and unsubstantiated assertions and mere propaganda.

The third indication is that the Government

did not go up to the Legislature with any proposals in the matter during the last Simla session, although there was plenty of time to do so after the views of the Central Advisory Council had been ascertained. It is hardly likely that Government would have referred the question to the Council without having made up, even tentatively, their minds in one direction or the other, and the only inference that can be drawn is that official opinion did not coincide with that of the non-official majority, who were in favour of State management.

The fourth indication is the secret and hasty creation behind the back of the Legislative Assembly, of the appointment of a Chief Commissioner for Indian Railways in part fulfilment of the recommendation of the Acworth Committee with regard to the machinery of Government control, as also the selection made for that office and the decision to constitute him as the sole adviser of Government in matters of railway policy. In reply to a question put by Mr. Manmohandas Ramji in the Legislative Assembly on 22nd September, 1921, in connection with the report of the Acworth Committee, Government repeated their undertaking that, as far as practicable, steps would be taken to ensure that no action, administrative or legislative, would be taken on reports of Commissions or Committees appointed by the Secretary of State or the Government of India until an opportunity had been given by the Government to the Indian Legislature to express its opinion. The creation of the appointment most decidedly constitutes administrative action on the Acworth Committee's report and in so far as the appointment was created without the Legislature being consulted, it constitutes a departure from the promise made only two weeks earlier when the Government were probably already in correspondence with the Secretary of State for India. There is already with the Government of India a body of official advisers who have expressed themselves as opposed to State management. The appointment to the newly created post of a man who has also expressed himself as being against State management and who is now the final official adviser must necessarily result in strengthening the official view against State management. When the time comes the Government of India will no doubt in their usual manner warn the Legislature against setting aside a proposal made on the advice of an expert selected by them. Admitting that the incumbent of the office had no such prepossession, the appointment would have engendered greater confidence in impartiality if Government had made the selection after settling their policy in regard to the best form of management of Indian Railways, and then entrusted to the holder of the appointment the sole function of advising them in carrying out the final policy decided upon by Government and the Legislature.

There is enough in what has been said so far to shew the great danger of the possibility of the Government placing before the Legislative Assembly proposals otherwise than in accordance with the declared wishes of the Indian public. It is, therefore, necessary that our legislators should forearm themselves against a contingency which after all may not be so remote either in time or in probability. An official resolution has recently been tabled in the name of the Honourable Mr. Innes who will move that the proposals of the Railway Finance Committee in regard to the separation of the railway from the general finance be accepted. It will be remembered that

the Railway Finance Committee came to the conclusion that separation of Railway Finance in the sense understood by the Acworth Committee was not, at present at any rate, a practical proposition and suggested that the consideration of the question should be postponed for three years when conditions might become more normal and financial equilibrium might be re-established. The Legislative Assembly, before whom the recommendation was placed for acceptance on the 27th March last in the form of an official resolution, decided to postpone its consideration till the September session. According to this decision the matter should have been brought up for reconsideration in September last and it is not quite understood why this was not done. In any case there are indications in the report of the debates which took place on the subject in March last that a large body of members are inclined to take an immediate decision, one way or the other, once for all. The question is too complicated to be adequately discussed, much less properly solved, on the floor of the House. Paragraph 7 of the Railway Finance Committee's Report shews a few of the many and varied considerations which enter into a proper solution of the question. Further, the Acworth Committee in paragraph 228 of their report state:—

"We think it is necessary here to draw special attention to the *caveat* which we have to enter. It is not State management as it has hitherto existed in India whose functions we recommend to be so greatly extended. In earlier chapters of this Report the Committee have pointed out the failure and drawbacks of the existing system of control of Indian railways, whether considered from the executive and administrative or from the financial point of view. To the Government Departments concerned, as at present constituted and administered, we should hesitate to entrust new responsibilities, in respect either of State or company managed railways. Our recommendation as to State management must therefore be read as coupled with and conditioned on the adoption, at least substantially and in main outline, of the recommendations which we have made with respect to financial and administrative reforms."

Some people hold that, according to this paragraph, a rejection of the proposal to separate the railway from the general finance involves *ipso facto* a rejection of the recommendation regarding State management, while others hold that such an interpretation is untenable. This introduces another factor into a question already bristling with considerations of great complexity, in so far as it will be necessary to examine the exact degree of interdependence, if any such really does exist, between the three reforms. In order that this may be done, all the three proposed reforms must be considered together. In these circumstances it would be a serious mistake to take a permanent decision without first asking a Committee with the necessary qualifications to consider the matter fully with a view to making a deliberate recommendation either to reject or to adopt the proposal of the Acworth Committee in this behalf. If a hasty decision comes to be taken by the Legislative Assembly without a previous reference to a small compact body and if that decision turns out to be against the proposal, it might greatly hamper the settlement of the question of the future management of railways in accordance with Indian opinion. It is therefore necessary that members who are in favour of State management should be on their guard against the introduction in the discussion of the question of the final rejection or adoption of the Acworth Committee's

proposal regarding the separation of railway from general finance.

ECONOMY.

MISCELLANEA.

MR. N. M. JOSHI'S REPORT.

THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE.

THE following is a summary of the Report of his work submitted to the General Secretary, All-India Trade Union Congress, by Mr. N. M. Joshi, Workers' Delegate from India, to the fourth International Labour Conference held at Geneva in 1922:—

The Conference was opened on the 18th October with Lord Burnham as President. In all 39 countries were represented in the Conference. The total number of Delegates and Advisers was 113 and 89 respectively.

The Workers' Group elected me as a substitute Member on a Commission of Selection, which resembles the Subjects Committees of the Conferences in India. On the 19th October, three Commissions were appointed to consider the following three questions:—(1) Reform of the Constitution of the Governing Body, Periodicity of the Sessions of the International Labour Conference and Amendments to the Standing Orders of the Conference; (2) Migration Statistics; and (3) Procedure for amendment of Conventions. I was appointed a Member of the first Commission, and, also, acted as a substitute Member for the second.

On the 20th of October, the Director of the International Labour Office introduced his report of the work done during the year for discussion. In the speech that I made during this discussion, I pointed out that the statement of accounts did not give sufficient details so as to enable Delegates to offer useful criticism, referred to the necessity of taking some steps regarding the position of Delegates from countries that do not pay their contributions, mentioned that special attention should be paid to secure the application of Conventions and Recommendations to the Colonies and Protectorates of different countries, making a special reference to the Indian States, reminded the Director about the necessity of considering the Government of India's Report on maternity, insisted upon special attention being given to countries which are regarded as special on account of their climatic and other circumstances, and, finally, requested the Governing Body to open offices of correspondents in India and Japan. Referring to the praise which the Director had given to the Government of India in his report, I pointed out that considering the reactionary attitude taken up by them as regards the Conventions and Recommendations of the Seamen's Conference held at Genoa and of the third International Labour Conference held at Geneva last year, the Director ought to have been more discriminating in his praise of that Government.

The question of the Reform of the Governing Body arose out of some dissatisfaction felt by non-European Delegates at the first International Labour Conference held at Washington, at the result of the election held for the appointment of the Governing Body. A resolution expressing this dissatisfaction was passed at the end of that Conference. This question was, therefore, placed on the Agenda of the third Conference held at Geneva in 1921. That Conference came to the conclusion that full justice could not be done to all interests unless the Peace Treaty was changed and, consequently, the Governing Body framed certain proposals and sent them for the consideration of several Governments. They, first, proposed that the total number of Members of the Governing Body should be increased from 24 to 32. Out of these 32 seats, 16 were to be set apart for Government Delegates, and 8 each for Employers and Workers. Out of the 16 Government seats, 6 were to be set apart for France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan and the United States of America and the remaining 10 seats were to be filled by

election with 4 seats reserved for non-European Governments. Out of the 8 seats each for Employers and Workers, 2 from each Group were to be reserved for non-European Employers and Workers. In these proposals, in the case of the Government seats the number of permanent Members was reduced from 8 to 6, unseating Canada and India, which recently was included among the eight Members of industrial importance. Strangely enough, the United States of America, which is not a Member of the Organisation, was given a permanent seat. It may not be uncharitable if one were led to conclude from these proposals that the European countries feel a disinclination to give the British Empire its due, and, secondly, they stand in too great an awe of the U. S. A.

A Committee of 36 Delegates was appointed by the Conference to consider the above proposals. The Government, the Employers, and the Workers of India were represented on this Committee. Sir Louis Kershaw, who represented the Government of India on this Committee, opposed the proposal for the reduction of the number of permanent Members from 8 to 6. But he could not get much support. I tried to get the words "at least" inserted in order to make it absolutely clear that the two seats reserved for the non-European Workers should be regarded as the minimum. But I also did not meet with any success. Thus the Committee substantially approved of the proposals of the Governing Body.

REPRESENTATION OF NON-EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

The Report of the Committee was discussed in the full Conference on the 30th of October. I spoke on this question at an early stage of the discussion. I expressed the same view which I had done at the previous Conference. In my opinion it is not in the interest of the non-European countries that a minimum representation should be guaranteed to them by a change in the Peace Treaty. If the minimum is thus fixed, it will tend to be the maximum. At the present time when the Oriental countries are only just developing, the minimum may be adequate; but when they will be fully developed, the minimum, which will be regarded as the maximum, will be found to be very inadequate. I was and am still against any change in the Peace Treaty for this purpose. I had advocated that, without any change in the Peace Treaty, the Conference should merely make a recommendation to the Groups to give reasonable representation to the non-European countries, till the latter come into their own and are able to secure what is their due by sheer force of their influence and votes. I feel fully confident that when the Workers in China and India are well organised, their places on the International Organisations cannot be challenged. But if a second change in the Peace Treaty becomes necessary in order to give the non-European Workers increased share of the representation on account of their better organisation, such a change will be made difficult by the European countries. I am, therefore, opposed to any reservation of seats for the non-European countries by a change in the Peace Treaty and I expressed this view in my speech.

When the Committee's Report was discussed in detail, the Government Delegate from Canada moved an amendment that the number of permanent Members of the Governing Body should be 8 and not 6 and that the names of the eight countries be fixed by the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with their industrial importance. This amendment was supported by Mr. Bhupendranath Basu and was ultimately carried by a majority. I did not move any amendment to press my views as I feared that there was practically no support for them in the Conference.

On the suggestion of the Swiss Government, the Governing Body considered the question of the periodicity of the I. L. conferences and brought forward a proposal that the conferences should be held from time to time, but at least once in two years. The Committee which considered the question of the Reform of the Governing Body also considered this question. By a majority of votes the proposal for bi-

ennial Sessions was defeated in the Committee. I favoured annual Sessions as being advantageous to countries like India in spite of our distance from Geneva. The Representatives of the Government of India supported the biennial Sessions. In full Conference, the advocates of the biennial Sessions again made an effort to have their view adopted; but there too they failed to get a majority. I made a short speech in support of proposal for the annual Sessions.

The question of the revision of the Standing Orders of the I. L. Conference was considered by the Committee which considered the reform of the Governing Body and the periodicity of the Conference. One of the amendments to the Standing Orders proposed to enable the Conference to appoint the Governing Body as the Committee of Selection. I opposed this change both in the Committee and in the full Conference mainly on two grounds. In the first place, the Governing Body is the Executive of the Conference; and a part of the work of the Conference is to criticise the work of the Executive during the past year. But if the Governing Body becomes the Committee of Selection there is the danger of a discussion on certain matters distasteful to the Executive being shut out altogether. The second ground on which I based my opposition was that, on account of distance, certain countries could not be represented on the Governing Body which meets several times in the year. But those countries, as they send Delegates to the Conference, can very well be represented on the Committee of Selection; and, therefore, if the Governing Body becomes the Committee of Selection, the distant countries will also be shut out from the Committee of Selection. Although my opposition did not carry influence in the Committee, I was able to carry my point in the full Conference.

The protest made by the All-India Trade Union Congress against the action of the Government of India in not nominating any Advisers to the Workers' Delegate this year, was placed before the Committee that was appointed for the verification of credentials at its last sitting. Unfortunately, the Committee came to the conclusion that the protest arrived too late to be taken into consideration. However, when the report of this Committee came before the full Conference, I drew the attention of the Conference to this matter, asked the Director to explain why he should have suggested in his circular letter to the Governments that there was no necessity of Advisers for this year's Conference, and finally, entered an emphatic protest against the action of the Director of the International Labour Office and that of the Government of India.

LABOUR CONDITIONS IN THE EAST.

On the 23rd of October, I gave notice of a resolution requesting the Governing Body to appoint a special Commission to make a full investigation into the conditions of work and life of the working classes in the Oriental countries. The Commission of Selection, however, changed the terms of my resolution and contented itself by asking the Governing Body to institute a preliminary investigation with the means now at the disposal of the International Labour Office and to submit a report for examination by the 1933 Conference.

This resolution came up for discussion on the 2nd of November. Sir Louis Kershaw, the Delegate of the Government of India, said that as he had no instructions from his Government regarding this question he did not know what line to take, and he moved an amendment asking the Governing Body to communicate with the Governments concerned regarding the possibility of instituting a preliminary investigation.

I opposed this amendment as I thought it did not lead to anything. But the amendment was carried. When the substantive resolution was put to the vote, it was declared lost on account of want of quorum, although it was carried by a majority.

The resolution of which the Workers' Delegate from Japan and I had jointly given notice, about the expediency

of instituting the services of National Correspondents in Eastern countries, and especially in Japan and India, was referred by the Conference to the Governing Body for examination.

The election of the six Representatives of the Workers' Group on the Governing Body for the next three years took place on the 30th October. This year the Conference also elected six substitute Members who may take the place of any absentee members and I was one of these six. Of course, in my case, this election is only a recognition of our claims, as I cannot, in practice, on account of distance, ever think of going to Europe to attend a meeting of the Governing Body even if I am asked to be present.

A Special Offer.

Don't Lose This Opportunity.

Bhagavad Gita.—Text in Devanagari with a preface and translation in English by Dr. Annie Besant. Pocket edition at As. 4. For orders for 50 copies or more a discount of 12½% will be allowed.

**The Theosophical Publishing House,
Adyar, Madras.**

AND
INDIAN BOOK SHOP

55 Meadows Street.

Fort, BOMBAY.

BEST REMEDY

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

**G. R. KHORANA,
LYALLPUR.**

CUT ME OUT

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

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

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

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

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

	Rs. a. p.
1. Indian Economics — (4th edition). Featherweight paper Demi. 8 vo. pp. 700. Cloth Bound. Revised & enlarged.	3-0-0
2. Gokhale and Economic Reforms — Crown 16 mo. pp. 250. Cloth Bound.	2-0-0
3. Indian Administration — (4th edition). With additional chapters on the Reforms Act. Demi. 8 vo. pp. 523. Cloth Bound.	3-0-0
4. The Reforms Explained — Demi. 8 vo. pp. 100.	1-0-0
5. Indian Industrial and Economic Problems — (2nd edition). Crown 16 mo. pp. 340.	1-8-0
6. India's War Finance and Post-War Problems — Crown 16 mo. pp. 164. Cloth Bound.	2-0-0
7. Currency Reform in India — Crown 16 mo. pp. 120.	1-0-0
8. Days of Modern Finance in India — Crown 16 mo. pp. 154.	2-0-0

These books can be had of:—

The Aryabhushan Press, Poona City.