

The Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XVII, No. 49. } POONA—THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1934. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN SUBSN. 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	577
ARTICLES :—	
England's Decision—and India's	580
Don't Give in, Gur'nor !	581
How it Looks to the States' People. By M. Ramachandra Rao	582
OUR LONDON LETTER	584
REVIEW :—	
Punjab Agricultural Economics. By N. S. S.	586
SHORT NOTICE	586
MISCELLANEA :—	
J. P. C. Scheme Unacceptable.—The Bombay Liberals' View	587
Congress and Joint Committee's Report	588

Topics of the Week.

Mr. Abdul Gaffar Khan.

THE prosecution of Mr. Abdul Gaffar Khan, the order restraining the movements of Mr. Subash Chandra Bose and the refusal of permission to Mahatma Gandhi to visit the N.-W. Frontier Province are events which bring home to every one in India that the spirit of the bureaucracy has not changed in any respect. If the new reforms were really far-reaching, as they are claimed to be, giving to the people real control, under proper safeguards, over all our internal civil affairs, surely the administration would adopt a different policy on the eve of the grant of popular freedom. The events mentioned above prove conclusively that, whoever may wield the nominal power, the real power will be in the hands of the officials as at present. The people are already indifferent to the reforms question, but the repressive measures to which they are being subjected may well take first place in their attention hereafter, making it impossible to turn their mind to anything else.

Defence of Safeguards.

SIR TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU has already begun to speak of the numerous reservations and safeguards contained in the Joint Select Committee's Report in the vein of Anglo-Indian newspapers: Indians themselves are partly responsible for them; if the constitution is properly worked, they may never obtrude themselves upon our attention; and, after all, formal provisions of a constitution are as nothing compared to the spirit in which we operate it. In an interview with the *Hindu's* representative, he refers to the British and Indian views on safeguards and then proceeds :—

I do not wish to enter into a discussion of the relative merits of these two views, nor do I wish to minimise either the nature or the extent of those safeguards which, to say the least, are irritating. But the only antidote to those safeguards we can furnish is that we must return men to the legislatures who will place the country before any special class and who can supply Ministers who will realise their responsibility and not suffer any wanton infringement of that responsibility or any improper use of the safeguards.

I hold very strongly the view that the strength of a constitution lies not so much in the written word as in the force of public opinion. There is no doubt that public opinion has grown in India during the last fifty years or so to an extent to which it had never grown before, but I think that public opinion has concerned itself more with the struggle for freedom rather with the fruits of freedom or more with constitutional theories than with actual problems of development in the light of concrete facts and in relation to available opportunities.

If public opinion is developed in future in relation to the actual problems of national development and is reflected in the legislatures in the manner as it should be by men of the right type, I can see no reason why the safeguards, galling as they are, should not be kept in their proper place. This of course does not mean that I approve of them generally, and I wish to emphasise that for some of those safeguards we ourselves are in no small measure responsible.

If strong and nationalist-minded Ministers can keep the safeguards in their proper place, what is wrong with them? And why does not Sir Tej Bahadur approve of them? He might as well. We thought the objection to safeguards was that they would make impotent even strong and nationalist-minded Ministers. If the only objection to the constitution is that it is not fool-proof and that even weak and communally-minded Ministers will not be compelled to act in the right way, the objection is puerile in the extreme.

* * *

Hoist with His own Petard !

HOW curious to see Anglo-Indian papers finding the same fault in Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Mr. Jayakar which these leaders find in the more uncompromising critics of the Joint Select Committee's Report, viz. a doctrinaire adherence to text-book principles without a comprehension of the realities of situation! The *Statesman*, in its issue of the 2nd inst., says, with reference to the Sapru-Jayakar statement :—

In a general way, it suffers, as to a certain extent did their whole contribution to the Round Table deliberations, from a somewhat pedantic regard for the constitutional usages that have, over a long course of years, come into existence in England. They have a curious, almost a superstitious, reverence for a particular kind of representative government, and a curious fear that any modification or adaptation of it must contaminate, make

it something less than a genuine article. Thus they cling fervidly to terms and definitions; having, for instance, set their hearts on dominion status, they are suspicious of any constitution which does not bear that trade-mark clearly on the wrapper. Apart, however, from this general disqualification, which is understandable enough in view of the peculiar circumstances of India's constitutional development, their criticism of the report is worthy of the serious consideration of the British Government and the Government of India.

What does Rejection mean?

THE *Tribune*, which is not committed to the support of Congress policy, thus explains what rejection means:—

In the course of an interview given by him to a representative of the *Tribune*, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru said: "It is not enough for us to say that we are dissatisfied or disappointed with the J. P. C. Report, any more than it is enough for us to use time after time the expression 'rejection,' whatever it may mean. If rejection means nothing more than an expression of dissatisfaction, then I am afraid the use of that word is apt to give rise to some misleading inferences. If, on the other hand, it is meant by that expression that those who reject shall not work the constitution, then, in the first place, what I know is that they have not said so, and I do not think they will say so, considering the trend of events during the last few months."

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru is perfectly right in thinking that rejection does not in this case mean refusal to work the constitution in the sense of non-co-operating with or boycotting the Legislatures created under it. But neither does it mean, as he seems to imagine, a mere expression of dissatisfaction or disappointment. What it does mean is a determination on the part of those rejecting the constitution to wage a ceaseless fight against it, both within and outside the Legislature, until it is swept into oblivion. For the purposes of this fight the country will use all the powers and opportunities provided by the new constitution, though it will not necessarily confine itself to using those powers and opportunities. There is nothing in the whole range of "legitimate and peaceful methods" which it will not use for the purpose, provided it is expedient and provided it can be expected to yield satisfactory results.

Take it or Leave it!

EVERYONE who is in touch with public opinion in England is agreed that no substantial improvement of the scheme embodied in the J. P. C. Report is feasible. The reason why no proposals for any serious extension of responsibility can now be entertained is not merely that British opinion in general is not advanced enough for it, but that, as our London correspondent points out, the scheme of the Report is itself the outcome of prolonged negotiations between representatives of different shades of opinion; that it represents a pact which, if once disturbed, will throw the whole scheme into the melting pot. If the constitution is pushed one step forward, it may be dragged ten steps backward. Friends of reform, therefore, we are warned, must not make any radical suggestions at this stage. In fact, the point has come when, we are told, Indians can either take the scheme as it is or leave it.

YET our Anglo-Indian friends are singing a different tune. "Don't reject the scheme out and out" they say, "but suggest modifications." They know well that these modifications, if they are of substance, have not the ghost of a chance. But they still press that course upon the attention of politicians in this country, merely in order to show indirectly, as the *Times of India* said bluntly the other day, that the

fundamentals of the scheme are acceptable to India, and that she desires only minor changes in them. But this is just the impression that progressive elements must avoid. They want radical changes and not mere changes of detail, and if they suggest any modifications at all, they must do it in such a way as to give no ground for the misconception which Anglo-Indian papers are sedulously fostering.

THE *Pioneer* objects to unconditional rejection, but not to conditional. After stating its objection to the Congress Working Committee's policy of root and branch rejection of the J. P. Committee's Report, it says: "They could have achieved exactly the same result by formulating their objections to the British Government's proposals and pressing for their modification, possibly, as Sir Chimanlal Setalvad suggests, with the threat that they would have no option but to reject them if concessions were refused. That would have been a more constitutional method—and a much more sensible one."

THE *Pioneer* is quite right in saying that both methods will produce the same result. In this particular case no modifications will be accepted, even if accompanied by a threat of rejection, and the threat will have to be put into execution eventually. If this is so, we cannot understand the violent objection the *Pioneer* takes to the Congress position and the condescending support it accords to the Liberal position. But we thought the *Pioneer's* principal objection to rejection was that it was impracticable. It is like defying the lightning, it says. On this ground it must condemn both conditional and unconditional rejection. If the Congress cannot make rejection effective now, how are the Liberals to make it effective next year? This only shows that Anglo-Indian papers are very anxious to divide nationalist ranks, which we must not allow them to do on any account.

Emergence of Central Opinion.

THE results of the Assembly election may have proved the implacable hostility of the Indian people to the scheme of reforms contained in the White Paper and still more to that contained in the Joint Parliamentary Committee's Report. But evidence is not wanting which goes to show that there is also a solid block of opinion which is in favour of them. This opinion was not observable so far, but it has now discovered itself to the Delhi correspondent of the *Times of India*.

HE tells us of "the influx of leaders of public opinion who have come here (to the capital of India) to assure Government of their desire to support the administration in every possible way, and in particular to accept nomination by the Governor-General to the Legislative Assembly so that they may there take their stand side by side with Government in repelling the attacks of Congressmen and their allies, and especially their attacks upon the Report of the J. P. C. and upon the position of India in the British Commonwealth of Nations."

THE phrase "side by side with Government" in the above passage deserves particular notice. The attack on the White Paper and the J. P. C. Report is to be repelled jointly by Government and these eminent visitors to Delhi who have offered, at such tremendous sacrifice, to be appointed members of the Assembly so that it may be given to them to save the reforms. This shows that official members are going to cast their votes along with nominated non-official members on the rejection motion. The Burma

example, it would thus appear, is to be cast aside. On the question of the separation of Burma from India, the official members of the Burma Legislative Council were excluded from the vote at Government's own instance, as a correspondent pointed out last week in our columns. But on this question perhaps Government feel that unless they mobilise all their forces the battle is sure to go against them, and they are right too!

Applications Galore!

TWO hundred applications for fourteen nominated seats! Almost fifteen applications for every seat! When so many people volunteer to vote for the Bill, knowing how great an unpopularity one incurs by doing so, it becomes perfectly clear that public opinion is violently in favour of the Bill!! The volunteers, we are told come from all parts of the country and all parties have contributed their quota. We were very curious at first to know the names of the Liberal volunteers, since the Liberal Federation, meeting soon in Poona, could at once deal with the matter. But from what follows in the correspondent's dispatches it would appear that there is no Liberal among these applicants, for the Liberal Party is one of the parties against whom the volunteers are organising their forces.

THE volunteers say to Government, to use the words of the correspondent referred to above:

"Let the Congress Party men and the Liberal Party men throw stones at the Parliamentary Committee Report, but we must do what we can to support Government in passing the projected Parliamentary Bill, because, though we know that our organised parties would not endorse this or any bill, we also know that what the Bill contains will be for the good of India, and that if educated India, by playing into the hands of Congress, upsets or delays the passage of the measure, incalculable harm to Indian welfare will be done."

Is it possible to produce more convincing proof that India wants these reforms? But how will the acceptability of the future instalments of reforms be proved, we wonder, if the nominated element is to be struck out in the instalment now under consideration? But we forget. There will be the Princes.

Constituent Assembly Plan.

THE *Bombay Chronicle* asks the Working Committee of the Congress to explain in greater detail what the adoption of rejection involves and then it also asks how the constituent assembly which the Congress has a mind to set up would be composed, referring here to Mr. Satyamurti's unauthorised suggestions in the matter. It says:—

It is also time the Working Committee gave the public a clear and authoritative plan of summoning a constituent assembly. So long the public has accepted on trust the most general conception of such an assembly, defined, however, as being convened on the basis of adult franchise or a near approach to it. But most unfortunate attempts are being made by some responsible Congress leaders to explain away the term "near approach" to adult franchise. These persons forget that, however much they may be enamoured of their own schemes of a constituent assembly, the latter cannot be substituted for the plan already outlined by the Congress. There is much doubt in the minds of the people not merely about the nature of a constituent assembly but also about the procedure in convening it. Who is to convene it and when? Is nothing to be done in that connection for the present? Cannot a beginning be made straightaway by the Congress? Questions like these are being put by many Congressmen puzzled by the absence of any authorita-

tive statement on the subject. If these questions remain unanswered indefinitely, many will feel that their faith in Congress promises and plans is being unfairly exploited. The Working Committee has, by its latest resolution, called upon the nation "to support the Congress in every step that it may decide upon to secure the national objective of Purna Swaraj." But the nation is entitled to know at every stage full particulars about the steps that have already been decided upon.

It is also necessary for the Congress to say whether the Constituent Assembly would be confined in its scope to British India, and if it is to extend to the States, whether it would admit the States' people or not.

Labour Party's Duty.

United Bengal agrees with the view expressed in these columns by Mr. P. G. Kanekar that the Labour Party should, in accordance with the view prevalent in all progressive circles in India vote against the India Bill at its final stage if, as is certain, its amendments are not accepted by Government. The journal says: "At present Labourites like Major Attlee and Mr. Lansbury are determined to vote in favour of the Bill so that it may not be defeated through the efforts of diehards like Mr. Churchill. But this attitude of the Labour leaders cannot be interpreted as beneficent towards India. The Labourites will better serve our cause and better appreciate our interests if the measure could be allowed to be defeated at the third reading in the House of Commons."

S. I. S. Rural Work.

MR. N. A. DRAVID, Senior Member, Servants of India Society, C. P. branch, who was already in correspondence with Mahatma Gandhi for some time past about his own village work at Bhambora and the plans which Mahatmaji was evolving in connection with the Village Industries Association, had a personal interview with Mahatmaji at Wardha on 23rd November. In the course of the conversation Mahatmaji, among other things, suggested that the treatment of dead cattle, that is, proper flaying and curing of the hides and turning the tanned leather into various articles of utility on the spot would provide a new industry, at least to the Harijans of the village. A profitable diversion of carrion to manuring purposes would incidentally wean the Harijans from the use they were at present making of it, viz, eating it. Cheap methods of giving medical relief and providing latrines and pure water were also discussed. Before taking leave of Mahatmaji, Mr. Dravid requested him to pay a visit to the S. I. S. Rural Centre at Bhambora at such time as may be convenient to him to advise him, after examining the situation for himself, as to what further measures for improvement he could usefully adopt, which Mahatmaji has agreed to do. Mr. Dravid was accompanied by Mr. R. S. Gupte, Member, Servants of India Society.

Birth Control Approved.

THE General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church approved dissemination of contraceptive information at its meeting in Atlantic City in October last. The resolution passed by the Convention runs thus:—

"We endorse the efforts now being made to secure for licensed physicians, hospitals and medical clinics freedom to convey such information as is in accord with the highest principles of eugenics and a more wholesome family life, wherein parenthood may be undertaken with respect for the health of mothers and the welfare of their children."

ENGLAND'S DECISION—AND INDIA'S.

IF the decision of the Central Council of the National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations on the Joint Parliamentary Committee's Report is, to all intents and purposes, Great Britain's decision, the decision of the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress is to an even greater extent India's decision. Both are no doubt party organisations, but, in the present conditions of the two countries, their voice is supreme; only the voice of the Congress is more supreme in India than that of the Conservative Party in England. There is no serious conflict on the Indian question between the Conservative Party and other British Parties. The Liberal Party has already decided not to move its motion for the substitution of direct for indirect election to the Legislative Assembly in order not to mar the effect of the whole-hearted co-operation which it wishes to give to the Conservative Party. The Labour Party will probably move amendments, but when they are mowed down, as they will be, it will either allow the India Bill to pass without a division or will vote for it. Only a few radicals like Col. Wedgwood and a few diehards like Mr. Churchill will stand out against the Bill to the end. As the British Conservative Party has the general support of other parties, so has the Indian Congress of all progressive parties in India. To all of them—whether Liberals, Independents, Nationalists, Democrats or Responsivists—the J. P. C. Report is unacceptable, whatever word they may use in describing the policy and whatever measures they may contemplate in making it effective. These differences, however, are easily capable of mutual adjustment, and fortunately leading Congress members seem anxious not to put any unnecessary obstacles in the way. Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel, for instance, speaking the other day at Patna, said that the Congress would be prepared to join with all other parties who are unwilling either to accept or acquiesce in the new constitution, whatever other differences there may be between them.

Thus it may be said that England as a whole stands for the J. P. C. reforms, and India as a whole against them. And the only question is whether England will heed Indian opinion or not. She may say, "It is for us to decide the issue, and we will decide it in our own way, whatever you may say or do. We are convinced that the reforms we are offering will do you good. If you will waive your present objection and work them contentedly, you will find this out for yourselves. But if you will become obstructive, we will put you on one side and carry on with the help of communalists, vested interests, and the Princes. But thrust the constitution we will on your country, come what may." On the other hand, England may say, "Your objection is wholly unreasonable. You are not the whole people, but the ignorant masses are influenced by you. And we have to reckon with what you say, highly prejudiced as it is. The need

for deferring to public opinion is all the greater because it is a federation that we are bringing into existence. The ordinary method of trial and error cannot be adopted here. When once a federation is brought into existence, it cannot be put out of existence at a later stage. It is on this basis that we have fashioned the constitution. We are ourselves convinced that a federal solution is the only solution, but we are equally convinced that this solution must be backed by public opinion. It cannot be rammed down the throats of people. The results of delay will be wholly bad, but there is no help for it. After all, federal solutions were not adopted in other countries the moment they came into the horizon. Oftentimes they had to be temporarily laid aside and revived later after a sufficient interval was allowed for popular passions to die down. So be it in India. We sincerely regret having to take this course, but in one sense it will perhaps be better. Let the undoubted advantages of federation, even of such an incomplete and unique type of federation as is alone possible in India, sink into the minds of the Indian people, and let the Indian federation be a voluntary act on their part. We will therefore drop the Bill and wait till the cry of rejection that we hear on all sides is heard no more and it is replaced by the cry of acceptance."

Let England decide in what way she will. So far as India is concerned, she has made up her mind to refuse to accept the constitution that England is offering. If the constitution cannot be improved in the way India wants, it can at least be put away. But if it is passed, all the progressive elements will take all the measures that it is possible for them to take to make it clear beyond peradventure that the constitution is imposed upon India. This will necessarily produce in the country an amount of hostility which all wise rulers will avoid. No one can predict what concrete forms the hostility will take. But whatever they may be, no progressive party in India will for that reason change their opinion and accept or acquiesce in a constitution of which the essential principles offend their moral sense. They must first preserve their self-respect before achieving self-government, and this they are determined to do, cost it what it will.

China's State Socialism.

CHINA, in her new constitution, has made provision for State Socialism. "Unearned increment on land is to go into public welfare. Private and individual wealth may be regulated. Public utilities are, in general, to be operated by the State. The production and distribution of farm products are to be regulated, though the same does not hold for industrial products. Both farmer and labourer are to be cared for. All of which would mean a nationally regulated capitalistic economy, based on the 'San Min Chu I'—the three people's principles laid down by Sun Yat Sen."

DON'T GIVE IN, GUV'NOR.

WE are filled to the full with admiration for the dialectic skill which the draftsmen of the Joint Select Committee's Report have brought to bear upon their work. Where they were compelled to recommend surrender of power, they have done so with an air of generosity which cannot be improved upon. Where they could recommend imposition of restrictions, they show how these are necessary exclusively in Indian interests. But, in one point, and a very important point, we cannot help saying that they are making an unnecessary sacrifice. Complete provincial autonomy and responsibility in a large, though not the whole, field of the Central Government, which they advise Parliament to confer upon India, they say, follow almost inevitably from the accepted premises. The necessity of some forward step in constitutional reform is admitted on all hands, and no one seriously suggests going back from the Simon Commission's report, which recommended transfer of control to Ministers in the whole provincial sphere. As for central responsibility, it is true that it was denied by the Simon Commission, but the reason for it merely was that the Commission at that time could not contemplate early establishment of an all-India federation. If the federation had to be confined to British Indian provinces, then of course no measure of central responsibility would have been possible. But the Princes' declaration of their willingness to enter an all-India federation has put an entirely different aspect on the situation. What without the Princes would have been a source of danger is with the Princes a means of security. "The best guarantee of stability", as Lord Eustace Percy has said, "is to accept the Princes' offer to enter the federation." Of course it would have been fine if we could have got the Princes in and yet withheld responsibility from the Federal Government. But, as ill luck would have it, that is not to be. For the Princes have intimated that they will join "only if the Federal Government is a responsible and not an irresponsible government." This makes it necessary, however much one may regret it, to introduce a measure of central responsibility. For, in the present case, two alternatives appear possible: (1) leaving out the Princes and keeping the Central Government irresponsible, and (2) bringing in the Princes and conceding responsibility in a part of the Central Government. When there are these two courses, and only these two, open for choice, what politician, however keen he may be on maintaining intact the power of the Britishers in the Government of India, will miss the opportunity of erecting a *facade* of autocratic authority behind which Indians may be allowed to play at democracy? Grant of so-called central responsibility thus follows automatically upon the introduction of the Princes into the new polity.

If we may be humbly allowed to say so, there is a flaw, and a serious flaw, in this argument, viz. the Princes asked for central responsibility as a condition of their joining federation, and it had to be

granted. Do not the authors of the Report of the Joint Select Committee know that in all negotiations the parties concerned take up, at the start, a very advanced position and then quickly retreat from it and shave their demands when they find that the terms offered by them, are not likely to be accepted? Has not their long experience in various diplomatic fields taught men like Sir Austen Chamberlain that what politicians say at the initial stage in making a bargain cannot be taken at its face value? Did not even Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru—and there is no man who is more averse to haggling—say that no one in India would agree to work a constitution if it was of a lower level than that adumbrated in the White Paper scheme? Has this prevented Sir Austen and his colleagues from subjecting it to a drastic curtailment? Did they not feel sure that even if it was so whittled down Sir Tej Bahadur would not counsel non-co-operation? And is not their belief fully justified? Why, then, do they accept so easily the Princes' declaration that their entry into federation is contingent upon the Federal Government being endowed with responsibility? May it not be that while the Princes would desire their regaining control over subjects which are now administered for them by the Paramount Power at its unfettered discretion, they would still not mind entering into a federation with British India even if the Federal Government is allowed merely to influence, but not to control, the administration of these subjects? Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru has at least expressed dissatisfaction with the additional restrictions which the Joint Select Committee advise the British Parliament to impose upon central responsibility. Have the Princes done so? Did they at all ask for liberalisation of the White Paper proposals in the Joint Select Committee? What reason then is there to think that they would really refuse, if it came to the scratch, to federate except on condition of responsible government being introduced in the Central Government?

We have the utmost respect for the Joint Select Committee's judgment, but cannot help feeling that they profess to give full faith and credit to the Princes only because they are determined to do everything in their power to plant India's feet firmly on the road to dominion status and think that they can best outwit the British diehards by confronting them with the Princes' non-possumus. We appreciate the Committee's motive and are deeply grateful to them for it, but honesty compels us to say that they know as well as anybody else that the Princes would still join the federation even if the Government of India remains an irresponsible government. The argument which they have advanced to disprove this is entirely fallacious, although it is meant only for the consumption of the Churchillites. The argument is drawn from the sovereignty of the Princes. It is supposed that the Princes, being sovereign, as Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru said in his address before the Royal Society of

International Affairs, " would not associate with the Central Government in British India unless it was a responsible Central Government." In order to enforce this point, Sir Tej added: " I should feel very sorry for any Prince who agreed to associate with a Government which was not responsible. Why should he part with such powers as he has? If I were a Prince I should absolutely decline to join a Government which did not give me power to pass such legislation as was suited to my own territory." Here it is assumed that Indian Princes are sovereign in respect of the subjects which they are willing to put into the common pool of federal subjects, and that, in entering a federation whose government is not responsible to the legislature, they will be parting with power which they now possess to manage these subjects in favour of a government which will be controlled neither by themselves nor by British Indians but by a third party. Even a tyro in politics knows, however, that this is not the case. The subjects on the federal list are precisely the subjects over which the Princes exercise no manner of control at present. If these subjects are managed in future by a composite Government made up of the representatives of British India and the States, though acting under the control of the British Parliament, instead of, as now, by a Government representing purely British India, the Princes will be in no worse position. In fact they will be better off. They will at least be able to take part in the discussion regarding those subjects and thus to influence to some extent the ultimate decision. The Princes are no doubt sovereign; but they are *not* sovereign in the sphere of government which is now intended to be made over to the Federal Government. They are in fact less sovereign in this sphere than British Indians. For British Indians have at least a right to participate in debates relating to it, but the Princes have completely divested themselves of power both of legislation and administration.

Our point is not to argue against federation. Who can be unaware of the advantages of federation for all, and least of all for Britishers? The Joint Select Committee truly say that " Ruling Princes, as members of a Federation, may be expected to give steadfast support to a strong and stable Central Government." We are not, therefore surprised in

the least that all intelligent British politicians are not only willing to let federation go forward, but that they insist upon making it an indispensable condition of any future constitutional advance. All we say is that the Joint Select Committee have erred grievously in assuming that no federation will be possible except on the basis of central responsibility. It is quite possible on the basis of irresponsibility also. The Princes will come in gladly and become the " helpful collaborators " with Britishers which they are expected to become in a federation, even if no power is conferred upon the federation. Why, even if the Princes are required to accept the Viceroy's nominees as their representatives in the federal legislature, they will not very seriously object. For even now the matters which are to be federal in the new regime have passed out of their control. The Princes will suffer no loss, but will gain somewhat if their representatives (though not appointed by them) are allowed to handle these matters. The Joint Select Committee do not know yet how reasonable our ruling Princes are. They have only to deal with the Princes as they have dealt with Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. They knew, in the case of Sir Tej, that his irreducible demands were still capable of being further reduced. So it is with the Princes too. The Princes are not so unused, after all, to irresponsible government as to be shocked at the denial of responsible government by the British Parliament. Nor is one quite sure that they do not at heart desire the same system of government to obtain in the federal sphere as in their own States. Be that as it may, the Joint Select Committee need not, in a defeatist spirit, say to the right wing of Conservatives: " We cannot help ourselves in the matter of central responsibility. The value of Princes' participation being admitted, we have to pay a price for it. The price they ask is that of a measure of central responsibility. We can only narrow its sphere, but an outright denial of it is not possible." Well, it is possible, if only you go about it the right way. Don't throw up the sponge in that way. That is not the way of Englishmen! Getting the Princes in, even if some central responsibility is to be given, is a good proposition. But getting the Princes in without central responsibility is a still better one.

HOW IT LOOKS TO THE STATE'S PEOPLE.

Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, ex-Judge, Mysore High Court, has written an Open Letter to the Indian Princes and the Subjects of Indian States, in which he shows, first, how, whenever the British Government makes concessions to the States, the rulers alone benefit and their subjects are left high and dry, and then appeals to the British Government to use the power which it undoubtedly possesses of persuading the Princes to introduce responsible government at the same time as they will come to participate in responsible government that will be inaugurated under the aegis of an All-India federation. He says:—

GRADUALLY, the restrictions, which were in vogue for a very long time (preventing the Princes to combine together), were slackened to a considerable degree, so much so that, after the Morley-Minto Reforms, the Princes could freely communicate with one another and carry on their respective internal administrations without reference to the British Residents or other Imperial Agents stationed within their territories. The removal of restrictions has, no doubt, been hailed by the Princes, but it is a question whether the opportunities thereby let free for taking the initiative for improv-

ing the welfare of their subjects and for introducing constitutional and responsible government within their States have been properly availed of. The measure of success can only be gauged by the increased happiness of their subjects, and, judged by this test, it is difficult to say that the subjects have really gained anything by the slackening of the grip on the part of the British Government over the Indian States.

The non-progressive character of the administrations in the States has deprived the Indian States' subjects of all hope of improvement in the future if the Princes are left to themselves. One of the clauses in most of the treaties which the British Government has entered into with the Indian Princes is to the effect that in case of misgovernment by an Indian Prince, the British Government should have the right to interfere and help to restore good government. Instances are not wanting in recent times in which the British Indian Government has stepped in, taken over the administration and endeavoured to restore peace and order where chaos had prevailed previously. Such interference being always for the good of the people, the latter have invariably welcomed it. This does not mean that the people would continue to welcome the new regime for all time. Every moment of their lives they see their brethren across the borders fighting for political rights and it would be misreading human nature if it is assumed that the people of the Indian States would or should remain unaffected by the political changes in British India.

The policy of non-interference is no doubt a good one so long as the Princes conduct themselves properly, become amenable to all the good influences of the modern world and always work for ameliorating the condition of their subjects. The experience of the people of the States as a result of this policy has, however, to the extreme regret of all, except of course the Princes, not been happy. Though the people of the Indian States are anxious that the Princes should continue to rule in the same way that the King-Emperor is ruling in Great Britain, yet they do not find genuine sympathy for their aspirations about the future anywhere outside the States or even in the Indian National Congress. In the States themselves, circumstances have so combined that it is not possible for the people effectively to make their desire felt by the Princes or by the British Indian Government.

The subjects of the States number over 81 millions and these have been altogether ignored in the bargain carried on by the British Government with the Indian Princes in the matter of Federation and it is a tragedy that the future well-being of the Indian States' subjects should be left in the tender hands of individuals who have not made good their claim to represent that huge population which is more than 1½ times that of Great Britain and larger than that of Germany or Japan. It is not easy to see any justification for such a course on the part of the British Government. The people of the Indian States are, therefore, placed in a great dilemma. The press within the States is invariably weighted down by innumerable handicaps and the newspaper press of

British India, except fattening on the large incomes derived from subscribers in Indian States, has till now done absolutely nothing to voice the real feeling of the States' peoples nor has it espoused their cause before the British Indian public adequately. Moreover, the British Indian press knows full well how seriously any displeasure on the part of the Indian States' Governments exhibited by either prohibiting altogether its circulation within their borders or taking other steps which will lessen its circulation, would touch its pockets. So, the British Indian Press may be taken to know on which side its bread is buttered. It has always tried to keep on the sides of angels.

The British Indian Legislature has also, by enacting a law known as the Princes Protection Act, provided sufficient safeguards to the Princes against any violent attacks in the British Indian Press. But the people of the States, until actual misgovernment is witnessed and recognised in any Indian State administration, can get no relief at the hands of the British Indian Government and a Prince who can misbehave but at the same time is shrewd enough to avoid his misbehaviour coming to the notice of the British Indian Government, can carry on his government without any interference whatsoever from outside. In these circumstances, is it fair or is it proper for the British Government, which is always noted for its justice and fair play, to keep aloof on some excuse based upon documents called Treaties which were entered into at a time when the political condition of the whole population of India was more or less on one level, help that portion of the population which by some good luck happened to come directly under its sway by placing it on a high road to the attainment of Dominion Status, and leave the rest of the population, which is by no means distinguishable from the former, to the tender mercies of the Indian Princes?

The level of civilization in an Indian State, individual capacity in all fields of human endeavour, not excluding even modern sciences, and the fitness of individuals to adorn even the Indian Civil, Financial or Technical Services with credit are in no way inferior to those found in British India. Whatever outside influences have moulded the political aspirations of the British Indian subjects, the same have equally affected the subjects of Indian States as well. The Princes are averse to training their own subjects to occupy the highest appointments within their own States and are known readily to apply either to the neighbouring British Indian Provinces or the ever obliging British Indian Government whenever vacancies occur in such posts. The people of British India have always looked upon Indian States as a convenient training ground for their officers to gain experience and to make a reputation so as to enable them to aspire for still higher posts in British India. The subjects of the Indian States who are the actual tax-payers are nowhere in such matters, being ignored by their own Princes and considered beneath notice by the people outside. It is very humiliating to the self-respect of the subjects of Indian States that such notions should be

held by the Indian Princes and by their own brethren in British India. Anyhow, such mentality on the part of the Indian Princes hereafter at any rate should disappear, if they want their subjects to help them in regaining their pristine glory while showing to the Princes their own regard and loyalty.

Some people are of opinion that the British Government, which till now had its own troubles with the people of British India, having arrived at a satisfactory settlement of those troubles, will readily come to the aid of the peoples of the Indian States. It is also the belief of some that the British Government is capable of changing the system of administration in all the Indian States in a twinkling or overnight if only it should seriously take up the matter. The subjects of the Indian States are not unaware of the pronouncements made from time to time by Their Excellencies the several Viceroys of India since the time of the Morley-Minto Reforms at banquets given in their honour by the Indian Princes. It is hardly necessary to add that the British Government will earn the eternal gratitude of the States' subjects if, on a critical occasion like this, it should use its vast influence and succeed in inducing all the Princes to join the federation without any loss of time and to reform their own governments on the excellent model set up by it in British India.

Before concluding, the writer may be pardoned for once more making an earnest appeal to all the Princes in India that they may be graciously pleased to take a long vision on such an historic occasion like the present, emulate the example of their highly patriotic compeers in Japan and thereby earn the everlasting thankfulness of their most humble and loyal subjects.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, 30th November.

THE INDIA REPORT.

NOW that the Report has been published and the members of the Joint Select Committee and of Government have become free to express their unfettered judgment, they have begun to take their part in the education of public opinion on the scheme of the Report. The most important body whose education has had to be taken in hand is the Conservative India Committee, under the Chairmanship of Sir J. Wardlaw-Milne, [M.P. This body, which is composed of members of Parliament, has been holding almost daily meetings, which have been addressed on one or other aspect of the scheme, by members of the Committee who signed the Report. Lord Salisbury and Sir Joseph Nall were unable to accept the Committee's invitation to address it, owing to previous engagements. I learn on good authority that the reaction is very largely favourable to the Report, and, subject to the proceedings of the Conservative General Council on Tuesday, it is expected that, at the end of the three days' debate week after next in the House of Commons, the Government will find an overwhelming majority of supporters in the House

and in the Tory Party rallying to the support of the "majority" recommendations.

In the country generally the Report has been well received, and it has secured an increasingly favourable Press. This is due to its own quality, to the great weight of the personalities that have backed it and to the reassuring speeches made on its behalf by many who have been critics of, or at least unconvinced by, the White Paper proposals as they stood, before they come under examination by the Select Committee. The fact that they have received the backing of such men as Lord Hardinge of Penshurst, Lord Derby and most significant of all Sir Austen Chamberlain, has done more than anything else to swing public opinion in the direction of the recommendations.

So much is this so that the Government are anticipating with equanimity next Tuesday's proceedings, where they feel already assured of a substantial majority. The debate will circle around an official motion by Mr. Amery himself in support of the recommendations of the Report and an amendment moved by the Marquis of Salisbury recommending substantially the views expressed in the Tory Minority Report. Every one recognises Lord Salisbury's honesty of purpose and integrity of principle, but that will not make his views more acceptable to those (and they represent the great bulk of public opinion) who are beginning to sense that you cannot sweep back the waves of Indian nationalism with a mop of such insignificant proportions. Doubtless Mr. Churchill, in support of Lord Salisbury, will contribute to the liveliness of the proceedings by his inimitable fire works, but it is at least a sign of discretion, if not of grace, that the attack upon the Report is to be led by the respectable peer rather than by the irresponsible commoner. Tactics after all count for something, even among diehards and other dyed-in-the-wool reactionaries. I understand that Mr. Baldwin will make his position perfectly clear. It is understood that he will wholeheartedly advocate the Report scheme, both for himself and for the Government, and that he will make it perfectly clear that the Tory Party can have his continued leadership only upon the condition that the motion is effectively carried. Probably one of the deciding factors will be Sir Austen Chamberlain's strong support and his public admission that he has been converted by conviction from adherence to the view that Provincial Autonomy alone should suffice. He carries enormous weight in the Party, just as Lord Derby's views do in Lancashire, where he and Sir Joseph Nall have been at pains to advise the people that they should confine their criticism to the commercial aspects of the Indian problem, and to do even that with tact and discrimination. If Tuesday's meeting goes according to the anticipations of the party managers, it is unlikely that the larger party meeting that was at one time anticipated will be convened or encouraged. Even if it were held, it would find itself faced with the fact that, as it could not meet until the middle of January, its proceedings had been anticipated by a formal vote of the House on the merits of the Report.

FURTHER STAGES.

The Government, expecting to take their earlier fences with comparative ease, are now considering carefully the further stages of the Indian reforms through Parliament. Sir Francis Younghusband, with that sense of chivalry and gentlemanliness that is so characteristic of him, and Sir Arthur Hirtzel, the former Permanent Under Secretary of State for India, have, in the columns of the *Times*, put in a plea for the exercise of "grace" in the discussions.

that are now pending. They have urged that what is to be done should be done in a spirit of enthusiasm and sympathy with Indian sentiment, even though the means chosen may not in themselves go very far to conciliate that sentiment. It is recognised that in such affairs of supreme importance as between nations, the manner is at least as important as the matter.

It is now expected that the Bill, in dummy form will be laid on the table of the House, and a first formal reading taken before the House rises for the Christmas recess. In that event it should be available for circulation after the views of the Government of India have been received, somewhere about the middle of January. The second reading debate may be expected to begin towards the end of January or the beginning of February, and the Bill will then be sent to a Committee of the whole House. The Labour Party, in fulfilment of their programme, will seek by amendment to incorporate the proposals of the British Indian delegation, as well as their own special proposals regarding the Committee procedure (that has the backing of such experts as Lord Snell, with his London County Council experience, and Dr. Drummond Shiels, whose handiwork in the framing of the Ceylon Constitution is easily recognisable), and their other proposals for the broadening of the franchise and the increase of representation of the workers and peasants of India, with a view to securing a more democratic constitution.

I have already said that, in the view of friends of India here every effort should be made in this direction, with the help and advice if possible of a well coordinated Indian delegation, carrying constructive proposals that will have the maximum of support, express or understood, of Indian opinion. I do not, however, anticipate that the Government will be in a position or willing to accept any amendment of substantial importance. In the very nature of the case the Report, which is to be the basis of the Government's Bill, must be regarded as having the character of a compromise between those who have signed it. Sir Austen Chamberlain's acceptance of the recommendations of the Committee has had to be paid for. The price is obviously that the recommendations must be accepted and carried through as a whole, and any attempt on the part of the Government to modify them in any important respect, unless the assent of men like Sir Austen Chamberlain were simultaneously obtained, would rip open the whole of the implied agreement and would cast the entire scheme once more into the melting pot. It may, therefore, be assumed that the Cabinet will not contemplate the prospect of such a disaster. They hope, on the contrary, with a little good fortune and in the absence of calculated obstructive tactics, to get the Bill through the Commons by the time Parliament rises for the summer vacation, even though this may mean that it will not go to the Lords until the autumn. They expect to get the royal assent about a year hence, and, if all goes well, to have the new India Act in operation in about two years' time, making allowance for all intermediate processes to that end that have to be taken in India.

It is easily to be understood that, at the present time, emphasis in both countries is being laid upon the nature, extent and variety of the safeguards. Whilst it is almost a necessity of the case that this should be happening, it is unfortunate that it tends to distract attention from the constructive proposals on their merits. In this country the Government feel that they still have to carry what is in the main, conservative opinion, irrespective of party association, regarding the transfer of power to Indian hands over the destinies of a vast population whose welfare has

been, at least in theory, and to a large extent in practice, though not always with understanding, regarded as a British trust. There is, too, inevitably interwoven with a subject of this magnitude the question of interests and rights that have grown up in the course of the joint history of Britain and India, which must inevitably be the source of considerable anxiety among large and influential groups of people here, who have been frightened, or at least gravely disturbed, by the Congress spectre, and by the somewhat wild expressions of intention by irresponsible people in India who, as has happened elsewhere in the world, may, by some sudden upheaval, during a weak administration, gain by subversive methods control in India. Such groups and interests have to be placated and their fears dispelled, and it is only natural, therefore, that emphasis here should in the first place be laid upon the safeguards rather than upon the extent of the transfer of power. In India, where hopes had at one time run high and aspirations had outrun a sense of the realities of the situation, it is recognised that emphasis is equally laid upon these same safeguards as symbolising doubts and suspicions here of Indian capacity for self-administration and of an intention not to part with the reality of power, especially in the face of the recognised weakness and disorganisation of the nationalist forces. It is generally hoped, however, by the better minds of this country that, after the first emotions of disappointment have subsided and the reforms scheme comes to be examined from the point of view of what can be done within its scope rather than from that of what it is in certain special circumstances designed to prevent, public opinion in India will tend to settle down to an appreciation of the opportunities that are provided for wider and more effective service to India and of the unalterable direction towards complete Responsible Government and real Dominion Status that are, if not inherent in the present reforms scheme, at least as inevitable, in not too long a period of time, as anything human is.

EAST AND WEST FRIENDSHIP.

The East and West Friendship Council held its Annual Meeting last week, and was presided over by Lord Lytton. The purpose of this Society, which is supported (and none-too-generously) by voluntary subscription, is to promote friendship between English people and students and others from the East who come to this country. The meeting this year was intended to arouse increased interest in the Council's aims by showing some of the difficulties experienced by Eastern visitors to England, difficulties which English people themselves rarely understand. The first speaker Mr. Chang, Warden of China Institute, explained in detail many of these difficulties from his own experience as a student. Mr. P. T. Chandī, from the Indian point of view, followed and emphasised the opportunities of information and understanding open to English people if they will enter into friendship with Indians. He pointed out some of the contributions already made by India to the world, and prophesied far greater enrichment of the two peoples if they would cultivate equal and unselfish friendship with each other.

Mr. Lionel Aird and Miss G. Sutton, the devoted Secretaries, also made a very valuable contribution to the discussion. The meeting closed with a strong appeal by Lord Lytton for true international peace, which could only be secured by having other nations as friends and not as enemies against whom protection is necessary.

MORLEY AND GOKHALE.

The following letter from Mr. Hy. S. L. Polak in yesterday's *Manchester Guardian* speaks for itself :-

'J. T. G.' in his review of "India, Minto and Morley, 1905-1910" recalls that "Morley complained, not without reason, that Gokhale whined when he did not get from him all he wanted." Whatever may have induced Lord Morley to employ this picturesque language, no one who knew Gokhale intimately would ever associate 'whining' with his robust independence of character. As the pupil of that rugged giant Ranade and the political teacher of Gandhi (whom 'J. T. G.' rightly admires), Sastri, and Sapru, each in his own way, it is inconceivable that Gokhale would have made any appeal had 'whining' been one of his attributes. I venture to hope that for the sake of Gokhale's reputation as one of the greatest Indians of his time your readers will hesitate to accept even 'J. T. G.'s endorsement of Morley's irritable epithet.

OF INTEREST TO INDIA.

Speculation is already being aroused as to the selection of Lord Willingdon's successor. Opinion generally is that, all things permitting, the choice is likely to fall upon Lord Linlithgow, who presided over the Royal Commission on Indian Agriculture as well as over the Joint Select Committee, and who probably has as wide a knowledge of all-India conditions as any man in the front rank of British public life.

It is not generally remembered that Mr. Churchill's father, Lord Randolph Churchill, was Secretary of State for India for a few months in 1885 in Lord Salisbury's first Ministry. During his brief tenure of that office he introduced the Indian Budget in a characteristically vigorous speech, in the course of which he remarked: "This Parliament has done little or nothing for India. It would appear as if Members of Parliament of this generation considered Indian affairs to be either beneath their attention or above their comprehension, and India is left to pursue its destiny alone as far as Parliament is concerned." No-one would be able to say of Parliament during the next session that it will be indifferent to Indian affairs.

The Maharaja of Patiala, whom Sir Michael O'Dwyer delicately pats on the back in to-day's *Morning Post*, has written to that paper describing as a baseless allegation the suggestion made in the *Daily Herald*, and which he takes to himself in view of publication of his photograph with the printed context, that lavish promises of increased status and other advantages have been made by unauthorised persons in return for their promises to assist in defeating the White Paper policy. Doubtless this episode refers to the recent visit of diehard emissaries to India who are reported as having sought to create the impression that the National Government's days were numbered and that it would be replaced by a purely Tory administration and that Codlin was the friend, not Short.

"SHEER BLASPHEMY".

The Rome Correspondent of the *Morning Post* quotes the *Observatore Romano*, the official newspaper of the Vatican as having taken to task misguided journalists and authors who would throw a cloak of divinity round the shoulders of Mahatma Gandhi. Certain Italian writers, it would appear, "ignorant of Indian affairs", have developed the habit of comparing the Mahatma to Buddha, Mohammed, Mahavir, and Christ. The latest offender, a contributor to the Naples *Mattino*, is castigated by the Vatican organ as follows: "To place the figure of Christ near that of Gandhi—a political and social agitator who has torn the leaves off the British laurel as an infant tears off the petals of a flower—is blasphemy. To compare, far less identify, Gandhi's sufferings, his theatrical prison display and his fasts, with the adorable Passion and Death of the Redeemer, that is indeed blasphemy."

Review.

PUNJAB AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS.

STUDIES IN THE COST OF PRODUCTION OF CROPS IN THE PUNJAB. By KARTAR SINGH. (The Board of Economic Inquiry, Punjab.) 1934. 25cm. 121p. Rs. 1-8-0.

THESE are studies of the farm accounts of Risakwala farm, where the estate is divided into squares of about 27 acres each, and leased out to tenants on betai system. Wheat, gram, cotton fodders (kharib and rabi), toria, sugar-cane, Berseem, maize, and miscellaneous crops are raised in the squares. The accounts have been maintained from 1927 and from the basis of these studies. Professor Kartar Singh takes (1) use of land and land revenue, (2) manual labour, (3) bullock labour, (4) water-rate, (5) seed, (6) manure, (7) implements, (8) and miscellaneous as winnowing, harvesting, picking of cotton, kamins, etc. as factors of production. The arrangement and the basis of the studies are good, but it is unfortunate that the only convenient method of deduction—that of striking averages—is most misleading here. The enormity of the fall in prices cannot be really understood where the period of average has within it two good and three bad years. This average price for various commodities suggests that the cultivator makes a profit in very bad years of low prices. Of course the author himself suggests as regards some commodities that it would not pay if the price went below a certain minimum. A study based on the annual price level of commodities might have been more useful and illuminating than this one based on the averages of a short period.

On p. 17 a slight error has crept in. "In the year 1930-31 as the price of cotton was only Rs. 6-9-6 per maund the profit per acre was only Rs. 33-9-6". The profit is not Rs. 33-9-6 but about half of it. Again, on p. 26, he says: "Thus the tenants get a return of Rs. 198-9-0 in addition to their own wages of five annas per working day". On p. 8 he gives 3 annas as the average return per man per day for the whole year. Though the number of working days are not given, it is really hard to reconcile these two statements.

The costs of production, though worked out on a systematic basis, may not reveal the truth of the matter. The Indian agriculturist with his slovenly ways might and usually does waste a lot of seed, manure, bullock and his own labour, which the author might not have taken into consideration. The studies, however good from an academic point of view, do not reveal the truth of the matter—the actual cost of production of the cultivator. The tabulated statements and the graphs are useful and instructive.

N. S. S.

SHORT NOTICE.

FROM WRONG ANGLES. BY GAGANVIHARI MEHTA. (The Author, 70-A, Chakrabare Road, Calcutta.) 1934. 21cm. 181p. Re. 1-8-0.

JOURNALISTIC witticism is as agreeable a pastime to the "leg-puller" as vivisection is to the self-absorbed therapist. Controversial politics being no more nor less than "dagger-play," no by-stander can resist the temptation of sneering at the so-called unpopular

objects. Caught in the excitement of things, Mr. Mehta, for all his laboured gaiety of spirits, proves himself no better fitted to retain consistency of open mind than the gloomy members of his profession. For all that, the spirit behind the laughing-stock that he has released, is well-worth being made part of the psychology of the freelancers of India in particular, inasmuch as it is supposed that they do not laugh hysterically enough for all the world to see as the Press lords of the West do. There is, however, this caution to be observed in transforming the journalist into a clown, and that is that in the process, the asses' ears do not overpower his sanity or that there is not born in him a malicious desire to laugh with purpose to do injury. It is not all harmless fun that Mr. Mehta provokes at the expense of those who are, according to their lights, engaged in the thankless task of improving the political fortunes of India, for he betrays his partiality for the political acrobat and dislike of the indirect actionist. The poor Liberal somehow is the only person who under-

goes unmerited distortion at his hands, so much so that the men of other political colour either go scot-free or are tenderly ridiculed. One does not grudge him the peculiar pleasure he finds in caricaturing the miserable bureaucrat whose instinct it is to do what is odious rather than earn a good name. Easy as it is to prick pins into the official and Liberal, it deserves to be brought home to the Congressmen that they do not stand above being scoffed at. There is no make-up that does not yield to scratching and no political stunt that is not without its ludicrous aspect. The sword of denunciation is never so single-edged as the theatrical patriot imagines and, once handled, it cuts both ways. Considerations such as these require that Mr. Mehta must compel his pen to take the line of least resistance. On the whole, however, the book possesses an especial value never to be under-estimated, in that it awakens a new and necessary sense of humour in the journalist.

K. VENUGOPAL RAO.

J. P. C. SCHEME UNACCEPTABLE. THE BOMBAY LIBERALS' VIEW.

The following Statement issued by the Council of the Western India National Liberal Association embodies the judgment of the Bombay Liberals on the Joint Parliamentary Committee's report. The Statement says:—

THE Council of the Western India National Liberal Association, after a careful study of the Joint Parliamentary Committee's report, express their deep dissatisfaction at finding that the report, instead of removing the serious defects and shortcomings of the White Paper proposals, has introduced further very undesirable features which tend seriously to make the responsible self-government that it professes to construct for India almost entirely illusory.

GOVERNORS' POWERS WIDENED.

The special responsibility of the Governors in the provinces has been unduly widened, and the powers of the Ministry have been correspondingly curtailed, particularly with regard to the public services, law and order, and the police. The Governors have been clothed with wide legislative and financial powers. They can issue Ordinances and Governors' Acts and direct that any bill or clause before the legislature should not be proceeded with. They can prevent the introduction of any bill or make the Ministers withdraw any bill or any measure which they consider inconsistent with the discharge of their special responsibilities.

They are given the powers by proclamation to assume the administration wholly or partly at their discretion, and even to suspend the legislature. The Governor is empowered, at his discretion, to make rules regulating procedure and conduct of business about matters relating to his special responsibility, and such rules are to supersede rules made by the legislature that may be inconsistent with them. The salaries of Ministers are made non-votable.

GOVERNOR-GENERAL'S POWERS.

The powers of the Governor-General are similarly widened. He is to have legislative and financial powers on the same lines as those of the Governors. The salaries of the Federal Ministers are made non-votable. The Upper House at the Centre is given equal powers with the Lower House in all matters including money bills and demands for grants.

The Governors and the Governor-General are clothed with the special responsibility to protect not only the legal rights of the Services, but also what are called their legitimate and equitable treatment. No existing service rights, not excluding the maintenance of scheduled posts and cadres, can be touched, and the Secretary of State has the power to award compensation for loss of any existing rights or in any other case considered just and equitable by him. Any member of the Services is given the right of complaint to the Governor or to the Governor-General against any order affecting his conditions of service, and also the right of appeal against any order for censure or punishment. Even their posting to any particular place can be done by the Ministers, only with the concurrence of the Governor or of the Governor-General.

PRIVILEGES OF THE SERVICES.

All the special privileges which the White Paper conferred on the Indian Civil Service and on the All-India Police Service and the additional privilege given by this Report are extended also to the Provincial Services, and even the refusal of promotion to anyone belonging to these services is appealable to the Governor. The recruitment and the conditions of service even for future entrants to the Indian Civil Service and to the Police Service are matters to continue to rest with the Secretary of State. It will not be permissible to the Ministry and the Legislature to make any changes in the number of posts or the cadre.

The establishment of double chambers in Bombay and in Madras is a new feature in the report. Indirect election to the Lower House of the Federal Legislature has been for the first time recommended in the Joint Parliamentary report.

COMMERCIAL DISCRIMINATION.

The provisions as to commercial discrimination, legislative and administrative, are made very stringent. No measure can be passed which will subject British goods, directly or indirectly, to discriminatory treatment. Companies incorporated now or hereafter in Britain are exempted from any conditions imposed by any law in India relating to the place of incorporation, domicile or residence of the directors and shareholders; but, if any restrictions are impos-

ed on Indian companies in England, India is to have the liberty of imposing similar restrictions against English companies.

Still more stringent provisions are recommended for ships and shippings. It is not permissible to the Indian Legislature to impose such restrictions against any ships, passengers or cargo belonging to any British subjects domiciled in Great Britain as are not imposed in England against Indian ships. This condition regarding reciprocity is altogether meaningless and one-sided. There is no possibility of any Indian companies establishing industries in England competing with those established by British subjects there.

Nor is there any possibility of Indian ships operating in British waters and competing with British shipping. While British shipping, with its vast resources, is at present strangling the infant shipping industry of India, India is not to be allowed to reserve even her coastal shipping to her own nationals, as other countries do.

POWERS OVER TARIFF BILLS.

The Governor-General and the Governors are clothed with unfettered powers to withhold sanction, at their discretion, from measures including tariffs which, in their view, are discriminatory in effect, though not in form, and, in this respect, they are not restricted by the terms of the statutory provisions against discrimination. The prior consent of the Governor-General is required to any amendment of the Reserve Bank Act and to any legislation affecting currency and exchange. Similar sanction is also required for legislation affecting the constitution and powers of the Railway Authority.

The report recommends the introduction of a vital and far-reaching change in the constitution of the Indian High Courts. Ever since the Chartered High Courts came into existence, the post of the Chief Justice has, by law and practice, been confined to barristers. The report proposes to make the L. C. S. Judges eligible for the post of the Chief Justice. This change will very seriously affect the prestige and confidence enjoyed by the High Courts at present.

The provision in the present High Court Acts under which Civilians are appointed to the High Court Bench was passed at a time when no Indian Bar of the requisite quality was in existence. Nearly a hundred years have passed by since then, and there is a strong Bar in India, consisting of both Indians and Europeans. The time has, therefore, come for the recruitment of High Court Judges wholly from the Bar in India and in England. Instead of taking such a step, the report makes a highly reactionary recommendation in the contrary direction by proposing to make Civil Service Judges eligible for the post of the Chief Justice. The Services Sub-Committee of the first Round Table Conference expressed the opinion that recruitment for judicial offices should no longer be made in the Indian Civil Service.

APPOINTMENT OF GOVERNORS.

The Committee recommends the perpetuation of the present system under which members of the Indian Civil Service are appointed as Governors of Provinces. The system is entirely unsuited to the new constitution, for the successful working of which the Governors would require more political sagacity and experience than administrative experience and capacity. As under the new constitution, members of the Civil Service can ordinarily rise only to the post

of Secretaries at the Centre and in the Provinces, it would be highly anomalous to appoint such Secretaries as Governors, over the heads of the Cabinet Ministers. The Council is strongly of the opinion that in future all Governors should be drawn from men in public life in England and in India.

It is very disappointing that none of the suggestions of any importance made in the Joint Memorandum of the British Indian Delegation has been accepted by the Joint Parliamentary Committee. It is also highly regrettable that the proposals that the preamble of the Constitution Act should define Dominion Status as the objective has not been carried out. There is no satisfactory arrangement proposed for the Indianisation of the Army, and for Defence and Foreign Affairs passing under popular control within a reasonable period of time.

Unless the Parliamentary Select Committee's proposals are so modified as to eliminate the many undesirable features as well as the objections that were pointed out with regard to the White Paper proposals by the National Liberal Federation, the new constitution will not be acceptable to India, and will, instead of allaying, intensify the existing political discontent in the country.

CONGRESS AND JOINT COMMITTEE REPORT.

The following is the text of the resolution passed unanimously by the Working Committee of the Congress sitting with the Parliamentary Board:—

WHEREAS the Congress has after full and earnest consideration resolved that the scheme of the future Government of India adumbrated in the White Paper be rejected and that the only satisfactory alternative is a constitution drawn up by a constituent assembly and the said rejection and demand for a constituent assembly have been endorsed in a clear and unambiguous manner by the country at the recent general election to the Legislative Assembly;

And whereas the proposals made in the Joint Parliamentary Committee report are in several respects even worse than those contained in the White Paper and have been condemned by almost every shade of opinion in India as reactionary and unacceptable;

And whereas the Joint Parliamentary Committee scheme, designed as it is to facilitate and perpetuate the domination and exploitation of this country by an alien people under a costly mask, is fraught with greater mischief and danger than even the present constitution;

This Committee is of opinion that the said scheme should be rejected, well knowing that the rejection must involve the necessity of struggling under the present constitution, humiliating and intolerable as it is, until it is replaced by one framed by a constituent assembly, in accordance with the Congress resolution on the subject.

This Committee requests the members of the Assembly to reject the scheme of government sought to be thrust upon India in the name of reform and appeals to the nation to support the Congress in every step that it may decide upon to secure the national objective of *purna swaraj*.