

Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XVIII, No. 17. }

POONA—THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 1935.

{	INDIAN	Rs.6.
	FOREIGN	SUBSN. 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	217
ARTICLES :—	
Jubilee of the Fergusson College.	220
Sparks from the Commons' Anvil.	221
REVIEWS :—	
Miss Sorabji's Memories.—By the Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, P.O., C.H., LL.D.	227
Indian Currency and Banking.— By Prof. D. G. Karve.	227
Gopal Krishna Gokhale.— By R. Srinivasa Iyengar.	228
History of Mudhol.—By D. V. Kale.	228
A Ten-year Plan for India.— By S. P. Andrews Dube.	229
SHORT NOTICES	229
MISCELLANEA :—	
Adding Chain upon Chain.— Mr. Morgan Jones's Speech.	230
Dr. Macnicol's Speech on Gokhale Day... ..	231
Liberals and India Bill.	232
Hindu Mahasabha Resolutions	232
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
"The Opportunity Will Not Recur."— By S. Satyamurti, M.L.A.	232

Topics of the Week.

Drop the Bill.

LORD ZETLAND may again say that he can never believe Indian politicians who express a preference for the existing constitution over the new one which is being driven through Parliament. This must not, however, deter Indian politicians from repeating at every available opportunity what they genuinely feel, viz. that if Britain cannot or will not make a good constitution she might at least refrain from forcing upon them a constitution which is universally detested and execrated in India.

It was very opportune for the Liberal Party in India and the Hindu Mahasabha to pass resolutions urging His Majesty's Government to drop the India Bill (these resolutions are quoted *in extenso* on the last page) at a time when the Committee stage of the Bill is practically over and members of the House of Commons may get a moment or two to look upon their handi-work and the reactions it has produced in India. There is no possibility, of course, of the Government halting the Bill; they will surely rail-

road it through Parliament. But it is the moral duty of the Indian politicians all the same, while there is yet time, to give an earnest warning to the British Government.

A new welcome indication of the unacceptability of the Bill even to the States' rulers is to be had in the columns of *United India and Indian States* of the 20th inst. This paper more than any other may be taken to voice the feelings of the Princes in general, and the paper says, in a paragraph significantly headed "This be Responsible Government!" as follows:

India has no reason to feel reassured by the progress made by the new Constitution Bill as the new Federal Constitution which emerges out of the provisions is a Frankenstein which differs from the monster in Mrs. Shelly's imagination in that it can do no harm outside India. It can neither do much good to India seeing that the element of responsibility supposed to be left to Indians in the centre is almost homeopathic in the strength or the quality of the dose prescribed in the Act.

If we remember that the Princes have been stipulating from the first that they will join a federation only if the federal government so created will be endowed with a large if not a full measure of responsibility, one may yet hope, from the expression of opinion about the kind of responsibility the Bill actually offers in their own organ, that the Princes may eventually reject the federal scheme.

This impression is further strengthened by the warm and enthusiastic support which the paper gives to Lord Hugh Cecil's proposal to refer the Bill to the Princes' Chamber and the elected members of the Legislative Assembly and to proceed with it only if these bodies vote for the Bill. If they don't want it, then surely it is not an India Bill, but, as Mr. Churchill called it, the Chelsea Hospital Relief (No. 2) Bill. *United India and Indian States* specifically refer to this description and says that it is apt. The paper further says, "Both the British reactionaries and all Indian politicians except half a dozen in the whole of India want the present Bill to be dropped. British Labour also does not want it. The Princes will wait till the Bill is passed to say whether they want it. The only persons who will get it whether they want it or not are the British Indian politicians." Mark the words. "All Indian politicians except half a dozen in the whole of India want the present Bill to be dropped;" and yet it will be forced upon them.

We do not expect what *United India* calls "a sensible proposal" of Lord Hugh Cecil being at all entertained in England. The solid mass of British

Indian opinion will be contemptuously ignored. In these circumstances the Princes hold the trump card, assuming that they can stand up to the British Government, who will undoubtedly exert the immense pressure that it is within their power to exert in favour of federation. They can save not only themselves but British India from the impending disaster.

* * *

Finance Bill in Upper House.

THE consideration of the Finance Bill by the Council of State, which was over last week, was hardly marked by any surprises. As expected, the measure did not fail to secure the support of a majority of members though it is significant that a majority of elected members even of that avowedly less popular part of the Central legislature cast their votes against it. From the speeches delivered in the course of the debate it appears that the feeling that the Government was needlessly defiant of public opinion was shared, by all sections of non-official opinion, even the European group not excepted. While the advantages of a balanced budget on India's credit are obvious, it was generally felt that the Government was going to absurd lengths in order to secure that end. The position of the European group was even more unassailable. It was its contention that even without disturbing the budgetary position it was quite possible for Government to meet public opinion at least half way. But the pleadings of such undoubted friends had no effect on Government who were able to secure the passage of the certified bill in an un-amended form.

* * *

WE hope we are not giving the impression that attempts made to improve the bill in the direction desired by public opinion by proposing amendments to it were uniformly unsuccessful. This was not so. The fact really was that no amendments were moved, not because nobody wished to put himself to the trouble of bringing forward amendments which, in view of the composition of the Council, were bound to be defeated, but because it was made clear by Government beforehand that they would have none of them! The President also indirectly contributed to the result by his ruling that even were any amendments carried, the Governor-General, even with the best will in the world would, find himself powerless to give effect to any of them. The President's view was that the Governor-General was debarred by the present Act from accepting any changes in a certificated measure even if his own inclinations lay the other way. To what extent the two factors jointly or severally helped to discourage non-officials from moving amendments to the Bill it is not for us to judge. The fact to be noted is that after the speeches on the motion for the consideration of the Finance Bill, the Bill did not take more than a few minutes to go through all its stages in order to await the Governor-General's assent. As pointed out by the *Statesman*, Sir James Grigg's handling of his first budget has achieved the very undesirable result of alienating all sections of opinion.

* * *

Exasperatingly Inadequate.

THE fact that the entire demand of Rs. 431,000 for the Army department was thrown out by the Assembly has not so far been prominently noted. It goes without saying that the Assembly took this extreme step in order to bring home to Government the strength of public resentment at their utterly

illiberal military policy, which was defended by the Army Secretary in a long speech. This is important as throwing a flood of light on the intentions of Government. In the first place, he made it clear that the process of Indianisation in operation for some years now is by no means part of an Indianisation policy finally decided upon. It was only an experiment upon whose results would depend the decision of the question whether Indianisation was to be carried to its logical conclusion or to stop short in the middle. Indian opinion habitually appeals to the valour shown by Indian soldiers in the last war and flatters itself that Indianisation need not be delayed for want of suitable material. The Army Secretary pointed out that, though the gallantry of Indian troops during the last war was undoubted, it did not follow as a necessary corollary that Indians as military officers would be able to make good. Even if they are able to lead small bodies of troops in peace time, as they doubtless are at present, it cannot therefore be assumed, in his opinion, that they would acquit themselves equally well during war.

* * *

BUT really the question of testing their fitness as military commanders does not yet arise. As the Commander-in-Chief said in one of his speeches in the Council of State, the earliest when this could be done would be in 1938. As a matter of fact even that test would be premature and unsatisfactory. According to military regulations, no officer can qualify for the post of commander till he has served for at least twenty-one years as an army officer. If this rule is enforced, the time for applying the test in the case of the products of the Indian Sandhurst founded in 1931 would arrive, not in 1938 but in 1950! And if the League of Nations succeeds in preventing a war till then, it is doubtful if such tests as would be applied in the absence of a war could be regarded as completely satisfactory. With the League of Nations vigorously at work, our hope must apparently be centred in the Frontier tribesmen providing the desiderated opportunity for testing the commanding qualities of Indian officers.

* * *

AS a means of facilitating complete Indianisation within the shortest possible time, public opinion insistently demands the immediate stoppage of British recruitment. But the Army Secretary blandly informed the Assembly that complete Indianisation has never been the aim of the Government. "Our policy" he said, "is not, never was, and never could have been, intended to Indianise the whole of the Indian Army, either completely or partially; and I do submit that it is unfair that it should be criticised as if that was its intention." "The object of our policy" he added, "is to Indianise a very definite portion of the Indian Army in a very definite time." Need it be stated that the Government policy as outlined here is exasperatingly inadequate to the requirements of the situation? No wonder that to such a statement by the Army Secretary the Assembly's only reply could be a total refusal of supplies for the Army department.

* * *

A Welcome Settlement.

THE financial cloud which overhung the fortunes of the Indian Women's University with which Prof. Karve's name will ever remain indissolubly linked up as its founder has fortunately lifted. And the university authorities are to be heartily felicitated upon the amicable settlement of the differences that arose between them and the executors

of the estate of their benefactor, the late Sir Vithaldas Thackersey. As our readers are aware, it was the arbitrary action of the executors in withholding payment in 1932 of the yearly grant of Rs. 52,500 representing the interest on the amount of the benefaction of Rs. 15 lakhs that gave rise to the estrangement of feeling between the parties. All attempts on the part of the authorities of the University to arrive at a settlement out of court having failed, they were eventually forced to resort to legal proceedings. Thanks to the spirit of compromise of which the executors of Sir Vithaldas Thackersey's estate gave proof at this stage, an agreed arrangement was rendered possible.

* * *

This no longer leaves the payment of the yearly grant to the caprices and whims of individual managers of the estate. In virtue of the settlement, they are specifically required to purchase, within a period of seven years, Government promissory notes of the face value of Rs. 15 lakhs and hold them as trustees for the University. The compromise arrangement reaffirms the donor's intention to hand over this amount to the University when it either secures Government recognition or is able to collect an equal amount. Till either of these conditions is fulfilled, the University is bound to get from the executors the grant of Rs. 52,500 every year in quarterly instalments.

* * *

The University for its part is required, among other things, to see to the early revision of its curriculum at the hands of a committee of expert educationists with a view to making it subserve modern requirements. We cannot believe that, given freedom from financial anxiety, the University authorities would not of themselves have done this sooner or later. And there is nothing in this which can be said to have even the distant appearance of its being forced on an unwilling party. Whatever view is taken of the settlement by the parties immediately affected by it, the public will welcome it as ensuring the uninterrupted continuance of the valuable work of the University unhampered by formidable financial obstacles.

* * *

A New Literacy Plan.

MR. FRANK C. LAUBACH, Secretary, World Literacy Movement, is at present in India, studying the educational problem at close quarters. The literacy campaign which he has devised seems to have been put into force in the Philippines where in five years the level of literacy is said to have risen by 50 per cent. He claims that if the plan meets with an equal measure of success in India it would be possible to banish illiteracy from this land in a period of twenty years. In a recent press interview he explained the plan which in brief was to make a teacher of every student taught so that the campaign might proceed by geometrical progression. By way of amplification he added:

There would be only one student for each teacher. The teacher would begin by saying: "I have selected you because I want to make a teacher of you, and expect you to teach your community. So, learn this little lesson well. You will have to teach it to another man immediately." In 15 minutes, the first short lesson in which the student learns about five syllables is over. Then he teaches another illiterate under the supervision of the teacher. He is then asked to teach as many illiterates as he can that day. Meanwhile, the teacher repeats the same procedure with another student. Thus, in the course of

seven or eight days, a teacher can develop ten or more new teachers, each of whom prepares other teachers, so that an entire community is educated in a surprisingly short period of time. That was precisely what he had frequently seen happen. 99 per cent of the work has thus been done by the students themselves.

Other features of the plan were the use of a primer consisting of only eight pages, which cost only two pice, so that the poorest could purchase it. The method of teaching was so simple that even an ignorant person could be made to adopt it. After learning only eight lessons, the reading of very simple matter could be taken up. Learning was made a happy game. The student found himself learning easily and rapidly and would go about telling others about it, and urging them to learn what he himself had learnt. There were many points in favour of making teachers of illiterates. The spirit of service would be kindled in them. The system would break the inferiority complex with which all illiterates were afflicted.

* * *

Baroda in 1933-34

THE Baroda administration report for 1933-34 is an interesting record of the activities of the different State departments in that year. And so far as can be seen, it may also be admitted that in most of them some progress has been registered. Two or three very desirable pieces of social legislation are either on the legislative anvil or have been placed on the statute book. The newly started rural uplift centre too may be said to have justified its existence by its work for the uplift of the villagers. And an increase, though not very considerable, is also noticeable in the number of students in educational institutions. It is gratifying to note that nearly three-fourths of the total school age population is already at school and that special efforts are being made to promote education amongst the backward and depressed classes. All this is good, so far as it goes.

* * *

THESE are results for which due praise cannot fairly be withheld from the State. But the subjects of the State have not achieved any measure of political progress during the period covered by the report. The Baroda legislature has undergone no alteration by way of a democratisation of its constitution, while local bodies continue to be officialised bodies, which is wholly out of tune with the spirit of the time.

* * *

THE Maharaja's unwillingness to give the people of the State a greater voice in the management of their own affairs might perhaps have had some show of justification if the State had been educationally backward. But in educational matters Baroda claims to be one of the most go-ahead States so that the excuse of the backwardness and ignorance of the people, commonly advanced by those who should, but do not wish to, part with their power, cannot avail in the case of Baroda. If the status quo is sought to be justified, as sometimes happens, by the lack of a public demand for a political advance, the argument cannot bear a moment's examination. If the education imparted to Baroda subjects all these years has failed to whet their political hunger, it must be said to have failed of its purpose. Is this failure admitted by the Baroda administration? If so, urgent and radical action is needed to overhaul the system of education in the State. Since this is not thought of, one is forced to the conclusion that it is not the incapacity of the people but the unwillingness of the Maharaja that is the real deciding factor.

* * *

Articles

JUBILEE OF THE FERGUSSON COLLEGE.

FERGUSSON COLLEGE and the Deccan Education Society, which conducts one Arts College and four High Schools besides this well-known institution, were the recipients of many warm congratulations upon their having completed fifty years of a useful and prosperous career. The Jubilee celebrations that were held on the 20th and 21st instant in Poona were marked by an enthusiasm and success which were remarkable even for such an occasion. The programme started with a ceremony which combined the graceful function of commemoration with the more practical one of a reaffirmation of faith. It is well-known that the late Mr. Gokhale was the moving spirit and the controlling influence in the affairs of the D. E. Society during the most critical stages of its early life. The stability, tradition and good name that the Society now enjoys are in great measure due to the wholehearted service that Mr. Gokhale rendered while he was a Life-Member. It was Mr. Gokhale's experience as an educational missionary that strengthened his faith in a social and political mission conducted on similar lines.

The vows of the Servants of India Society were taken by Gokhale and were then administered to the three other foundation members on 12th June, 1905. This solemn and fateful ritual took place on a spot of ground which is within the grounds of the Fergusson College. We do not know what exactly determined the choice of the spot in the mind of Gokhale. The imposing presence of nature's elements on the top of a hillock in the early hours of a summer morning must indeed have weighed with the imaginative and earnest mind of Gokhale. But it is not improbable that the feeling of diffidence about the prospects of a secular mission in the as yet strange field of political and social work received a counteracting measure of assurance from the success that had attended the similarly inspired activities of the Fergusson College in the educational field. The principle of dedicating one's life on the basis of self-sacrifice to a secular cause was first prominently avowed and successfully practised by the Fergusson College. In other spheres and wider areas this principle has since brought about a striking transformation in the outlook and life of the Indian people. It was, therefore, a happy thought to commemorate the first administration of the vows of the Servants of India Society by erecting a small yet beautiful commemoration stone on the solemn spot. The Right Hon'ble Srinivasa Sastri acted with great propriety and success the part of 'a learned priest' on the occasion. Incidentally the ceremony helped to remind the present generation of workers in both Societies of the high idealism of their respective roles.

In a sense this commemoration ceremony was outside the principal programme of the Jubilee which

commenced with the meeting of the General Body of the past students of the institutions of the D. E. Society. It is calculated that the number of students who at one time or another have passed through the institutions of the Society comes to about 70,000. Such a large number of educated young men and young women spread over the Deccan must have influenced the course of the country's evolution to a great extent. In different walks these have contributed their mite towards an all-round improvement of the nation. The large number of past students present on the occasion and the enthusiastic loyalty that they evinced were indicative of their continued appreciation of the role played by their *alma mater* in shaping their lives. The past students decided to present an address and purse to the Society and also resolved to form themselves into a central association of the Society's past students. The address was worded in terms of gratitude, appreciation and helpful suggestion. This was presented along with a purse to the Chairman of the Governing Body of the Society at the hands of Sir C. V. Raman who was the guest of honour at the central Jubilee function held the next morning.

A very imposing pandal had been erected on the big playing field to accommodate nearly five thousand guests. Every available inch of ground was, however, filled long before the arrival of Sir C. V. Raman and other distinguished guests. The strength of the audience and its composition left no doubt in the minds of an observer of the feeling of appreciation for the Society's work that pervades among all classes of the people and in all parts of the Deccan. The announcement that promises of financial assistance to the extent of nearly one lakh of rupees have been received from friends and supporters speaks for the assured place of the Society in the friendly estimation of all classes of people in the Deccan. Messages of congratulations flowed in in large numbers. Not only did they come from all quarters, official and non-official, Hindu, Muhammadan and Parsee, extremist and moderate, princes and commoners, but they were couched in most sincere and informal terms. Sir Chandrasekhara Venkata Raman, who is in the very first rank of the world's greatest scientists, was fittingly asked to be the principal speaker at the celebration of the Jubilee of what is on all hands admitted to be India's premier non-official educational institution. Sir Chandrasekhara spoke in enthusiastic and realistic terms about the past work and the present responsibilities of the Society. In fact what he said on that occasion has a much wider appeal than for the immediate audience who heard him.

Rightly did Sir Chandrasekhara point out that the Fergusson College first proved to the salary-mad Indian mind of half a century ago that a man's worth does not depend on the salary that he gets but is measured by the service he renders to the community. The dedication by men like Gokhale and Paranjpye of the best portion of their lives to the cause of private teaching has not only raised the position of workers in similar organisations, but it

has positively helped to alter our views about the scales of public payments. The unanimity with which Indian public men and social reformers are demanding a scaling down of the cost of public administration is a tribute to the faith and sacrifice of the early founders of the D. E. Society.

Sir Chandrasekhara did not allow his sense of realism to be clouded by his feeling of appreciation for the past record and the present usefulness of the Fergusson College and other institutions of the D. E. Society. The prevailing feeling of dissatisfaction with a predominantly literary as opposed to a scientific and technical education was prominently voiced by Sir Chandrasekhara Raman. We trust educationists in all parts of the country will profit by the strong current of opinion in this matter. We might suggest, however, that the opposition between scientific and literary education is not so real as it appears. The real opposition is, as Sir Chandrasekhara hinted, between a scientific and a mercenary approach to the subject of study. If acquisition of knowledge and discovery of truth are not our objects a so-called science course will not be any more scientific or valuable than a literary course. On the other hand, it is wrong to deny academic and practical value to a methodical study of several so-called literary subjects. The completion of a full half-century of a regime of cheapening and facilitating education must indeed remind us all that the time is overdue for a deliberate movement towards a more efficient and variegated system of instruction. By its own efforts as also by cooperating with similar institutions in this part of the country the Deccan Education Society should play a conscious and deliberate part in bringing about such an orientation.

All will agree in the view of Sir Chandra-

sekhar that the example of teachers in a college like the Fergusson College has gone a long way in shaping the character of students. By a greater elaboration of the corporate life of our educational institutions and by a lessening of the spoon-feeding mechanisation that too often prevails in them a deliberate and concerted effort must be made to produce the desired moral and intellectual effect on the student's minds. Institutions like the Fergusson College which are staffed to a large extent by persons who have deliberately chosen a career of service and sacrifice in the cause of national education are the best fitted to undertake further improvements in this direction. The red herring of educated unemployment is being constantly drawn across the path of educationists and public men. In all conscience the educational system cannot be held to be primarily responsible for the evil of unemployment, nor will the adoption of all the reforms suggested by educational critics solve the problem for good. But a further specialisation and diversification of courses, as also a greater improvement in educational methods will reduce the extent of the evil and will, at any rate, make the increasing number of our graduates better fitted to fight their way through the difficulties of a modern life.

The Deccan Education Society and the Fergusson College have in the past rendered signal service in the cause of Indian national renaissance. May we not hope with assurance that in the more arduous and difficult task of reformation that lies ahead the Society and the College will play an equally distinguished part? We offer our warm fraternal greetings to the Fergusson College on this auspicious occasion and wish it many happy returns.

SPARKS FROM THE COMMONS' ANVIL.

5th, 8th, 9th, 10th and 11th April.

THE Indian demand for the recognition and protection of fundamental rights of citizenship has practically been ignored in the Bill. But the rights of property are very carefully safeguarded. The Joint Select Committee made elaborate recommendations for implementing the principle that no property can be taken except upon compensation being paid. In embodying the principle into legislative provisions, however, it was discovered by the law officers of the Crown that all the recommendations could not be given effect to without imposing too severe and unjust restrictions upon the legislature, and the Bill thus falls short of the Committee's Report in one or two respects. The die-hard members attacked the Government for these shortcomings.

First, the Committee proposed that safeguards should be proposed for all kinds of property, both real and personal. Clause 280, however, applies only to real property, i. e. "immovable property of every kind and any rights in or over such property." Personal property, "which would include stocks and shares, securities and movables," is excluded. The

Attorney-General explained that it would be absurd to safeguard personal property *simpliciter*, for it would involve making it illegal even to tax people. He promised, however, to consider putting in after "land" in Sub-section (2) some such words as "or any industrial or commercial undertaking." "That will have the effect," he said, "of making it illegal to take the whole undertaking of a person by way of compensation."

Another objection was that the Clause gives protection against the expropriation of land if it is the property of "private persons," and that no protection is afforded against the expropriation of the property of bodies or companies. On this point complete satisfaction has been promised. The Attorney-General promised to insert words like "incorporated companies" to make it plain that "legal persons are intended as well as natural persons." The third objection taken was that there is no protection in the Clause against compulsory acquisition of property except "for public purposes." On this point Government expressed its inability to meet the critics. For

the omission of the words "for public purposes" would involve payment of compensation even if property were taken in satisfaction of a judgment in an action between two individuals.

Still another objection was that the Clause does not provide, as the Joint Select Committee recommended, for the assessment of compensation by an independent authority. The Attorney-General pointed out that such a provision would make it impossible to enact, say, tenancy legislation where it is not the custom to fix compensation by a tribunal. He, however, promised relief in another way. "I am prepared to undertake," he said, "that there shall be inserted in the Instrument of Instructions a provision that bills of an expropriatory character which the Governor-General or the Governor does not feel justified forthwith in disallowing on grounds of inequity should be reserved for the signification of His Majesty's pleasure." Thus, confiscatory measures would either be vetoed or reserved. To do more would be "to place fetters upon the Indian legislatures beyond what is reasonably necessary to prevent confiscation without compensation."

The Labour Party agreed with the main principle of not taking anybody's property "save by authority of law," but objected to sub-Section (3) requiring the Governor-General's or the Governor's previous sanction to such a law. As Mr. Gordon MacDonald said, "this is simply putting the Governor-General (or the Governor) in the position of a dictator." This matter, he said, "ought to be left to the Legislatures." The Solicitor-General then used some mollifying words. He said:

The Clause is not inserted because we distrust the new Indian Legislatures, the safeguards are not put in from motives of distrust, but in order to prevent apprehension, possibly ill-founded, in certain minds as to the effects of this great change. We believe that ordinary principles of law will be observed, but we have put these safeguards in the Bill to prevent apprehensions and misgivings arising which themselves may do great harm to the new constitution.

But, of course, the Government did not yield at all on the main issue, to the Labour Party; on the other hand they made further surrender to the Tories, as is clear from the above paragraphs.

SEPARATION OF BURMA.

IN the Committee of the House of Commons Major Milner put the case against Burma's separation very well. The case for separation is based mainly on the difference in religion, race and language between the Burmese and Indians. But Major Milner's contention was that this was not a sufficient reason for separation. "There is no more difference," he said, "between the Burmese and the Indian people than there is between certain different races in India itself. For example, there is no more difference between the Burmese and the Madrasi than is between the Madrasi and the tribes on the North-West Frontier. Similarly there is as great a difference in religions in India itself as there is a difference between the religions of Burma and the religions of India; and the same applies to languages also." The same about the distance. If one compares the distance

between Delhi and Rangoon with the distance between Delhi and Travancore, the latter distance will be the greater." While separation is unnecessary (Major Milner argued), it is distinctly undesirable. As a member of the Indian Empire, Burma like other provinces can be and is represented at the League of Nations. But if she separates herself from India, her status will be reduced. "She will be a mere colony of the British Empire, and will only be entitled to be represented through the British delegation." Similarly, in internal politics also, "the only hope of the Burmese people is to identify themselves with the struggle of India towards that goal which inspires the people of both countries."

He also narrated several facts which go to show that Burmese opinion is against separation. In the election held specifically on this issue as many as 500,000 voters cast their votes against separation and 270,000 for separation; thus Burma's decision was two to one in favour of continuing her association with India. On this point Sir Samuel Hoare was not quite honest in his argument. He tried to make out that there was no breach of pledge involved in imposing separation upon Burma in spite of this vote. He seemed to argue that the Prime Minister's pledge only was to take the decision *after* the election, not necessarily *in accordance with* the result of the decision. In quoting Mr. MacDonald's words he was very selective. He quoted this sentence: "The decision might be taken after a general election at which the broad issue had been placed before the electorate." He omitted other sentences which put a different complexion on the nature of the pledge. Major Milner quoted them. They were: "The first step is to ascertain whether the people of Burma endorse the provisional decision that separation should take place. That decision will determine whether, on the one hand, Burma should be independent of India or, on the other hand, should remain a Province of India." The decision of the Burmese people was to determine the question. The British Government has now upset the question thus determined. Is there no breach of pledge in this? Major Milner also pointed out how, contrary to past practice, the official members were ordered to vote for separation in the Burma Legislative Council on 21st February this year, and a non-official majority (37 to 31) was converted into an official majority (47 to 37) in order to cover up the breach of pledge.

But His Majesty's Government has now discovered that, promise or no promise, desired or undesired, separation must be effected. Sir Samuel Hoare said:

Suppose there were no separation, it would be almost impossible to fit Burma into the Indian polity. There you have a country, as we have heard in the very interesting speech from my hon. Friend the Member for the English Universities (Sir R. Craddock) and a former Governor of Burma, differing socially, economically and historically as well as from the points of view of religion and economic outlook, from India; a country so far distant and so definitely remote geographically that a sea voyage of between 700 and 800 miles is needed to get from Rangoon to Calcutta. It takes something like a week for Burman representatives on the Indian Assem-

bly to get to that Assembly to attend its deliberations. It is sufficient to state those facts to show to the Committee how impossible it is to fit into a permanent Indian Federation a country that differs in every respect from India and is geographically so remote.

If Burma cannot possibly form a unit of federation even if the Burmese intensely desire it, why was the question referred to them at all and why was the pretence made of consulting them? The Government should have said, "Whatever the wishes of the people of Burma may be, it is impossible to include her in the Indian federation. We have had to take many decisions against Indian opinion because they are wise. We will not follow Burmese opinion on this question if it goes against separation, because separation is not merely a wise decision, but the only possible decision". But apparently they have only recently discovered the inevitability of separation as they discovered very late the inevitability of federation in India. They discussed the desirability of federation for a long time, and were themselves opposed to it, and now they have reached the final opinion not that federation is good, but it is indispensably necessary. So it is in the case of Burma in the matter of separation.

EXCHANGE COMPENSATION.

AN amendment was proposed in Committee by Mr. Reed to the effect that if the rupee should fall in value below 1s. 6d., civil servants should be given proportionate compensation. Mr. Amery pointed out that it would be fair to compensate such servants only in respect of any sums that they might transfer from India to England, but not in respect of the whole amount of their salary. In discussing this question a good deal of opinion was expressed in favour of the depreciation of the rupee, and how the civil servants had benefited from the rise in its sterling value. Sir John Wardlaw-Milne, for instance, said: "Let us be honest. They have benefited a good deal from the rise of the rupee from 1s. 4d. to 1s. 6d., and I am one of those who do not shut my eyes to the fact that India might benefit considerably by a reduction of the rupee to 1s. 4d. I do not want to give a definite opinion, but there is a good deal to be said on both sides of the question. The extent to which the ryot may be suffering from the 1s. 6d. rupee would have to be taken into consideration." Mr. David Mason, who takes a deep interest in currency questions, was against giving "a more or less stereotyped guarantee" such as the amendment sought to give, and Col. Wedgwood, who is as violently in favour of devaluation as Mr. Mason is against it, opposed the amendment on principle. He said:

If there is ground for compensation in India, there is just as much ground for increasing salaries here, including that of the right hon. Gentleman, by 50 per cent. at the present time. It would be an entirely new precedent in legislation if we had a Clause to this effect put in any Bill. It would mean that future Governments would be shackled always by the liability to pay enormous compensation, because there is no reason why this should be limited to civil servants; it might extend to all the railway workers and, indeed, to everybody else in the country. That is one great danger of putting into this Bill anything in the shape of statutory compensation for these cases.

It would then be impossible for any revaluation of the rupee to take place. I am not quite certain what the Secretary of State thinks on this question of revaluation in the future. There would be the question of guaranteeing the Council of India Bills, and that would be increasingly impracticable for the British Government if the Indian Government were compelled to take the rupee at 1s. 6d. By such a change in the law as is proposed we should be preventing an economic change which may be necessary and desirable from the point of view of the Indian exchange.

The Under-Secretary has promised to talk the matter over with those interested in the question.

ABOLITION OF POSTS.

CLAUSE 247 provides that no civil posts of a certain grade can be abolished if the abolition thereof would adversely affect any member of the services—except by the Governor-General or Governor acting in his individual judgment. Mr. Morgan Jones pointed out that "to lay down a hard and fast rule such as this in the terms of an Act of Parliament is a little hard and does unduly hamper the future Indian Ministry." Sir Samuel Hoare's only defence was that the Clause applied to subordinate services concerning mainly Indian officials, and that "it was felt, quite rightly, that in a case of existing officials they ought to be guaranteed from their careers being disadvantaged in the same way as we guarantee officials in the other services... Just as in the case of the other services, where we are keeping control over the abolition of existing posts, so we feel that in these somewhat subordinate services we ought to keep similar control over existing officials. This does not tie the Government from making new arrangements for the future, but it does safeguard the position of existing officials in accordance with what they regard as their contract of service. This is the procedure we have adopted for the Secretary of State's services, and I think it is necessary to adopt it also for these subordinate services."

Higher officials being given a certain privilege, lower officials also must be given the same. This in short is the argument. But how can one say then that it does not tie the Government of the future? Mr. Cocks gave a good answer on this point. He said:

It means that if a reorganisation of services were desired on grounds of economy or because there was a superfluity of posts he could prevent it as long as there was somebody in that service who might expect in 30 or 40 years' time to occupy one of those posts. I do not know where that principle comes from. Surely it is not a principle known to this country. If it were, it would mean that the Board of Admiralty, for instance, would not be able to cut down the number of admirals as it sometimes does because there was a midshipman in the Navy who might rise to that position in a certain number of years' time. Nobody would ever think of compensating the midshipman in such a case for loss of his prospective advancement. We know very well that if services are reorganised there are some who will get disappointment. That is one of the disappointments to which all human beings are liable in this very uncertain, changeable, and disappointing world, but people have to put up with it. If the Ministers think that certain posts should be abolished, I think the Government should accept their opinion. I am not saying that people should not be compensated, but I am saying that reorganisation should not be prevented on those very wide grounds.

Sir Samuel Hosre's defence was: "It always has been, or at least it has been for many years, a principle of Indian government. I suppose it came about as a result of the big changes that have taken place." It may have been a principle of Indian government of the old days, but is it to continue even when self-government is supposed to come into operation? Is it necessary to "hamstring," as Mr. Morgan Jones said, a Swaraj Government too?

DOMINION STATUS.

THE omission of reference to Dominion Status from the Bill is a matter which is now beyond the power of His Majesty's Government to remedy even if they had the will to do so. They decided, at first, to have no Preamble to the Bill. The reason for this decision has not yet been given. The Attorney-General said in Committee, "The present Bill was introduced without a Preamble for reasons which I need not discuss." Having thus introduced the Bill, the Chairman of the Committee ruled that even the Government could not add a Preamble later. For failure to rectify the omission they will thus claim to be exonerated. In the debate that took place the general feeling appeared to be that the addition of a Preamble would not make any material difference, but it would produce very favourable psychological reactions upon Indian opinion, and it would be very desirable to secure this result. Col. Wedgwood, however, holding that the Bill, if passed, would establish a constitution which would be exceedingly difficult to amend later, even opposed the addition of a Preamble, which would give a false impression that the Bill constituted a first step to be followed by subsequent steps leading ultimately to a certain result. He said:

The reason why there is no Preamble to the Bill is obvious. It would be a contradiction of fact if there were a statement in a Preamble to the Bill saying that the Bill was one stage in the direction either of dominion home rule or of home rule of any sort. The Bill is final. The Government know that it is final, and the draftsmen of the Bill know that it would be a lie to put in a Preamble that this was only one stage further in the association of Indians with responsible rule. The Bill that we are now—

The Chairman: The possibility of a Preamble to the Bill is a Second Reading matter. It follows with regard to the Bill as a whole that discussion of that point is outside what I have ruled to be in order.

Col. Wedgwood: I will pass over the question of the impossibility of a Preamble to this Bill, as that is out of order. The question is whether we are doing anything to make good that statement. If we had put in the Amendment that is out of order, calling the Bill "Dominion of India Self-Government Bill", would that have made any appreciable difference in the actual facts of the situation? The facts of the situation are that we are taking the final step so far as India is concerned, and, therefore, it is useless to talk about a series.

He concluded: "From my point of view, and I must say from the point of view of common sense, what difference does it make if there is or is not a Preamble expressing a pious hope for the future when what is being done in the Bill is the final stage, which cannot be altered in any circumstances?"

PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY ALONE?

THE Government added a new Sub-section empowering His Majesty in Council to fix different dates for the commencement of the whole or portions of the Act from those fixed in the Act. This raised the question incidentally whether the Government would bring provincial autonomy into operation first and federation long afterwards. Mr. Morgan Jones raised the question, and in doing so, he made it clear for the tenth time that his faith in federation was melting away, and that he would not care very much in the present circumstances for the federal part of the Bill in particular. He said:

The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Butler) will know that the question of the date of the coming into operation of this Bill is very present in the minds of the Indian people. They are very anxious about it and always have been, and I can only express the hope that the Government in taking this power—and I understand why they are seeking to secure this power—will not in any way postpone unnecessarily the date of the coming into operation of the Bill, certainly as far as the Provinces are concerned. I put in that proviso, because I am losing my faith in the other part of the Bill with regard to Federation. Whatever my own views may be about this, I am sure that the Indian people will be extremely disappointed if there is a long hiatus between the final discussions on the Bill and the coming into operation of its provisions.

FEDERATION WEAKENS PARAMOUNTCY.

COL. WEDGWOOD took an opportunity, on a new Clause, of saying how under federation the power of the British Government to exercise paramountcy would be reduced very much in fact, though in theory paramountcy would be maintained intact. The new Clause allows a Federated State to become as it were unfederated in respect of water rights. The Bill sets up an *ad hoc* tribunal for adjudicating in disputes about water rights, and a Federated State is allowed, by the new Clause, not to put itself under the tribunal if it so chooses, in which case the control of the Paramount Power would come into play. The Attorney-General was at great pains to explain that, while the new Clause would help the States, it would not injure British India, for, in the case of the States not accepting the jurisdiction of the tribunal, *status quo ante* would be maintained. Col. Wedgwood argued that this hope was not well founded. He said:

I do not think it is quite fair to say that under the paramountcy the relationship between the Paramount Power and the Princes who contract out of this particular business will be the same in the future as it has been in the past. After all, the Prince who has not acceded, and who has control over the water supply, will still be sitting in Delhi, and his vote will be ten times more important than was the case in previous times. The relationship between the Paramount Power and the Princes is radically and fundamentally changed by the fact that the Princes are sitting at Delhi and the Government depend upon their votes. If a man is in a position to say, "I have not put this into the pool, and I can still bargain with this counter—I can still use it against the Government"—the Government will be ten times more anxious to meet him than they will be to meet his neighbours who have gone in. It is really putting a premium on staying out. I am afraid that the Secretary of State and the Attorney-General will find that the position of the Paramount Power in India, once Federation is approved, will be very different from what it has been in the past.

THEN STATES WILL HAVE TO RECIPROCATE !

CLAUSE 279 provides that "no subject of His Majesty domiciled in India shall on grounds only of religion, place of birth, colour or any of them be ineligible for office under the Crown in British India" &c. The Duchess of Athol moved an amendment extending the benefit of the Clause to the people in the British Empire and the subjects of a Ruler of an India State. Col. Wedgwood supported the amendment heartily, particularly in the interest of the States' people. There should be no discrimination, he said, in any part of British India on the ground of race, religion and colour. Such a provision would be of great advantage "to the unfortunate subjects of the Indian States whom, by this Bill, we are putting perpetually into an anomalous position." The Solicitor-General said in reply: "We hope as heartily as he (Col. Wedgwood) that in this matter there will be no discrimination anywhere within the British Empire. One might extend one's aspirations and hope that there will be no discrimination within the civilised world." But he saw practical difficulties. If British India were to admit the States' people freely into her services, would not she expect her sons to be freely admitted into the services of the Indian States, and will the Princes agree to it? The Princes, we know, do not agree, and would it be fair to make British India do the generous thing by the people in the States? On this ground he refused to accept the amendment. He said:

If the Amendment were accepted, it would impose a statutory restriction on British India and leave rulers perfectly free to do, if they choose, the very opposite of what we would be preventing Indians from doing. Therefore, I am completely at one with the argument of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman in hoping that there will be nothing of the kind, and that British Indians will have every facility in all the States, and that the subjects of the States will have complete facilities in British India. Quite plainly it would not be right under this Bill to introduce a provision of this kind applying to one of the parties, and not restricting the other side.

THE SEX BAR.

MR. LANSBURY moved an amendment to Clause 279 making it illegal to introduce restrictions on the ground of sex. As the Clause leaves all offices and trades open to men of all religions, he wanted them to be open to both sexes. He made it clear that what he wanted was "not merely to remove any sex bar, but, if possible, to prevent one from being set up." "We do not see," he said, "why in the new constitution of India there should not be a safeguard, just as there are many other safeguards, securing that the sex disability shall not operate."

Sir Samuel Hoare raised many difficulties. In the first place the Government controls entry into the services but not into the trades and professions, and, in the second place, there would be necessary, in the interest of women themselves, some special restrictions as in mining. With regard to public offices too, all that he promised to do was "to put down a new Sub-section to the appropriate Service Clauses, making it clear that the Secretary of State can recruit women to the various services covered, in that part of the

Bill." But this is not what Mr. Lansbury had asked for. He did not want power to be given to the Secretary of State to appoint women; he rather wanted power to be withheld from the legislatures to deny offices to women *qua* women. But this was all that could be got out of the Government. On this question Miss Rathbone said:

You are setting up a very reactionary form of Federal Government. Suppose that government chooses to pass a law excluding women from the legal or medical professions. Unless there are some safeguards in the Bill, that sort of thing is not impossible. It may be very unlikely, but who five years ago would have thought that Germany would relapse into mediaeval barbarism? We have to safeguard women against such a strong reaction against western customs as would gravely imperil the slender protection they have now from their position in medicine and law. I will not enlarge upon the matter, but I compliment the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Samuel Hoare) and hope that he will bear that in mind, and as far as possible reduce to a minimum the possibility of putting restrictions upon women in Government services or in the trades and professions.

I could not follow him when he instanced the case of mining. I am afraid that it is only too easy to get round these fundamental Clauses. Merely to say that there is to be no bar on the ground of sex will not prevent discrimination against women on what may be called reasonable grounds which are not grounds of sex. If it could be proved, for instance, that if women entered into a certain profession it would be dangerous to the lives of women or the lives of others, it would not be necessary for the legislature to bar them on the ground of sex only. I think the possibility against discrimination should be reduced to a minimum.

MAKE MOOTING OF AMENDMENTS IMPOSSIBLE.

CLAUSE 285 provides machinery for the Indian Legislatures passing resolutions proposing amendments in regard to the franchise and forwarding them to the British Parliament. The Clause bristles with safeguards against overhasty amendment. First, the resolutions can be proposed only a certain number of years after the constitution comes into operation; then they must be proposed by Ministers; and they must be passed in both Chambers. Even when this is gone through, all that is guaranteed is that Parliament will take the resolutions into consideration within six months after they are received. Parliament, of course, can reject the resolutions every time they are received. But even this is too much for the die-hards. Sir Henry Page-Croft moved an amendment making it possible for the resolutions to be forwarded to Parliament only if they are passed "by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members of each Chamber." Their point was that "no change should be mooted with regard to the subject (of the communal award) or such questions as the constitution of a legislature without a decisive majority in each Chamber." If a two-thirds majority were fixed in nearly every Province there would have to be agreement between Hindus and Moslems.

The amendment served to bring out the fact prominently as to how slight is the power which the Clause confers upon the Indian people. For, in rejecting the amendment, Sir Samuel Hoare said:

It is provided that, after a specified period, an Indian Legislature should have a formal procedure under which its resolutions on the points set out in the Clause would have to be taken into account by the Imperial Parliament. Parliament is not tied in any way. All that would happen would be that resolutions sent to the Secretary of State under the procedure set out in the Clause would be taken into account. I attach importance to the safeguard that this procedure cannot come into operation for ten years. I think it is very important that we should have as much stability as possible in the early years of these constitutional changes. I should have thought that, with that safeguard, this was on the whole a satisfactory kind of procedure, namely, that the Legislature should be able to send forward its resolutions and that Parliament should have to take formal notice of them.

CONTROL OF THE SERVICES.

CLAUSE 251, being opposed by the die-hards and the Government having yielded to the opposition, was defeated in Committee by 43 votes to 243. The Clause provided that if any changes in the present system of recruitment and control of the services are desired, they may be introduced by an Order in Council without an amendment of the Act. It will be recalled that the White Paper had proposed that an inquiry should take place five years after the constitution came into operation to find out whether the Secretary of State should transfer his power in regard to recruitment and control over the higher services to an Indian authority. This proposal was turned down by the Joint Select Committee, who said that an inquiry should not be obligatory at the end of five years, but that it should be held where need for it would be felt.

If after inquiry it was found that a change should be made, what is to be the machinery for introducing the change? The Clause supplied an answer to the question. No amending legislation was necessary under the Bill as it was drafted, but now the relevant Clause is defeated, and even if it is decided to transfer the Secretary of State's power, say to the Governor-General, the transfer cannot take effect unless Parliament by adopting an Act for the purpose sanctions it. There was no sort of danger in the Clause as it stood, for, under Clause 286, an Order in Council introducing this change would have had to be submitted to both Houses of Parliament and their sanction taken by means of an affirmative Resolution. This is really as good as, or as bad as, an amending Act being required.

There is much force in what Sir Samuel Hoare said, that "between procedure by Order in Council and procedure by an amending Act, I do not myself believe there is great advantage one way or the other from the point of view of Parliamentary discussion," and Parliament's sanction is in any case required. Sir Austen Chamberlain, at whose instance, inquiry after the fixed period of five years was dropped, also admitted it. Still he insisted upon an amending Act.

"I agree with the Secretary of State," he said, "that there is not a very profound difference between the two methods. I agree with him also that whatever we do to-day must be, when we have had more experience, subject to inquiry, and may, though it by no means neces-

sarily will, require alteration as the result of that inquiry. I agree with all that. But there is a difference between having that inquiry presented to us in the form of a Bill with the full consideration which a Bill necessarily demands, and having it presented to us only in the form of a resolution to approve an Order in Council in which it is embodied."

He therefore asked that the Clause be deleted so that no change in the present position in this respect take place without further legislation.

Members of the Labour Party and the Liberal Party stood out for the retention of the Clause, but they too agreed that there was not much substantial difference between the two methods proposed, and that an Order in Council would be as difficult to get as amending legislation. Mr. Morgan Jones, for instance, said, "There is not much difference between the two procedures, although there is a possibility of something very substantial being lost by a change." Mr. Isaac Foot said, "While I agree with the Secretary of State that there is not a great deal of difference in the political machinery he proposes to adopt, either by Order in Council or a new Act, I am sure that this change will be exaggerated in India, that it will be looked upon as a concession to the reactionaries..." Mr. Foot too voted—for a wonder—against the Government with the Labour Party, but the Labour Party's grounds of opposition were very much wider than the Liberal leader's. Mr. Morgan Jones, voicing the opinions of the Labour Party, said:

I have been somewhat apprehensive of the tremendous efforts there have been to safeguard, and safeguard, and yet to safeguard the interests of the Civil Service in India. I think I have said before that so far as we are concerned we are entirely in accord with those who wish to safeguard the legitimate rights of our people who are now serving in India and to do nothing to interfere with their proper pay and their financial interests generally, but there can be only one effect upon Indian minds by these repeated efforts to erect additional barricades round the English section of the Indian Civil Service.

Sir Samuel Hoare remarked, in the course of his speech defending the Clause: "There is no doubt about the fact that Indians take a very close interest in this question (of the services), and we, on that account, would be unwise to take any unnecessary action that might antagonise the very reasonable view of the politically-minded Indian who thinks that in the future, at some date unnamed, there must be changes of some kind." Mr. Churchill had a pungent reply to give on this point.

I do not think the right hon. Gentleman need feel any serious apprehension about the effect which will be produced on Indian opinion. He used the expression that he was afraid of antagonising politically-minded Indians. He need not worry about that; he has antagonised them all already. I was reading in the *Times* newspaper, his own organ, the special organ of Indian defeatists, only this morning a report from their Delhi correspondent, in which he said that India may rightly claim that politically-minded India is universally opposed to the Bill, or words to that effect. There is no question of arguing it any more; it is admitted that from one end to the other all politically-minded classes are already hostile to the Bill and determined to do their utmost to resist it.

Col. Wedgwood, however, welcomed the omission of the Clause, leaving changes in the recruitment and control of the services to be brought about by an Act instead of by an Order in Council. His reason, of course, was quite different, viz. that the removal of the Clause would be something of an admission on the part of the Government that the new Act was susceptible of amendment; as he understood it, it was almost wholly unalterable. He said :

After all, if we can bring in an Act of Parliament so amending this Bill, we can amend it in other directions as well. If there is a chance of amending this Bill, if there is a chance of bringing in a new Bill to meet a changing situation, the situation may change in other directions as well. We have been led to understand that this Bill is in the nature of a treaty between the Government and the Princes in India, a treaty as permanent as the laws of the Medes and Persians. If we can alter it, then the treaty idea goes to the wall, and there is some hope that in future India will get a Bill not so manifestly unfair to the Hindus as this Bill.

Reviews.

MISS SORABJI'S MEMORIES.

INDIA CALLING. THE MEMORIES OF CORNELIA SORABJI. (Nisbet.) 1934. 23cm. 308p. 12/6.

THE author of this book is well-known as the first lady barrister in India, who has spent many years as legal adviser to *purdah-nashins* in Bengal and Upper India. It is a series of memories mainly of a professional character but interspersed with observations upon Indian life and customs which are of great interest, partly because they relate to the unhappy rich, and partly because they are told in a style which holds the reader by its vividness and terseness, though slightly touched with preciousness. In the earlier portion, of which the scene is in England, many persons of the first eminence appear on the stage. Some of the anecdotes told of them are really good, and one wishes it were possible to reproduce several of them. Here is one about Jowett. Mr. Justice Wright and his wife entertained select friends in their country-house. It seems they had a ritual, "the observance of which not even Jowett was allowed to escape. The main guests put out the candles after dinner with the words, 'boiled pork.' The Master, spectacles on nose-tip, and not enough 'blow' to produce even a flicker, was a delicious sight. And the Judge, superior in his 'boiled' proficiency, would sternly insist 'No, at it again. We can't help you.' And Jowett would go on seriously pumping at the bellows. I believe he really enjoyed amusing us thus." Let us cull one other story—this time of Mrs. Gladstone. Our author was a fairly frequent visitor in the House of Commons and has heard every Prime Minister's speak, from Gladstone onwards. "Mrs. Gladstone used to sit up at the right-end corner of the Speaker's gallery; and on a day when I, being a staunch Unionist, was glowing with pride in a speech of Mr. Balfour's, she came across to me and whispered, 'Don't admire that. Wait for my husband's speech.' The darling!"

If Miss Sorabji is a staunch Unionist in British politics, it is no wonder she is a stout Conservative in Indian politics. In fact her observations on political topics, not many in this volume, may be mistaken for an Anglo-Indian official's. Of Gandhi she has formed a picture in her mind which no other Indian would

recognise as at all true. She has a sneer for his title of Mahatma; for his economics and political views she has no use whatever. Here is her record of a fact connecting Gokhale and Gandhi. But how distorted! It is well-known that before Gandhi could carry out his wish to join the Servants of India Society, Gokhale had prescribed a year's travel for him all over India. He was to study men and things for himself and judge at the end whether the complexion of affairs was such as would incline him to take the step. Miss Sorabji gives a different turn to this episode.

I myself believe that Gandhi was genuine in his social service aspirations upon his return to India from South Africa and that he was exploited by his disciples. Gokhale, that level-headed and sincere reformer, realised Gandhi's danger and put him under promise not to interfere in politics. While Gokhale lived, Gandhi obeyed his *guru* as he called him. But after Gokhale's death he was at the mercy of the body of clever young politicians. These men realised that the masses would respond to nothing but a call in the name of religion. "A new Mahatma has arisen."

"Where is he," said the simple villagers, "that we might go and pay him reverence?"

"He does not allow you to visit his shrine, but he bids us collect alms in his name, and by us he will send you directions from time to time".

Now all this was begun in Bihar within my own area of work off the beaten track. So I speak of that of which I have personal knowledge.

Contributions were levied at the rate of two annas a man; and miraculous stories of the Mahatma were circulated by the best propagandists in the world.

A word must be said about her language. There is a rather marked desire to startle the reader by unusual words and expressions. For instance we have the words 'embassage' and 'alpha-pluses.' She forms curious compounds like 'must-(or must-not) be-dones' meaning injunctions or prohibitions. Then one sees an unaccountable partiality for capital letters. Here is a sentence: "There were no Colleges for women in my Presidency, but the Parents had ascertained that I could be admitted to the Men's College in our Town." In a book so well printed one is surprised to see a proper name misspelt. The middle name of Sir Courtenay Ilbert is not Courtney.

V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI.

INDIAN CURRENCY AND BANKING.

PAPERS ON CURRENCY AND THE RESERVE BANK FOR INDIA. By S. K. SARMA. (S. Krishna-swami Ltd., Teppakulam P. O., Trichinopoly). 1934. 20cm. 67p. Re. 1-4-0

THE substance of this small book originally appeared in the daily press when the Reserve Bank Bill was under discussion. The nature of the thesis presented by the author can be seen from the following extracts. "A Reserve Bank for India, operating with open mints for the free coinage of silver would have been too manifestly a just and reasonable gift for the Government to make on the eve of the new reforms. ...So far as Legislative members are concerned they may have their reward. They may find themselves thrust into the All-India or Local Boards with the prospect of a 'Deputy Governorship' dangling before them. But as for the people whose trust they have betrayed, their woes have only half begun. . . If our redemption is ever to come, it can only be from the independent group of Anglo-Indian merchants, but not from the patriotic group of political orators who have never cared to think out these problems seriously."

It is interesting to find that Sir Montague Webb has found a supporter for his favourite idea of re-opening the mints for the free coinage of silver. If in the end this school of a free silver standard is making no headway either here or elsewhere the reason certainly is not lack of advocacy or vigour on the part of its protagonists. Mr. Sarma's book is written in forceful and entertaining style and as a variant from the most generally accepted tenets of currency principles and practice will serve a very good purpose. Nor can the lack of serious interest on the part of 'patriots' and economists be pleaded as a valid cause of the ill success of this school. Even before Mr. Sarma and Sir Montague began to claim attention for their prescription to cure the currency maladies of India a valiant Bombay millowner had familiarised the interested public with all sides of the proposal which amounts to a cry to go back to 1893.

The trouble is that the world has realised that money is principally a representative token and it requires to be regulated like any other social institution in the interests of the community as a whole. Not only a silver monometallic standard but all metallic currency standards including the pre-war gold standard are, like Stephenson's locomotive, relegated to a place of historical interest but have no present importance. We might quarrel with Indian Currency authorities with regard to the objectives of their policy and the methods of its execution, but any talk of going back to a metallic standard with open mints, gold or silver, is highly unreal. In spite of sincere and eloquent advocates like Prof. Sarma the cause of the re-enthronement of the white metal is in no better plight than that of the restoration of dynastic kings.

D. G. KARVE.

GOPAL KRISHNA GOKHALE.

GOPAL KRISHNA GOKHALE. By E. LUCIA TURNBULL and H. G. D. TURNBULL. (V. Sundra Iyer & Sons, Trichur.) 1934. 19cm. 132p. Re. 1.

LALA LAJPAT RAI, in his classic book, "The Problem of National Education in India," wrote: "No scheme of national education in India could be complete without including the active teaching of 'patriotism' and 'nationalism' as a regular subject of study. The Turnbulls have by their authorship of the handy volumes of "The Golden Deeds of India," "Story of India," "Stories of Indian Youth," and "Famous Heroes of India," accomplished, in a most remarkable manner, the admittedly difficult task of writing books which fulfil the high purpose, mentioned by Lalaji, of national education in our country. Their biography of Gokhale is another valuable contribution in this direction. Montagu said of Gokhale, "His mind possessed the qualities ascribed to statesmanship without ever losing the fire of its enthusiasm or its warm human interests." Every chapter of the book under review has been so ably written as to afford some illustration of the rare combination of qualities with which Gokhale of revered memory enriched Indian public life.

One cannot, in reviewing, pass over the authors' view, though expressed with a strong assertion, on the effect of the employment of foreign capital in India, without stating that the young nationalistic India, whose temper and mind, it may be conceded, should be enlightened by history and guided by the method of scientific thought, would find it hard to swallow it. They observe, "Few impartial economists would agree that the result of the employment of foreign capital in India was to impoverish the country". Again, with regard to Gokhale's opposition

to the Abkari policy of the Government, as a temperance reformer, they simply mention that "it may be said that prohibition in America has given rise to more evils than it has prevented, and that in England since the War high prices have diminished consumption." One might wish that the authors had stated the pros and cons of this important question, and treated it in a fuller manner, especially as they have taken great pains to develop, in one separate chapter, a survey of the British connection with India and of the Indian situation at the time Gokhale entered public life. Barring these, it must be said that the book, for which the Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastriar writes an appreciative foreword, is a precious addition to that class of literature which imparts to the Indian youth sound patriotism and intelligent nationalism, and may be safely and confidently commended to the educational authorities in the several provinces of India.

R. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.

HISTORY OF MUDHOL.

A HISTORY OF THE GHORPADE FAMILY OF MUDHOL. Editor D. V. APTE. (Aryabhushan Press, Poona.) 1934. 22cm. p.635. Rs. 5.

THE book under review is an encyclopædic compilation as regards everything pertaining to the history of the house of the Ghorpades of Mudhol, and falls under the category of what is termed a source book. The principal source, covering 256 pages of the book, is a faithful translation into Marathi of a Persian chronicle written about 250 years ago, naturally conceived and executed according to the then prevailing standards. The appendix contains 175 pages of miscellaneous items such as important farmans in Persian, several extracts from contemporary correspondence and later references, traditional family lists handed down from generation to generation and several genealogical trees. The way in which these have been brought together and furnished with excellent apparatus is symptomatic of the great care bestowed by the learned editor on his work, every item of which seems to be supplied with an eye to the needs of a careful student.

Thus the chronicle or *Bakhar* is amply supplied with notes. The farmans are printed in the original Persian script, transliterated and translated and even profusely annotated and every other detail sufficiently explained. And, to add to it all, there comes a fuller introduction covering 187 pages not only supplying a link through all the pieces of information spread all over the source book, but also discussing several propositions arising out of the social and political vicissitudes of the family under study. The Ghorpades in history stand mostly as the direct opponents of Shivaji or as partisans of his enemies. Mr. Apte in handling this delicate situation has very skilfully brought out the real nature of the political theory and practice of their age in sufficient detail to be able to justify their innocence of any modernish ideas of patriotism or the like. He has incidentally remarked on their wonderful persistence of military ability from generation to generation and has cautiously discussed the nature of the hereditary transmission of useful virtues. But his real contribution to the historical literature is his balanced comparison of the political career of the two leading families of the Bhonsles and the Ghorpades, who represented the two leading and opposing tendencies of their age.

Many a student has noted the unity of the two families in origin and the certain possibility of proving the Rajput descent of the Bhonsles from this connection as some of the farmans give strong

support to that belief. The publisher in his preface has done well in quoting the editor's strong conviction on the point. But that point has nowhere received the pointed and detailed treatment which it deserved, considering the controversy which raged about it for so long.

On the whole the book is a perfect triumph for the editor and also for the publishers as it was through their instrumentality that these important records are made available to the public. The reigning chief of Mudhol is to be congratulated on his readiness in handing over the papers to be published. The present publication will always serve as a model to the several rulers who must have their historical papers with them and for those to whose lot it would fall to edit them for the public.

D. V. KALE.

A TEN-YEAR PLAN FOR INDIA.

PLANNED ECONOMY FOR INDIA. By M. VISVESVARAYA. (The Bangalore Press, Bangalore.) 1934. 22cm. 432p. Rs. 6.

SIR M. VISVESVARAYA is a writer of great force and poignancy. His latest work, the above book, has placed before all serious-minded students of India's public affairs a plan and programme for the material and moral development of this country within ten years. While nations of the West and Japan were marching on at a quick pace towards a better economic order, few people in India were turning their thoughts seriously to tackling this difficult question. The statistics published at the end of the book bring out vividly the all-round sad state of the people in India in contrast to some of the leading nations, such as U. S. A., Russia, U. K. and Japan. The author in an outspoken manner points out the causes which are responsible for this unfortunate plight and makes constructive suggestions for organising the people's welfare on all fronts. Sir M. Visvesvaraya holds that steadily increasing ruralisation in India and absence of industrialisation on a large scale are at bottom keeping India down materially. The interests of the rulers of the land being in conflict with those of the ruled in the matter of trade, commerce and finance, the Government largely concerns itself with maintaining 'law and order' in the country, and bothers little with questions of material prosperity of the people. The chapter on "unemployment" details the causes and offers concrete suggestions for its cure. The remedies proposed for all ills are the setting up of a national government at the centre and in the provinces with full and complete control over currency, banking and exchange, and inaugurating a comprehensive scheme for multiplying the national wealth. What is particularly striking in the book is that while the author has not spared the foreign government from blame for not initiating a bold and far-reaching policy in matters of industry, finance, Indianisation and education, he has also not failed to expose defects in the national character.

No prudent or patriotic Indian will wish for his country less than what the most progressive nations of the world enjoy by way of worldly prosperity, but, as a realist, he will have to reckon with the forces which are working against him all the time. The baneful climatic conditions practically throughout the year, the meager wants of daily life, the religious belief that the present life is not the last on this earth, the disproportionately large number of cattle to people's requirements—these and other considerations weigh heavily against any big and organised drive which the Government or in its absence the proposed National Economic Council may launch forth for increasing the national wealth and per

capita income of the people. Let us hope with the author that India's national shortcomings will be greatly minimised when a wise and bold Ten-Year Plan is set in motion, and the people get busy with it.

The book is full of interesting and useful information and is written in a captivating style. It is inspiring and will quicken patriotic fervour in any Indian.

S. P. ANDREWS-DUBE.

SHORT NOTICES.

MOTHER AMERICA. REALITIES OF AMERICAN LIFE AS SEEN BY AN INDIAN. BY SUDHINDRA BOSE. (Messrs. M. S. Bhatt & Co., Raopura, Baroda.) 1934. 22cm. 304p. Rs. 5/-.

THE title is reminiscent of Miss Mayo, but this is not the same sort of book. For one thing it is not the work of a globe-trotter, but is written by an Indian who has had long years of residence in America, and is on the staff of a well-known State University. He has had abundant opportunities for contact with all forms of American life, educational, business and social; and is on the whole very fair in his apportionment of commendation and criticism. If a few chapters are scathing and cynical, such as those dealing with the problems of the Negro and the future of the Philippines, many more are frankly appreciative of the good qualities of the American nation as a whole and of numerous individuals. England, as mentioned here and there throughout the volume, does not fare so happily at his hands.

To the reviewer, the book appears to be not an integrated volume, but rather an aggregation of separate short studies, strung together in a casual sequence. Many of them show evidence of having been written several years previous to the publication of the volume:—this is shown not only by positive statements but also by omissions, there being no references to the "Depression," the "New Deal" or any of the great social experiments now under way. This lack detracts considerably from the value of the book, but it still has much useful information to offer in regard to conditions as they existed a few years back.

The writer gives brief accounts of the lives of certain distinguished Americans, such as Washington, Lincoln, and Bryan; his personal familiarity with the subjects of education and the press leads him to write at length upon these important phases of American life—in regard to both of which he has many good words to speak. A comparison of American with Indian conditions and needs gives a practical turn to many of the essays and adds interest for the Indian reader. Political problems also engage the attention of the author: he explains something of the antecedents of the two-party system, and deals with the question of American imperialism as it affects the future of the Philippines and Porto Rico. It is only when dealing with such topics as race relationships that the writer falls into a spirit of real bitterness, though he is also caustic in his comments upon religion.

It is a pity that the publishers did not put up a better job. The many interesting photographs are marred by lack of clearness and the pages are dotted with an incredible number of printers' errors.

On the whole, the book may be commended for giving a scattered but useful series of impressions of American conditions, quite fairly balanced between praise and blame.

A. B. VAN DOREN.

THE BOMBAY LAND REVENUE CODE WITH RULES. By K. S. GUPTA. (Author, 691, Budhwar, Poona.) 1934. 22cm. 774p. Rs. 10.

MR. GUPTA is an authority on revenue law in the Bombay Presidency and has already to his credit commentaries on the Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act, the Bombay Cooperative Societies Act, the Mamlatdars' Courts Act, and several other works. In his latest work, the one under review, he has fully maintained his reputation for deep study, painstaking research and careful handling of his subject. His Bombay Land Revenue Code should rank as a work of a very high order, extremely useful alike to revenue officers, practising lawyers and the public at large.

The arrangement of the subject matter leaves nothing to be desired. The history of legislation on the important subject has been succinctly traced; its object, as disclosed in the proceedings of the Legislative Council, clearly indicated; intricate questions of law carefully explained; Government orders elucidating obscure points explicitly referred to; rules framed by Government fully reproduced below appropriate sections; and the case law exhaustively dealt with. In respect of controversial matters, the various aspects of the case have been presented with scrupulous fairness supported by copious extracts from authoritative statements; and the reader has been left to draw his own conclusions. The history of the various systems of land tenure, survey, assessment and settlement, that are in vogue in India in general and in the Presidency in particular, has been sketched with commendable lucidity, evincing a grasp of principles and mastery of details which it is rare to find in one unconnected with actual settlement operations. While it has been clearly demonstrated that the non-official slogan that assessment should be proportional to the profits of agriculture, however unimpeachable it may be in theory, cannot be given effect to in practice, the official myth that the 'rental value' can be determined with any degree of accuracy has been exploded with equally devastating vigour. In short, Mr. Gupta has performed his self-imposed task with consummate skill and remarkable thoroughness.

D.

Miscellaneous.

ADDING CHAIN UPON CHAIN.

Mr. Morgan Jones voiced the opposition of the Labour Party to the provision of Clause 280 relating to the compulsory acquisition of land. The Attorney-General, in pleading with the die-hards, had said, "The more restrictions you try to pile upon the Legislatures the more difficulties you make both for yourself and for the Legislatures." Mr. Morgan Jones alluded to this observation in his opening remarks.

I DO not propose to follow the Attorney-General in all the details in which he has discussed this matter, but I wish he would translate the very amiable generalisation with which he completed his speech into something more practical, and that he would present a firmer front to the voracious gentlemen who surround him on every hand. I see that the Attorney-General disagrees with my description, which appears to me to be an entirely adequate one. I have listened to almost the whole of the proceedings on the Bill, and the more I have listened the more staggered I have been at the number of interests which have had to be safeguarded. For over a fort-

night we have been safeguarding this, that and the other interest, and in doing so we have added chain upon chain to the limbs of the future Indian Legislature until it seems that it will be almost impossible for it to move at all. Is there any justification for these things?...

We want to register a very strong objection to the weakness which the Government have shown in face of the clamant requests of hon. Members for further concessions in the direction of safeguards. It is our view, as I have said more than once, that in the last fortnight we have been piling safeguard upon safeguard, and most of those safeguards have been in the direction of protecting private interests in one way or another. In this particular case we are dealing with a restricted area and a concession has been granted by the Government which in our judgment is very largely unnecessary. I will explain why I think this extra concession is unnecessary. The Governor-General is in possession of very ample powers of veto. If a Bill is brought forward by the Government in respect of certain matters with which the Governor-General disagrees he may veto it. If the Bill in the course of its progress through the Legislature is amended in a certain way the Governor-General may insist that the Amendment be withdrawn. If the Bill is carried and the Governor-General still objects he may withhold his assent. These are very ample powers.

This evening we are told that the Government are prepared to introduce into the Instrument of Instructions a new proviso, a new safeguard. If a Bill dealing with the expropriation of land is introduced containing terms with which the Governor-General does not agree, he can reserve the Bill for the signification of His Majesty in regard to the matter. We are discussing the question of what may be the attitude of a future Federal government or a Provincial government on the question of land ownership. I do not anticipate that during the next 30 or 40 years there will be anything approaching a revolutionary government in the Provinces or in the Centre in India, because the Government are taking good care that property interests are more than amply represented in both those bodies. But suppose that at some future time 30 or 40 years hence a government, say, of Socialist tendencies were elected for a Province or the Centre, or let us assume the election of a Communist government by the Indian people. A Communist government on being elected would have the authority of the people behind it and be entitled to carry out the mandate received from the people. I am not interested in the progress of Communism but I am interested in the progress of Socialism. Let me assume that a Socialist majority is elected by some hazard or chance—it would have to be that—and they deem it necessary in the public interests that the land should be nationalised. In this country that may happen within a very short time, for all we know. So long as the government elected has the authority of the people for the purpose what right have we to say to the people of India that they shall not have their will? What right have we to say to the Indian people that they shall not do this, that or the other? For Heaven's sake let us have done with this hypocrisy. If we are not giving self-government, let us say so. If we are giving self-government, let us give it frankly and freely.

I agree with what was said by the learned Attorney-General that if you are going to tie up the Indian Legislatures both Provincial and Central by these innumerable safeguards, if you erect barriers around them, you are bound in the end to create greater difficulties in administration in India, and you will do a much bigger and much more dangerous thing. If you make the people think that you have

introduced into the Constitution barriers that cannot be moved away, safeguards that they cannot get over you will develop in India, perhaps without desiring it, an unconstitutional or an anti-constitutional spirit which right hon. and hon. Members opposite as well as ourselves would deeply deplore. The only way to safeguard the constitutional spirit in any country is to give the people the assurance that they can get what they desire constitutionally.

The Deputy Chairman: I think the hon. Gentleman is now developing a much wider argument than this Clause will bear.

Mr. Jones: With respect, may I put my proposition once again? In Sub-section (3) we are going to reserve to the Governor-General the right to say that if a Central or Provincial Parliament carries a Bill for nationalising land he can if he likes withhold his assent. That is a power which he ought not to possess. The consequence of giving that power is to develop in the minds of the electors of India the feeling that however constitutionally they may move, however amply they may exercise their constitutional right of the vote, they are not in the long

run to be the arbiters of their own fate, the person who determines whether the thing is good or bad for India is the Governor-General. The effect of putting the Governor-General in that position may be one which hon. Members perhaps will not like. You will make the representative of His Majesty in India appear to be the bulwark against the progress of the Indian people. You are doing a dangerous thing, and for my part I shall have no share or lot in this effort to prevent the people of India having a full expression of their desire for progress along the lines which seem best to them. What right have we to say to the Indian people 40 years hence that they must not nationalise the land? Who are we to speak in their name? Who are we to put impediments in the way of their progress? What right have we to speak in this way? If we are going to give them self-government let us give it, but if not then drop this hypocritical attitude and say that we cannot give it because we distrust them, it is too great a power to give. In that case let us have done with this hypocrisy, and keep them in leading strings as we have in the past.

GOKHALE DAY IN U. S. A.

DR. MACNICOL'S SPEECH.

Under the auspices of the Yale University Inter-Racial Affairs Group, a meeting was held in the Graduate School on the 19th Feb., to celebrate Gokhale Day. Dr. C. T. Loram, Sterling Professor of Comparative Education and Chairman of the Inter-Racial Group, presided. Prof. John C. Archer, of the Yale Divinity School, who was twice in India with the Y. M. C. A., and Dr. Nicol Macnicol, who spent some thirty years in Poona and knew Gokhale intimately, and Mr. P. Kodanda Rao, spoke on the occasion. The following are the notes of Dr. Macnicol's speech, which was suffused with genuine love and enthusiasm for his theme.

I AM here this evening because, having been asked to come to do honour to the memory of one whom I honour as I do G. K. Gokhale, I could not but come. I have little claim to be here, except for that. It is far more important and appropriate that one of the sons of Gokhale's spirit is here in the person of Mr. Kodanda Rao, and that he will speak to us.

I can say little that is of any value or significance, but I would like to try to illustrate the great qualities of this Indian statesman by setting him alongside of three men with whom his life was closely related.

The first of these is M. G. Ranade, the most influential social reformer of his day, a man of great moral stature, revered by all, Indian and foreign. Ranade was always viewed by Gokhale as his spiritual preceptor, his guru, and he certainly stamped the deep impress of his singularly noble nature upon his young disciple. I remember vividly with what reverence Gokhale spoke of him,—how he pointed out to me the place where he often stood—never sitting down in his master's presence—and listened to his wise words. He learned from him that ideal of studied moderation, that sweet reasonableness that mastered his whole political career, an ideal which he never forsook in spite of many provocations. He followed this master, too, in his devotion to the cause of education, alike higher education which he served in his early years as Professor, and primary education for which he fought so strenuously, with, alas, such limited success. Gokhale was indeed a son of Ranade's spirit, seeking no popular applause, but only the approbation of his own inward monitor.

The second personality beside whom I would place him was very different from that first one. Here it is a contrast I would have you see. This is his fellow-townsmen, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, the idol

of the people in his day. Gokhale and he belonged to the same very remarkable Brahman group—a group that has exercised an amazing influence through the last century and more, but in spirit and in aim they were widely apart. Gokhale, indeed, found it necessary to have as little as possible to do with his fellow-fighter in the country's cause. Once, however, I was in the usual position of being chosen along with these two great leaders to represent the public mind to Government at a period of sharp conflict. The cause was one in which we were all three in agreement, but it might have been a question who would be our spokesman. There was no hesitation, however, on that subject. Gokhale was the one of us who by his wisdom and firmness and knowledge was obviously fittest to handle our case, and we sat silently by while he with consummate ability presented the case. Tilak was a great man, but he knew when to give place to a greater.

The third confrontation that I would show you is one that every year for a succession of years took place in the Imperial Council, and his foil on this occasion is Lord Curzon, whom he called "one of the greatest Englishmen that ever came" to his country. Great in some notable respects he was, but—his fellow-countryman though I am—I cannot but acknowledge that in the greatest qualities of personality Gokhale was his superior. I do not mean merely that he was able to speak as an equal with the Viceroy year after year in his Budget speeches, but that in statesmanship, in foresight, most of all, in his magnanimity of nature he was the greater man. Curzon lacked that quality which is indispensable for a great guide of any nation's fortunes, the quality that sees far beyond the immediate present, foreseeing and preparing the way to the distant goal. That is just the quality that Gokhale preeminently possessed and made him a statesman and a patriot of the first rank, as I believe he was. That

gave him his serenity and steadfastness in the midst of storms, it delivered him from pettiness. He could afford to retrace his steps, as he did in the matter of his plague charges in Poona. He could afford to be defeated by superior forces that enabled him to say in the face of the young men in a hurry who did not find him fiery enough for their impatience,—to say wistfully, "Youth shows but half" and to go on and say, "Trust God, see all nor be afraid."

That reminds me of others of his friends, of whom I would like to speak, such as his successor in the Presidentship of the Servants of India Society, Srinivasa Sastri. I see him—very like Gokhale in this—standing before a crowded and not very friendly audience of Poona students, saying, as Gokhale also would have said, "Let reason rule, not passion." Or I would like to refer to his relation to that other great Indian, who is never weary of owning his deep debt to him as his "political guru"—Mahatma Gandhi. One of the most memorable events in my own life was my introduction to Mr. Gandhi by the dying Gokhale—just a few weeks before he died. Gandhi had just arrived from S. Africa,—had arrived, as he said, with the purpose of merging himself in Gokhale. But that could not be. I can never forget the occasion. Gandhi had come away from receiving the acclamations of Poona for his great service in South Africa, to see Gokhale at his house and Gokhale had risen from his sick bed to receive him. If only it had been possible—as the Mahatma hoped—that he might have merged himself in his revered political leader, Gandhi's immeasurable power over the people, united with Gokhale's vision and statesmanship. But we need not dwell upon what could not be. Rather we remember tonight what was, and gratefully honour the memory of this great Indian and great man.

LIBERALS & INDIA BILL.

The Council of the National Liberal Federation of India at its meeting held at Allahabad on the 14th inst. passed a resolution urging Government to drop the India Bill now before the British Parliament. The resolution runs :

The Council of the National Liberal Federation of India is of opinion that the Government of India Bill which reproduces all the objectionable features which made the Joint Select Committee's Report unacceptable to the country has been made more reactionary by the amendments introduced in it by the House of Commons. While every effort has been made to conciliate the Princes and the British die-hards, the joint demands of the progressive section of opinion in British India have been studiously and contemptuously ignored and every attempt has been made to place added obstacles in the way of India's advance to Dominion Status. The Council therefore strongly urges that the Bill should be dropped. If it is proceeded with in the teeth of British Indian opposition, it will further embitter the relations between India and England.

HINDU MAHASABHA & INDIA BILL.

The Hindu Mahasabha which met at Cawnpore last week has passed the following resolutions :—

INDIA & BRITISH PARLIAMENT.

IN view of the fact that the British Parliament is so constituted that it is incapable of reflecting,

much less representing, Indian opinion and interests in any way; further in view of the fact that constitution-making now in progress for India by that Parliament has not satisfied any section of opinion in India, this session of the Hindu Mahasabha is of the opinion that the situation calls for a radical and different constitutional procedure, whereby the task of constitution-making for British India should be the concern of the Emperor of India and the Indian people, on the lines of the Statute of Westminster and the political conventions operating in the case of the self-governing Dominions. This view was fortified by the Royal Titles Act of 1876 as well as by the legal implications of the same Act.

INDIA BILL.

It is the view of the Hindu Mahasabha that the Government of India Bill, now before Parliament, is totally unacceptable to every section of Indian opinion and could not be proceeded with, as the constitution proposed was regarded on all hands as much worse than the existing one and was even reactionary and obstructive to the growth of nationalism and democracy, on account of its communal scheme, which was intended to keep the communities constantly estranged.

COMMUNAL REPRESENTATION IN SERVICES.

This session of the Hindu Mahasabha unreservedly condemns the recent announcement of the Government of India fixing the communal proportion in the all-India services of the Government, as it is not only detrimental to the establishment of efficient administration, but is also anti-national and is sure to perpetuate communal friction.

Correspondence.

"THE OPPORTUNITY WILL NOT RECUR"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—I cannot adequately express my admiration for the way in which your paper has been attacking, with knowledge and strength, the proposed Indian federation. The last article entitled "The Opportunity will not Recur" is easily the best. The way in which you have portrayed the three voices of Great Britain to the Princes, British India and to the British public on this subject is true. It is true. It is a pity. It is a pity, it is true. British India has found out the trick and says so. The Indian Princes have found out the trick, but dare not say so. The British public must have found out the trick, but do not want to say so. It is right, therefore, that you should find out the trick and expose it. I hope that this Federation will be still-born. If it is, much of the credit will go to you.—Yours, etc.

New Delhi,

S. SATYAMURTI.

10th April.