

SPEECHES OF THE RT. HON. MR. E. S. MONTAGU.

governed on racial lines has long ago disappeared. The watchword of the future is co-operation. We are pledged to advance, and we mean to advance but it must be steadily and prudently. The very appointment of the Commission is a good earnest of our sincerity, and, as their share, we ask from the progressive section of the Indian community, patience. The Commission will advise us as to what changes, what reforms, are necessary to take us as far forward on this new road as we are now justified in going.

All I take leave to do now is to make this one comment on the subject. It is not only a question of new regulations, of carefully balanced proportions between the two races, it is not only a question of words and of figures, it is, above all, and beyond all, a question of real determination on both sides to act up to the spirit of the underlying principle. Mere lip service to a formula is worthless. I wish to appeal to British and to Indians alike, to make this co-operation a real thing by inspiring it with the vital elements of tact, sympathy and sincerity—the instruments of success in India. Finally, I want to remind the House that there is another side of the question which the Commission probably will not touch, but which is as important, as serious and as deserving of our most earnest consideration. There are in India millions, tens of millions,

THE INDIAN BUDGET—1913.

I might almost say hundreds of millions, who do not, cannot and probably never will aspire to a share in the Government of their country, who live the life of an Oriental, unstirred by the Western life we have imported. We measure their lands, we administer justice to them, we teach them to keep themselves, their houses and their village clean; we show them how plague may be avoided, and we bring to bear on their material improvement all the resources of Western science and civilisation. But all this is to them but as a phase passing in a maze and murmur of words, in the Eternal Scheme of things. (Cheers.) The principle on which we act is right. It is our bounden duty to give of the best that we have to the betterment, according to the best of our ideas, of the people under our rule. We must do these things, and we must do them by rule and by code, and through the agency of officials who speak the language and use the practices of officials. But let there be added to the rules and codes, and to the official book, a note of explanation, a gentleness of application and an endeavour to interpret.

The Indian of whom I now speak has a view of life which is not our view. His ways are not our ways; our books, our medicine, our sanitation, are as mysterious to him as the rites of Shiva or of Vishnu to the average middle-class Londoner. The language of officialism booms in his ears and stupefies

him ; he is entangled and trapped and terrified in the coils and meshes of official codes. He is, in spite of all our Western importations, the same man as he was 15 centuries ago. That is one of our difficulties that we find in India—living side by side the 20th century and the fifth, and the same machinery to deal with both of them. I do not ask for separate machinery, but what I do ask is that, where the machinery, with all its complications and intricacies, suited to the 20th century comes in contact with the fifth century, let every effort be made to simplify, adjust and explain (Cheers) Understanding is what is wanted. Understanding is impossible unless the officer who meets the people in direct contact has the time to see and talk to them face to face, and the liberty, the freedom, to adjust and to lighten their difficulties, and to ease their condition by the intervention of his personal agency and sympathy. And so my last word is a plea for devolution, not necessarily by a redistribution of duties and powers, but by the liberty to exercise a wise discretion in the use of duties and powers as they now are. If we make co-operation and devolution our guiding principle, I am convinced that we shall be on the right lines, and if anything we have done during this year, or if anything I have said this afternoon, helps towards securing for the one section of the Indian commu-

THE INDIAN BUDGET—1913.

nity another instalment of their just and proper ambition, for the other and largest section of the Indian community a more personal, a more elastic, a more understanding rule, and for our public servants some due recognition of their loyal and unsparing service by the removal of any existing or potential cause of discontent, then I shall feel that, though I have taxed the patience of this House, I have not wasted its time.

THE INDIAN RAILWAYS AND IRRIGATION LOANS BILL.

SPEECH DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
ON 17TH MARCH, 1910.

On the motion for the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Montagu said :

The Secretary of State for India possesses no power to raise money by loan in this country except with the consent of the Houses of Parliament, and so from time to time he comes down to the House of Commons with a bill of this kind and asks for power to raise a limited sum of money. There were Loans Bills passed into Loans Acts, comparable to this, in 1893, 1898, 1901, 1905 and 1908. There are two kinds of these Bills. Sometimes power is sought to raise money for general purposes. Sometimes it is sought only for specified purposes. The Bill which is now under discussion is of the latter kind, and only seeks to raise money for the specified purposes of irrigation and railways.

THE INDIAN RAILWAYS AND IRRIGATION.

General borrowing powers are only used to meet great emergencies, such as war or famine, and it is a matter of great rejoicing that since the Bill of 1908 no such emergency has arisen; and the Secretary of State still possesses unexhausted the whole of the borrowing power for general purposes granted by this House in 1908 together with an unexhausted portion of the borrowing powers granted by the Act of 1898, to the extent of sums amounting altogether to £6,371,699, so that it is absolutely unnecessary to ask for power in this Bill to borrow money for general purposes. The Government asks the House for power to raise £25,000,000 sterling for railways and irrigation. I may say that these powers are not to be exercised at once, but only during the years 1911, 1912 and 1913 and subsequent years, and they will only be exercised with due regard both to the necessity of the services involved and the conditions of the money market at the time. I may also say, having regard to the discussion in the previous Debate, that in the undertaking contemplated there is nothing military or strategic. All the work contemplated has to do with the development of the commercial prosperity of India. The subject of irrigation is only included in this Bill so as not to limit unduly the powers of the Secretary of State. But, as a matter of fact, the money required for irrigation is nearly always raised in India, and

SPEECHES OF THE RT. HON. MR. E. S. MONTAGU.

probably the money raised under this Act will be used entirely for railway purposes.

IRRIGATION GRANTS.

I will deal shortly with the subject of irrigation first. There can be no doubt as to the value of irrigation, and the success of expenditure under this head is one of the outstanding features of the recent development of India. It was in 1864, that the principle was accepted of constructing works, of irrigation out of funds supplied by loans, and since that date various systems have been steadily pursued of supplying water to country previously arid or exposed to the danger of famine in seasons of occasional drought. The policy now governing this work is based on the approved report presented by Sir Colin Scott Moncrieff's Commission in 1903. The sum of £32,143,278 had been invested in major irrigation by the end of 1908-9 and £4,028,294 in minor works, irrigating together the enormous area of 16,435,527 acres. This showed increase over the preceding year of £1,628,541 capital expenditure, of £126,761 gross receipts of £22,041, working expenses, of £104,720 net receipts, and of 358, 639 acres irrigated. These figures are only the departmental index of the general increase in the productivity of land and the effective production of districts previously

THE INDIAN RAILWAYS AND IRRIGATION.

liable to famine in times of drought and in some cases the settling on land previously uncultivated of large and prosperous populations. The major works only are constructed from borrowed money. The net receipts from these have increased from £1,711,000 in 1900-1 to an estimated net capital liability at the same time has increased from £23,475,332 to £33,643,278, so that the percentage of net receipts to capital liability has remained practically constant throughout the ten years. We can therefore face the consideration of increased expenditure on irrigation with a confidence that the money spent is not only of immense profit to the population of India, but is spent on sound commercial undertakings, eminently satisfactory to the revenues of the Government of India.

RAILWAYS IN INDIA.

Turning to railways, we are again occupied with work, the advantages of which are undoubted. The building of railways in India, dating from 1853, has been the foundation of the growing prosperity of its people, the basis of any war against the famine, the fundamental support of law and order, the root of all progress. Thanks to railways, food can be supplied to distressed districts, and good harvests do not entail the waste of crops. Railways have equalised prices and distributed food and produce, they have colonised new dis-

tricts and led, so far as is possible, to establishing a greater community of interest among the various peoples of India. Turning to the more 'material' question of profit to the Government of India again, we see a story of satisfactory investment. About 24,000 miles out of the 31,485 opened for traffic are now the remunerative property of the Government of India, yielding in 1909-10, which has not been a particularly favourable year, 4·41 per cent. of the money invested in them, which now amounts to about £300,000,000. The railway service gives employment to 525,000 persons, of whom 508,000 are Indians. The number of passengers rose from 161,000,000 in 1899 to 321,000,000 in 1908, and during the same period there had been an average increase of 790 miles opened per year. Loans raised under Bills such as we are now discussing are spent, first, in fulfilment of the railway programme for the year; and, secondly, in the discharge of capital liabilities. The railway programme for the year is decided by the Railway Board, which, subject to the approval of the Government of India and the Secretary of State, manages Indian railways. A portion of the money spent goes to improve the equipment of existing lines; increasing trade makes increasing demand on the lines built to meet the more modest requirements of earlier years. A great increase of goods carried.

THE INDIAN RAILWAYS AND IRRIGATION.

necessitates the provision of more rolling-stock and heavier waggon. This means new bridge girders, strengthening the permanent way, and new goods yards. By far the larger part of the money raised for capital expenditure is used for such purposes. Of the £20,900,000 included in the programme of capital outlay for this year 1909-10 and the coming year, £8,800,000 goes to open line works, £7,600,000 to rolling-stock and £4,500,000 to new lines and lines in progress. I may add that the Railway Board and the Indian Railway Companies themselves pay particular attention to the proper distribution of the charges for improved equipment between revenue and capital and only such work as can properly be said to improve the revenue is charged to capital.

Continued representations were received from India some time ago as to the insufficiency of railway development to keep pace with the development of India to supply the needs of its trade and to enable the railways to be worked to the best possible advantage. A Committee was appointed as a consequence of these representations, which was presided over by Sir James Mackay and reported in 1908. The report recommends that a capital expenditure of £12,500,000 should be incurred annually on railways, on which £4,000,000 should be provided in India and the remainder in England. It is with a view to meeting the recommendations

of this Committee that expenditure has been increased, and this accounts for the shortness of the interval between this and the last Loan Bill. The full expenditure recommended, however, has not yet been attained, and may not be attained for some time to come. The resources of India in the near future may fall short of the £4,000,000 contemplated by the Committee which was to be contributed from such sources as the Revenue Surplus, Rupee Loans and Coinage Profits. It is probable, therefore that about £8,000,000 a year must be raised in this country for the purposes of the programme. Some part of this sum will be raised in the form of Capital Stock or Debentures of Guaranteed Railway Companies, for the creation of which the authority of Parliament is not required. It is not possible to give any accurate estimate, but, based on past experience, it may be suggested that about £6,000,000 a year will be raised for programme purposes by the Secretary of State. The amount raised for programme purposes under the Bill of 1908 has been £13,307,273.

RAILWAY CONTRACTS.

As regards liabilities for the discharge of capital most of the railways belonging to the State in India are worked by companies, guaranteed by the State, under contract. Termination of a contract with any company means of payment of capital contribut-

THE INDIAN RAILWAYS AND IRRIGATION.

ed by them ; this, together with the repayment of terminable bonds, must be met by borrowed money. Under the Loans Act of 1908, £997,800 has been spent on the discharge of debentures ; before the end of this year, when the contract between the Secretary of State in Council and Indian Midland Railway Company comes to an end, it will be necessary to repay to that company £2,250,000 ; possibly, also, though I hope this will not be the case, £1,510,000 may be required for repaying capital and certain debenture bonds to the South Indian Railway Company. The loans for these purposes will be raised under—and, I may add, go far to exhaust—the borrowing powers of the Act of 1908. In 1911-12 £1,776,200 worth of bonds originally issued by the Madras and Indian Midland Companies will have to be discharged, and in 1912-13, £1,477,600 worth of similar bonds, and in 1913-14, £1,281,200. Accepting, therefore, the estimate of six millions as the amount to be raised annually under present Bill for the railway programme, the House will see that it is possible to estimate the requirements of the Secretary or State in each of the next three years at about seven and a half millions and that the powers asked for under this Act will have to be renewed at the end of 1913-14.

There are only two other points which I should mention, rather by way of anticipating criticism, and

they are not wholly unconnected. I have shown that railway undertakings have in recent years nearly always means a considerable profit. This amounted to £9,770,000 during the last ten years, supplementing the revenue raised by taxation for meeting general administrative expenditure; but in 1908-9 there was a loss of £1,242,000. This was due to a decrease in gross earnings consequent on unfavourable agricultural and trade conditions, and an exceptionally high rate of working expenses, resulting partly from the necessity of giving special allowances to compensate for the high prices of food while the effects of famine were still felt, and partly from the large outlay on renewals. This brings me to say a word on the matter raised on discussion of the last Bill as to the passenger facilities of the railways, the improvements of which was responsible to some extent for the increase of working expenses in 1908. The Railway Board in 1905 issued a circular to the several railway administrations urging the necessity for providing (1) facilities for passengers to obtain their tickets a longer time before the departure of the trains; (2) facilities for examining tickets of third class passengers so as to enable passengers to have proper access to the platform; and (3) proper accommodation for the third-class passengers to prevent overcrowding. There is every evidence that

THE INDIAN RAILWAYS AND IRRIGATION.

ample response has been made to this circular. Continuous booking at the principal stations and the opening of town offices for the taking of tickets, deals with the first evil. As regards the second, the railway administrations are re-arranging their waiting-halls and platforms. The only way of dealing with the third evil is to increase the supply of coaching stock. New third-class carriages of a modern type are being provided with every possible speed.

RAILWAYS : A COMPARISON.

Finally, if there be any Member who thinks that we are proceeding too rapidly, I would remind him that, if we compare India with any of the advanced countries of the world, there is room and need for a great development of railways. To compare it with the United Kingdom, with one-fourteenth of the area and one-sixth of the population, you find that the United Kingdom has three times the mileage of railways. I would also point out that the productive debt of India makes up by far the larger portion of her debt. The total permanent debt on 31st March, 1909, amounted (in round figures) to £251,000,000. Of this total £182,000,000 represented railway debt, producing more than 4 per cent. interest; £31,000,000, irrigation debt, producing 8 per cent. interest; and £38,000,000,

ordinary or unproductive debt. Few countries can show so favourable a record.

RAILWAY PROFITS.

I wish to be clearly borne in mind that it is for this remunerative debt, not for the unproductive debt, that I now ask for powers to raise money. Profitable as the expenditure of capital on railways is now, it will be more profitable in future. In the first place, the purchase of railways by the State has, in the majority of cases, been made by means of terminable annuities. When these are paid off, the railways in the possession of the Government of India will become an unburdened commercial property of enormous value. In the second place, a considerable number of railways have been built, not for immediate profit, but for the development of certain areas, and these will become remunerative in proportion as they achieve their object. Nor do the people of India have to pay highly for the inestimable benefit conferred upon them by railway development.

Although during the four years ending 1907-8 the net annual gain to the State from this source was approximately £2,000,000, the rates charged for passengers are only one-fifth of a penny per mile and for goods half a penny per ton per mile. I think now I have laid before the House sufficient

THE INDIAN RAILWAYS AND IRRIGATION.

evidence of the necessity for this Bill, and the purposes for which it is required. This was granted to the Secretary of State in 1908 borrowing powers for railway and irrigation purposes, which have now been nearly exhausted on new construction, better equipment and repayment of capital. I ask it with confidence to renew this power in order to give further assistance to the Government in providing for the continued improvement of the first necessity of the modern development of commerce, agriculture and general prosperity—improved means of communication.

THE CONDITION OF INDIA.

Mr. E. S. Montagu, Under-Secretary for India, was the principal speaker on November 2, 1910, at a Liberal meeting held at Bishop Auckland. Mr. JAMES RAMSDEN, Chairman of the Auckland Division Liberal Association, presided. Sir Henry Havelock-Allan, M.P., for the division, also spoke.

In the course of his speech Mr. MONTAGU said :—
A striking phenomenon of the last few years is the awakening among English people at home of an increased interest in the affairs of the Indian Empire. On the platform, in the Press, and in general literature there is year by year more attention devoted to India ; and everywhere we find a dawning realisation that what has been called the "brightest jewel in the British Crown" is no mere ornament, but an Imperial charge involving great and growing responsibilities. The importance of the connexion between India and Great Britain cannot be over-estimated, nor is it possible to exaggerate the magnitude of the task to which we have put our hands and the absorbing interest of the problems that we have to face. That

THE CONDITION OF INDIA.

India is coming more prominently before the public eye in England is, therefore, all to the good. The increased interest is due partly, no doubt, to the new spirit in the East that is now forcing itself upon our notice, the arising in an insistent form of problems that an older generation was content to leave in the lap of the future, and to the political outrages which, by dramatically arresting public attention for the moment, have assumed a fictitious importance. But if I were asked to say what single thing has played the largest part in this assumption by Indian affairs of a greater prominence in England, I should say that it was the act of the present Government in appreciating the dignity of India's place in our Empire, and the importance of her problems, by giving to India of their best, by allotting to the India Office a man who was perhaps the most striking and best-known personality on the Liberal front bench. (Cheers).

LORD MORLEY'S ADMINISTRATION.

I am reminded of an article in one of the reviews that I was reading the other day, written with an object frankly hostile to a certain aspect of Lord Morley's administration, which, nevertheless, pointed out that whatever the shortcomings of the present Government and of Lord Morley's treatment of Indian questions, together they had done India one

great and lasting service—they had put an end for ever to the practice of regarding the Secretaryship for India as a dumping-ground for mediocrities. I hope that it is true. It is certainly true, I think, of Liberal Governments; further than that I would not presume to prophesy.

But Lord Morley's services to India are not confined to illuminating the Secretaryship of State for India with the reflected lustre of his name. What he has done and is doing is so well-known that I need not enlarge upon it. He has had a difficult time. He has been much criticised by the old school of thought, he has been criticised with even greater acerbity from a diametrically opposite point of view by well-meaning enthusiasts on our own side, who do not realise that their true aims are best served to by his policy and are inclined to forget that, to quote from a book recently published about India regarding which I shall have more to say later, it is specially true of that country that "the pendulum violently lurched forward will speedily swing back." But Lord Morley has steadily held to his course with unswerving courage: and history will, I think, speak with no uncertain voice as to his place in India's story. (Cheers.)

THE CONDITION OF INDIA.

PROSPERITY AND POVERTY.

Mr. Montagu went on to say it was self-evident that the Government of India by England had been for India's material prosperity. He was not blind to the fact that, unfortunately, a vast number of people in India live their whole lives in extreme poverty, but he asserted that poverty had been decreasing under British rule. Examining the trade returns he showed that in 1858, the earliest year for which we have figures, the total sea-borne trade of India was £39,750,000. Last year it was £203,000,000, an increase in the half-century of more than 500 per cent. Again, the revenue of India, which was last year £74,250,000, had more than doubled during the last 50 years, and this although the sources of revenue have remained almost unchanged. Land revenue, a rough index of agricultural prosperity, had increased (if measured in rupees) by 60 per cent. Moreover, the increase had been concurrent with a very much greater increase in the value of the gross agricultural yield, and was in no way the result of increasing burdens.

Then, again, we in England had lent India vast sums of money for the purposes of internal development. The total amount invested by Englishmen in commercial concerns in India had been estimated roughly at a minimum figure of £350,000,000. But

SPEECHES OF THE RT. HON. MR. E. S. MONTAGU.

leaving out of account investments in private concerns, for calculations about that were largely guess-work, it might safely be estimated that upwards of £130,000,000 had been lent by England to the Indian Government for what were technically called "public works purposes"—that was to say, for the construction and development of railways and irrigation canals. The total amount of what was called "ordinary debt"—that was to say, dead weight debt, corresponding to our National Debt at home—was £42,250,000, a ridiculously insignificant sum compared with the £700,000,000 with which we were burdened here.

THE "DRAIN" UPON INDIA.

By a curious perversion of reasoning this loan from England to India was regarded by a certain school of thought, fortunately small, as an offence to us because it entailed the payment of interest, and the annual payments made by India to England were spoken of as a "drain" by the latter on the former. It would be absurd, of course, to take credit upon ourselves for having lent money to India; but so it was grotesque to regard the payment of the very moderate rate of interest at which India could obtain this capital in England and put it to an immensely profitable use in India

THE CONDITION OF INDIA.

as the bleeding of a helpless people by a tyrannical capitalist nation.

The so-called "drain," in the eyes of those who alleged its existence, consisted, however, not only of the interest on debt but of the whole of the annual remittances of the Government of India for the purposes of defraying what were called, "home charges"—that was to say, payments made in England from Indian revenues. Last year these amounted to just over £19,000,000, of which interest on debt accounted for rather more than half. Of the balance the principal item was pensions and furlough pay to European officers amounting to 5½ millions, while about one million was attributable to Army and Marine effective charges and about one million to stores purchased in England, such as railway rolling stock and material which could not be manufactured in India. Army and Marine effective charges were the payments made by India to the War Office and Admiralty for services rendered to her by the British Army and the British Navy, and were part of the price of her security. In the case of stores, the benefit to India was obvious and direct; it no more involved a "drain" than the purchase by the British Government of a French dirigible balloon involved a "drain" from England to France. In the case of pensionary and furlough payments the benefit to

India was indirect, but it was none the less real. Unless India was to be severed from all connexion with England, the administration must contain a nucleus of European officers. That nucleus was small enough. Europeans in the Indian Civil Service actually engaged in the administration of the country at any given moment numbered only 955—that was to say, there was one to about every 230,000 of the population.

Turning to the moral welfare of India, Mr. Montagu said he might repeat what he had said elsewhere, that, though some times our methods might have been shortsighted and our means crude—these were inevitable features of great experiments, however lofty and disinterested the aims of those who made them might be—the situation was full of hope. We had sown Western ideas in Eastern fields; our harvest was ripening. We were too much inclined to regard the whole problem of Indian administration as wrapped up in the problem of meeting the spirit of unrest that had been kindled in a small fraction of the people of India. Perhaps hardly one in a hundred of the population of India was aware that a spirit of unrest was abroad. Still less must we permit our views to be vitiated by the occasional occurrence of political crime. Outrages and crime were, numeri-

THE CONDITION OF INDIA.

cally, very rare, and had nothing to do with the real spirit of unrest.

THE ARTICLES IN THE "TIMES."

I am the more unwilling to enter at length into the question of "unrest," in that, since I made my Budget speech, a series of articles has been published in the "Times" on this subject. The writer, it is an open secret, is Mr. Valentine Chirol, the well-known writer on Eastern questions and foreign editor of the "Times." They deal with the question from every conceivable point of view, and run, I think, to about 75 columns. I am glad to hear that they are to be re-published in book form, when they will be more accessible. It would be idle to pretend that I am in agreement with all that they contain; in fact, the writer more than once attacks statements made by me. But this does not prevent me from recognising the infinitely careful research of which they are the fruit, the moderate tone that they adopt, their pregnant arguments and illuminating exposition, the thoroughness with which every branch of the question has been examined and set forth. It would perhaps be ungracious and presumptuous for me to say anything in criticism of these articles—ungracious because everyone who takes an interest in Indian problems must recognise the debt of gratitude that he owes to Mr. Chirol for his masterly illumination of

the causes, progress, and ramifications of the complex movement that we call Indian unrest; presumptuous because he has made a minute and laborious examination of conditions on the spot, and I have not. But this much I may perhaps be permitted to say. I venture with the greatest respect to suggest that he does not give sufficient prominence to the paramount necessity of drawing a line between the healthy and natural growth of aspiration that we ourselves have awakened and the small malignant growth that manifests itself in political crime.

“ REPRESSION AND CONCESSION. ”

It is often very difficult to draw the line: sometimes it seems almost impossible. But it must be drawn if we are to do our duty by India, even if it sometimes involves giving the benefit of the doubt. The malignant growth must be cut out by the relentless application of the knife, but we must not let the knife slip in doing so. Still less must, we for security's sake, deliberately cut away the sound with the rotten. The policy of “ blended repression and concession ”—I seem to detect a note of hostility in that compendious jingle—is the only possible policy for dealing with the “ unrest ” problem. I do not like either word. I do not like repression because unless it is made clear that it is applied only to crime it suggests unsympathetic and un-English methods,

THE CONDITION OF INDIA.

Still less do I like the word "concession," which is wholly inept, because it suggests going beyond the requirements of strict justice for the purpose of conciliation. It should be made clear that repression and concession, accepting the words for the moment, are not alternative policies applied in turn to the same section of the community, but concurrent policies applied to different sections of the community, it is often suggested by journalists less dignified and less fair than Mr. Chirol that our policy is to give so-called "concessions" for the purpose of ingratiating, in order that we may be in a better position to defend ourselves when we want to take so-called "repressive" measures; that we grease the wheels of Indian opinion with the former, in order that the latter may run more easily. They adopt a different and metaphor call it, with more brevity than grace, the "powder and jam policy" By whatever name it is called it is, of course, a groundless calumny (Cheers)

THE INDIA OFFICE AND THE CIVIL SERVICE.

There is one point in which I venture with all respect to suggest that Mr Chirol is definitely unfair towards the Government of which I am a member, and that is in his allegations regarding the attitude of the India office towards the Indian Civil Service. "An unfortunate impression," he says, 'has undoubtedly been created during the last few

years in the Indian Civil Service that there is no longer the same assurance of such support and encouragement either from Whitehall or from Simla " and he goes on to speak of "the frigid tone of official utterances in Parliament, which have seemed more often inspired by a desire to avoid party embarrassments at Westminster than to protect public servants, who have no means of defending themselves, against even the grossest forms of misrepresentation and calumny, leading straight to the revolver and the bomb of the political assassin." An accusation that Government attaches more importance to the avoidance of party embarrassments than to the protection of their servants from assassination is not one that should have been lightly made. Mr. Chirol adduces no specific instance in support of his statement. * I hope he will forgive me if I suggest that he would find it impossible to do so

I am sure that Mr Chirol is not in sympathy with the contention that the Indian official should, as a matter of high policy, be exempt from outside criticism. Place a man outside the pale of criticism and he will deteriorate, that is a universal law to which there is nothing in the conditions of India to make that country an exception. On the contrary, the very irresponsibility of the Indian official to the people whom he governs makes proper criticism the more salutary. The Home Government and the

THE CONDITION OF INDIA.

British Parliament, together with the Press and the cable, replace at present an electorate to which he is directly responsible. He has to answer and welcome honest criticism and to establish his prestige on the only certain foundation—justification of his action. This plea for freedom from criticism has been put forward on the ground of prestige, not so much by the Service itself as by ill-advised persons outside it, and the Service has had to suffer. Very largely owing to this, the Anglo-Indian has become the constant quarry of a small section of the British public. Their criticism in its more moderate form assumes that he is unsympathetic, aloof, arrogant, narrow, a cog in a relentless machine. From this it soon follows that in their eyes nothing he does can do good, no motive is pure; in every question the presumption of guilt is always against him. He is subjected to constant, unreasoning, ill-informed, cruel and cowardly disparagement. This sort of thing can do nothing but harm, just as honest and well-informed criticism can do nothing but good. It irritates and takes the heart out of him and drives his apologists to claim on his behalf immunity from criticism to an unreasonable extent.

• MR. RAMSAY MACDONALD'S BOOK.

As I have had occasion to denounce in public more than once, this habit on the part of certain

people in England of imputing to the Englishman in India a sudden and complete loss of all the English virtues on the possession of which is detractors so pride themselves, I should like to call public attention to an example of the sort of criticism to which no one can object, which does real service to Indian Government, not sparing the faults, but moderate and good-tempered, well-informed and brilliantly vivid. I have in my mind Mr Ramsay MacDonald's recent book "The Awakening of India" I think he was in the country for about two months. If all itinerant politicians in India spent their time as well as he, that now classical poem, "Padgett, M P," would never have been written! I do not, of course, mean by this to put an official endorsement on all Mr MacDonald's arguments, still less on all his conclusions, with some of which I profoundly disagree, and I think he has once or twice dropped momentarily from the very high standard of criticism he set himself. But Mr. MacDonald went out with an open mind to see for himself. He comes back out of sympathy with some of the stock shibboleths of the party towards which he naturally inclined, and he has honestly and squarely said so. Similarly, he found much to criticise in our administration, and he has spoken his opinion with no less good humour than vigour and conviction. Criticism of this kind never

THE CONDITION OF INDIA.

did anything but good. Its effect on the person criticised, if he is an honest man with a well balanced mind and sense of humour, will be like that of a cold bath, it may convey a startling shock for the moment, but its after effect will be invigorating. Mr. MacDonald's book should be a model for those who write on political holidays.

Indeed, this has been the wonderful year in the history of literature dealing with India. First comes M Chailley's disinterested, dispassionate view of an interesting question in which he has no concern save that of an onlooker. He describes with great knowledge and hesitates to prescribe. He shows a remarkable appreciation of the British love of order and of government, the British genius for altruistic rule. Then comes Mr. Chirol, the anatomist, with great knowledge, indefatigable research, large view, great control making a work of reference on one respect of Indian conditions as they are, and lastly Mr. MacDonald, a portrait painter, an impressionist, with his peculiar gift of gaining glimpses and conveying them to its readers.

These three gentlemen have helped the problem of the Empire which we are engrossed on your behalf. I say advisedly 'on your behalf' and that is why I commend their efforts to your attention." (Cheers.)

INDIAN HIGH COURTS BILL.

SPEECH DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF
COMMONS ON JULY 21, 1911.

In moving "that the Bill be now read a second time," Mr. Montagu said :—

In asking the House to agree to the second reading of this measure. I do not think it will be necessary to occupy much time, because so far as the House is concerned it is a very unimportant measure indeed. But I want to explain it as fully as I can, because, as at present advised, I propose, if the House gives it a Second Reading, to move that it be retained on the floor of the House, and I will ask the House to be so good as to pass the subsequent stages of the Bill without discussion, which is not in any way necessary. The reason for introducing the measure at all is the great congestion of legal affairs in India at present. The House will agree with me that if you have great arrears in the Law Courts the delay of justice very frequently amounts to a denial of justice. I have only to read to the House some figures concerning the Calcutta High Court to show what I mean. In 1908 the

INDIAN HIGH COURTS BILL.

cases in arrears on the appellate side of this Court were 5,245. At the end of June, 1911, the number of civil appeal cases pending was no less than 8,389. The Courts work as hard as any Courts could possibly work. Every kind of re-arrangement has been attempted, but it has now become obvious, not only to every Judge of the High Court, but to the Government of Bengal and the Government of India, that the time has come to ask for the raising of the maximum number of Judges in the Courts. At the same time, because I think it is desirable in these matters to be prescient, a similar increase of the maximum possible Judges in India is asked for, where is no fear that the Government of India will abuse the power for which it asks. The Courts of Madras and Bombay, which have a maximum of fifteen now, have got eight Judges, so that it is for future and not for immediate application that the first clause of this Bill includes them. I should like, before I dismiss this clause, to remind the House that there is no excess of Judges in India at the present moment. The maximum number of Judges of the High Court in Bengal and Eastern Bengal is now fifteen.

There are 86,000,000 people there. In England and Wales the population is 33,000,000, and there are thirty-three Judges of the High Court.

Now I come to the ~~second~~^{second} clause, which is highly technical, and only, I think, of technical importance. There is no immediate desire to establish a new High Court anywhere in India, but the Government of England desire to be able to cope with circumstances which may arise by a less clumsy method than having to wait for an opportunity to pass an Act of Parliament while justice is being delayed. It is possible for the Government of India at present to immediately establish a new Chief Court anywhere. Anyone familiar with the Indian Courts will appreciate the difference between Chief Court and a High Court, and I venture to suggest that it will not be wise to drive the Government of India for the sake of expediency and the saving of time to the establishment of a Chief Court, having regard to the circumstance that in prestige, dignity and confidence the High Court is the better alternative. In the Act of 1861 it was enacted that a High Court might be established by letters patent in any area where no existing High Court has jurisdiction. At that time the well-known appreciation of the advantages of litigation, which is a characteristic of the Indian people, had not yet developed so far as it has at the present moment. It was not contemplated that it would be necessary at any time, I think, to establish new Chief Courts or new High Courts in areas in which existing

INDIAN HIGH COURTS BILL.

High Courts affected by that Act already had jurisdiction, and I submit that if it should become necessary in the future to establish a High Court or a Chief Court, Parliament should adopt the same procedure with regard to this as was adopted by our predecessors under the Act of 1861

There is only one other clause in the Bill of any importance which is clause 3. It deals with the appointment of temporary Judges. There is no intention at any time that the number of Judges, temporary or permanent, in any Court in India, should exceed the maximum number prescribed by this Act. If a Judge is away on leave or if a Judge is ill, at present it is possible for the Lieutenant-Governor of a Province to appoint a temporary Judge on his behalf, but even if there is not the maximum number of Judges at the time occupying seats on the Bench, if there is a lesser number than the maximum number of possible Judges, which is fifteen, and there are only fourteen, and there are great arrears which the Government of India is anxious to wipe off, they have no power to appoint a temporary Judge. The only possible way in which it can be done is to appoint a new permanent Judge, raising the number to the maximum of fifteen and leaving no vacancy. That is a very cumbrous method, and it may lead to overstocking the Bench and these powers allowing the Government generally to-

appoint temporary Judges up to the maximum number with a view to clearing off arrears are, I think, necessitated in the interests of economy and of speed in dealing with legal matters. We are only asking for power to appoint temporary Judges. The House will agree with me, I think, that this measure does not require any elaborate Debate, and I think that all classes in India will welcome its speedy passage for the improvement of the legal machinery in the Provinces of India.

THE INDIAN POLICE.

POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. Montagu, M. P., Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for India, has addressed the following letter to a correspondent:—
India Office, 23rd September, 1911.

Dear Sir,—You inquire whether I can give you any information regarding the nature of the statement that I intended to make on the debate on the Indian police, which was to have taken place on the motion for adjournment of the House of Commons last month. As you are aware, the attention of the House of Commons was exclusively occupied on that occasion with the serious labour troubles in England, and I am glad to have this opportunity of communicating to you what I was thus prevented from saying to the House.

First as to the Midnapore case. On this there could have been no discussion; fairness to those involved demands suspension of judgment until the appeal has been heard. But I may remind you that Mr. Justice Fletcher's judgment did not endorse all the suggestions of the learned Chief Justice in the criminal trial, notably the suggestion about the bomb. The decision was, however, generally adverse to the police officers and they have filed an appeal. Every one must hope that these officers, whose

LETTER OF THE RT. HON. MR. E. S. MONTAGU.

record of service is of the very highest, will be able to clear themselves from charges which, if substantiated, must entail the very gravest results to their careers. No one will wish to 'prejudice the last stages of the trial, nor, I think, would any one desire that the Government, for whom these men have laboured all their lives, and in whose service they have erred, if erred they have, should fail to provide the funds for giving them every chance of clearing themselves. (This course is strictly in accordance with precedent.)

Meanwhile the men will not be employed in administrative office, and the promotions gazetted immediately after the hearing of the civil case—promotions which would, in ordinary circumstances, have been matters of normal routine—have been cancelled. These are suspensory steps, in no way final or condemnatory, but wise, as I think you will agree, pending the hearing in the Court of Appeal. I may add that in future all proposals for promotion or bestowal of honorary titles are to be held in abeyance in cases where inquiry or legal proceedings are pending

This is all that can be said about the Midnapore case. 'But I intend also to take the opportunity of announcing to the House certain new rules and regulations for the better control of the Indian police.

THE INDIAN POLICE.

A TRIBUTE TO THE FORCE.

In the first place may I remind you of a few facts and figures ? The police in India are an indigenous agency numbering 177,000 men with only 500 European Superintendents. They deal with a population of 244 millions spread over an area of eleven million square miles. This force has to preserve the public peace and to maintain order in a country where there is little public opinion or civic sense as we know it in England to assist them. It performs its duties with great bravery and energy. Its superior officers have often to supervise areas of over 5,000 square miles, and under their scanty supervision the indigenous police loyally fight dacoity, murder, robbery, and all the violent crimes to which the general population, now assured of security by their aid, would otherwise be exposed. No praise could possibly be too high for the conduct of members of the force in recent years in quarters where it has been necessary to deal with anarchical conspiracy ; of men who have steadily pursued the path of duty, knowing well that they risked their lives, until perhaps a bullet in the back in a dark by-street has ended a career of humble but heroic service to the State.

No greater mistake could be made than to imagine that the distressing cases of torture about

LETTER OF THE RT. HON. MR. E. S. MONTAGU.

which questions are asked in Parliament are the rule. They are, indeed, the very rare exceptions. When they occur, attention is immediately directed to them, and every effort is made to prevent recurrence. The annual average number of convictions for torture during the last six years is nine. This, out of a force of 177,000, is a record of which many European forces might be proud. You, I am sure, do not associate yourself with the cruel and unfounded suggestion that British officials try to hush those cases up. I may remind you that the superior officers are, if anything, disposed to err on the other side, and many prosecutions are brought for charges which cannot be substantiated.¹

Of course, I have never denied that scandals occur occasionally. As long as these scandals continue to occur so long will the Government of India continue to devote themselves unceasingly to stamping out the evil that remains.

It was my intention to inform the House of Commons of certain measures that have recently been taken with this object. These measures must not be regarded as the sudden move of an Administration hitherto inactive. On the contrary, they are the latest instalment of a history of continuous improvement. For fifty years there has been steady, unremitting effort to improve the police by means of Commissions, legislative inquiries, executive

THE INDIAN POLICE.

orders, training schools, and so forth, but most of all by quiet Departmental methods of exhortation, example and punishment. In this way natural merits have been developed and natural imperfections eliminated.

MAGISTRATES AND CONFESSIONS.

The most dangerous natural imperfection is the tendency to rely on confession, which inevitably involves the temptation to apply pressure. The maxim, "*optimum habemus testem confitentem reum*," formerly recognised in Europe, still appeals to the Indian mind. It was laid down many years ago that no inducement was to be offered for a confession, that no confession was to be recorded by police, that no confession made by any one in police custody was to be admissible in evidence, and that no prisoner was to be detained in police custody for more than twenty-four hours. It has been further laid down that only magistrates can record confessions, and that a magistrate must be satisfied that the confession is being made voluntarily.

The magistrate's part is important, and with a view to seeing that it shall be performed adequately, the Government of India have recently collected the various orders dealing with the matter in the different provinces in order to prescribe uniform and efficient procedure and to eliminate opportunity for

LETTER OF THE RT. HON. MR. E. S. MONTAGU

abuse by interested officers. In future the power to record confessions will be confined to (a) magistrates having jurisdiction in the case, (b) first-class magistrates (magistrates of high standing and large powers), or (c) specially selected second-class magistrates. Owing to considerations of time and distance a certain elasticity is necessary, but third-class magistrates will no longer record confessions. The Government of India have further prescribed that the Bombay rule which enjoins the examination of a confessing prisoner should be invariably adopted. The police interested must be ordered out of Court, the accused must be asked whether he has been ill-treated, and if there is reason to suspect ill treatment there must be a medical examination.

Certain further measures are under consideration. Local Governments have been asked to consider whether it is advantageous to have confessions recorded at all before the trial begins except in very special circumstances or by order of the District Magistrate. There is, moreover, to be an exhaustive inquiry into the conduct of lock-ups with a view to obtaining proper supervision. The police are already forbidden access to the gaols, and the Government of India are considering the possibility of a rule that no prisoner who has confessed should be given back to police custody, and also that no

THE INDIAN POLICE.

confession should be recorded until the person confessing has spent one night out of police custody.

So much for preventive measures. It must be remembered that the restrictions on the police are, especially as regards remands and confessions, already far greater than in England. There is a maximum of precaution beyond which it is impossible to go without crippling the force. We must not, in our anxiety to prevent opportunity for occasional and isolated abuse, render the police and detection difficult or impossible. Nor must we refuse a confidence which the vast majority of the Indian police thoroughly merits. If we refuse confidence we kill all sense of responsibility, all zeal for improvement, and sap the loyal energy and *esprit de corps* upon which we must rely for the preservation of peace.

ABUSE OF POWER.

I pass on to describe one or two new measures of importance of a deterrent nature which have been taken in order to increase the efficiency of the police and the confidence of the public by advertising widely the grave view that Government takes of abuse of power.

Orders have been given that punishment of police officers, judicial or departmental, shall be widely published. They will be inserted regularly in the "Police Gazette." Steps will also be taken to

LETTER OF THE RT. HON. MR. E. S. MONTAGU.

bring home both to the public and the police that the merits or fitness for promotion of police officers are not judged by statistical results or the number of convictions obtained.

Further than this, the Government of India, recognising that the importance of securing public confidence in the genuineness of inquiries must prevail over departmental considerations, have urged Local Governments that, in inquiring into allegations of police misconduct, there should be freer recourse to magisterial inquiry. When inquiries are consequent on strictures passed by magistrates in the course of a judgment there is to be inquiry by a superior officer of police when the charge is unimportant or a magisterial inquiry when the charge is serious. When a serious charge is made by a superior Court, and the Court indicates the necessity for inquiry, there is to be automatically a public inquiry by two officers, and one of these is to be an officer of judicial experience. Of course, where a prosecution is possible, it takes place, and no inquiry is needed; but as regards other cases, I am sure you will regard these new rules for adequate inquiry as satisfactory.

This is, I think, the substance of what I should have said in other circumstances in the House.—

Yours, etc.,

EDWIN S. MONTAGU.

LIBERALISM AND INDIA.

SPEECH AT CAMBRIDGE.

GUILDHALL, FEBRUARY 28, 1912.

The Hon. E. S. Montagu, M.P., Under-Secretary of State for India, visited Cambridge on February 28, and in his capacity as President of the Cambridge and County Liberal Club, addressed a large meeting at the Guildhall. The chair was taken by Dr. APTHORPE WEBB, and among those upon the platform were Mr. A. C. Beck, M.P., Sir J. J. Briscoe, *Bart*, Dr. Sims Woodhead (Professor of Pathology), Dr. J. S. Reid (Professor of Ancient History) and Dr. Scarle, F.R.S.

Mr. MONTAGU, after devoting the opening portion of his speech to domestic questions, continued :—

TRUE EMPIRE-BUILDING.

I want, also, to invite your attention to the other branch of the justification of our Imperial organisation—our oversea activities—and I am going to contend, and, I think, prove, that the Empire, as we know it, and the ideal which it fulfils, is the production of the Liberal Party. Englishmen

have a conception of Empire different from that of their predecessors or forefathers and different from that of other countries, an ideal which alone justifies the existence of an Empire. It is not enough for this thinking generation to wave a flag or shout a song or do a turkey strut in pompous celebration of the number of square miles over which the British flag flies, or the population which owes its allegiance to his Majesty the King. Land has been won by conquest often under Conservative rule, not by Conservative statesmen, but by British Scotch—and I would remind you in this important juncture—by Irish soldiers on behalf of an Imperial ideal which should know no party. (Applause) But it is not a question of land, but of hearts. It is not a question of domination and of subjugation, but of alliance, co-operation and perfect freedom between the 'component parts. Empires have died or been destroyed either from deterioration at home, which the legislation of the last six years is designed to combat, or through the denial of justice or arrogant misrule which makes the yoke galling to the younger parts. We should use our administration and our legislation at home as an example to those sister nations who are linked with us, and we should make our Imperial ideal one of spreading throughout the Empire free institutions, and all that is meant by the wonderful word "justice." If this be true, then, if

LIBERALISM AND INDIA.

you will bear with me while I go into history, I think I can show that the freedom of the Empire has been the gift of Liberalism, which has ensured its permanency in the teeth of a short-sighted, stubborn Conservatism.

CANADA AND SOUTH AFRICA.

The keystone of Canadian loyalty is the freedom of the Canadian people. Yet Lord Stanley, speaking in the House of Commons in 1839, voiced the opinions of the Conservative Party, when he said: "What would be the consequence of granting the Canadian demand? The establishment of a Republic. The concession would remove the only check to the tyrannical power of the dominant majority, a majority in numbers only, while in wealth, education and enterprise they are greatly inferior to the minority." Translated into Carsonian English they could imagine how it would sound: "Ontario will fight, and Ontario will be right." (Laughter and applause.) And then you had the Duke of Wellington in the House of Lords: "Local responsible Government and the sovereignty of Great Britain are completely incompatible." Well, Canada has not moved a step towards separation nor Republican institutions, yet Canada is divided only by an imaginery line from the greatest and most progressive Republic in the world, and the tie of free

SPEECHES OF THE RT. HON. MR. E. S. MONTAGU.

association within the Empire has held in face of the strongest natural and political attractions. From that the Conservatives ought to have learnt a lesson in Empire-building, but they learnt nothing. When more than fifty years had passed, when Canada was becoming increasingly loyal and prosperous, we came to South Africa. Had the Conservatives learnt anything in Empire-building? The Lyttelton Constitution, rejected by the Dutch, fraught with friction and irritation at every step, was their best performance! When, fortunately, and by the mercy of heaven, the end of their reign came, and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman by his application to South Africa of the liberal principles of freedom, laid the foundations of the South African Union, of another Canada in Africa, which in my opinion justified the policy of the British Empire in the eyes of the world, yet the then leader of the Conservative Party, Mr. Balfour, called our policy "the most reckless experiment of modern times," and declined to take any responsibility for this experiment in principle and civilisation, and there once again we have the Conservatives objecting to a Liberal institution, which I think is the only principle of modern Empire-building.

THE TURN OF INDIA.

Well, then, when these principles of Self-Government had been applied in their most extreme

LIBERALISM AND INDIA.

form, came the turn of India, when Lord Morley introduced his Indian Councils Act in 1909. Here was no far-reaching scheme, here was no reckless experiment, merely a cautious attempt to associate the governed with the governor and to give expression to popular opinion in India. And we had the late Lord Percy in the House of Commons saying, "Therefore, although it is our duty to warn the Government of the dangers which in our opinion attend many of the steps which we are recommending, the responsibility of acting upon or neglecting the warning must rest with the Government themselves." And we had the usual carping criticism of Lord Curzon. Well, nobody can doubt the success of the Indian Councils Act, but still the Conservatives have learnt no better. The latest efforts in Imperial workmanship were the far-reaching reforms announced the other day at Delhi as the central feature of his Majesty's successful visit to his Indian dominions. It would be improper for me to discuss these reforms without prefacing my remarks with a word of my own personal belief that the great outstanding triumph of that Indian tour was the personality of King George himself. The good results of his gracious voyage to India will long outlive the pleasure afforded to the Indian people by the opportunity of demonstrating their overwhelming loyalty to the British Throne. But what of

SPEECHES OF THE RT. HON. MR. E. S. MONTAGU

our policy, what of the new provinces and Delhi? You have invited a Departmental Minister to occupy the office of President, and you have so brought it upon your heads that I should take, as I am bound to take this, an opportunity which does not assort ill with the theme of our discussion, of answering the critics of that scheme.

THE DURBAR ANNOUNCEMENTS.

In the House of Commons Mr. Bonar Law dismissed it with two criticisms; firstly, that it would cost money; and, secondly, that the reversal of the partition of Bengal, as he called it, was a damaging blow to our prestige. I would say in passing that the complaint about expense as the first objection to a great Imperial measure is typical of modern Conservatism. To them, ideals, poetry, liberty, imagination are unknown; they reduce Empire to a profit and loss account; their ideal is one of a cash nexus, and a million or two is to them far more important than the fact that the transfer of capital provides India with a new city, in a historic place, amid the enthusiastic welcome of the whole of a tradition-loving people. And as for prestige—O India, how much happier would have been your history if that word had been left out of the English vocabulary! But there you have Conservative Imperialism at its worst: we are not there, mark

LIBERALISM AND INDIA.

you, to repair evil, to amend injustice, to profit by experience—we must abide by our mistakes, continue to outrage popular opinion simply for the sake of being able to say “I have said what I have said.” I have in other places and at other times expressed my opinion freely on prestige. We do not hold India by invoking this well mouthed word we must hold it by just institutions, and more and more as time goes on by the consent of the governed. That consent must be based on the respect which we shall teach them for the progressive justice of the Government in responding to their legitimate demands. But Mr. Bonar Law knows nothing of India, as he will be the first to admit, and it is to the House of Lords that we must turn for a more exhaustive criticism of our proposals.

LORD CURZON'S ATTITUDE.

And here we come face to face with the great Lord Curzon himself. Now, Sir, no one who has held my office for two years would be absurd enough to speak on a public platform upon this topic without paying a tribute to the great work Lord Curzon has done for India. His indomitable energy, his conspicuous courage, his almost unrivalled self-confidence have placed India under a lasting debt to him. But I would venture, with all respect, to ask how has he spent his time since? Admiring what.

he has done, not looking and saying, "We have done this," but saying, "This is my work." In the lengthy speech which he delivered last week in the House of Lords he did lip-service of Parliamentary control, but notwithstanding the fact that Lord Midleton was sitting next to him, notwithstanding the fact that it was Mr. Brodrick, as he then was, not Lord Curzon, who was technically responsible for a large part of the Curzonian administration, he never mentioned the Secretary of State in the whole course of his speech, nor did Lord Midleton speak himself. Lord Curzon has chosen as a point of survey for the work of which he is so proud a point in which he is in his own light, and his shadow is over everything that he has done. It is not "Hands off India" that he preaches it is "Leave Curzonian India as Lord Curzon left it." To alter anything that Lord Curzon did would be damaging to our prestige. I want to ask you in all seriousness what would be the first criticism which a man wholly ignorant of India—the man-in-the-street—would make to Lord Curzon's speech? I think he would say: "We read of the welcome given in India and in England to this scheme by statesmen, soldiers, civil servants, by speech and by Press of all parties, and we know, therefore, that it is not wholly bad." Therefore, am

LIBERALISM AND INDIA

I not justified in discounting the whole of Lord Curzon's speech by the fact that, although he went into exhaustive details, although he knew the sensitive nature of Indian opinion, the way in which his words would be telegraphed throughout India, although he did not hesitate to bolster up his case with a gossiping story which, as he told it, was obviously untrue and for which he could not state his authority in public, he had no word of praise of any sort or kind either for the conception of our policy or for any detail by which it was carried out—(applause)—although he spoke even longer than I am speaking to-night; he curses it from beginning to end; he curses it for what it did and for how it was done; he curses it because we did it without consulting him—oh, horror of horrors!—and because it ended something which he had done; he cursed it because his Majesty the King was graciously pleased himself to announce it to his people assembled at the Durbar at Delhi. I say again that these are not the grave and weighty criticisms of a statesman: they are the impetuous, angry fault-findings of a man thinking primarily of himself.

THE STORY OF 1905.

May I take his criticisms in a little more detail? He objected to his Majesty making the announcement because, he said, that made it irre-

vocable. Well, educated India reads with full knowledge the words of his Majesty's proclamation: "I make this change on the advice of my Ministers," and knows what is meant by a constitutional monarch, and that blame, if there be blame, and credit, if there be credit, must be laid at the door of his Majesty's advisers. Lord Curzon complains that what the King has said is irrevocable; so I hope it may be, but if it had been made by the Viceroy, Lord Curzon would have said it is irrevocable, and surely what is said by the Viceroy on the King's behalf is as irrevocable as what the King said. In fact, as the Prime Minister said, "What Lord Curzon might do in Lord Curzon's opinion his Majesty the King ought not to do." (Laughter and applause.) Then he asks why Parliament was not consulted. It is a little curious that he should blame us in this regard, for he objects to our having reversed, as he says, a policy of his. Lord Curzon's partition of Bengal was an accomplished fact before any discussion in the House of Commons had taken place. Mr. Herbert Roberts asked Mr. Brodrick on July 5, 1905, a question, and was told "The proposals of the Government of India on this subject reached me on February 18, and I have already communicated to them the decision of the Secretary of State in Council accepting the proposals." But the proposals them-

LIBERALISM AND INDIA.

selves were not divulged. Mr. Roberts, having moved the adjournment of the House on the question of the partition, withdrew his motion on Mr. Brodrick's promising to lay further papers. The recess intervened, during which the proclamation, which finally constituted the new provinces, was issued, and when Mr. Roberts protested against this treatment he received from Mr. Brodrick, a letter from which I quote the following passage: "You will remember that when the discussion took place in the House of Commons the scheme put forward by the Viceroy had already received the assent of the Home Government, and the resolution of the Government of India embodying the scheme has been published and presented to Parliament." Again, Lord Curzon says that the decision in the case of his partition was announced after a Blue-book full of information had been for months in the possession of Parliament. What are the facts? After despatches had been passed between the Government of India and the Secretary of State, the decision was announced in a resolution of the Government of India, dated July 19, 1905. The resolution was presented to Parliament in the form of a White-paper on August 7, and a Blue-book, containing further papers, was presented on October 12—i.e., almost

three months after, not months before, the announcement of the decision.

THE REAL RESPONSIBILITY.

The fact of the matter is, the Secretary of State is responsible to the House of Commons, and the House of Commons can censure him or the Cabinet just as much as it could have done if the Viceroy had made the announcement. The House of Commons has never claimed more than a general control over the Government of India therefore announcements such as the partition of Bengal, and new administrative changes which must be made suddenly and by proclamation, conflicting interests, conflicting claims having to be balanced and adjusted, public discussions would make them difficult, if not impossible, of accomplishment; and that is why the British and the Indian Constitution retain the Royal proclamation as a method of bringing about such changes as this in India or the Self-Government of the Transvaal.

WHY THE PARTITION WAS REVERSED?

Next, Lord Curzon stated that our policy involved a reversal of his policy. I trust Lord Curzon will forgive me for saying that he never had a policy at all. (Laughter and applause.) He was a mere administrator, an industrious, fervid and

LIBERALISM AND INDIA.

efficient administrator. He was, in a word, a chauffeur who spent his time polishing up the machinery, screwing every nut and bolt of his car ready to make it go, but he never drove it; he did not know where to drive it to. (Applause.) He merely marked time and waited until a reforming Government gave marching orders. If he were to claim that the partition of Bengal was more than an administrative measure, designed as a part of a policy, then I say that it was even a worse mistake than I thought it, for the making of a Mahomedan State was a departure from accepted British policy which was bound to result in the antithesising and antagonising of Hindu and Mahomedan opinion. I had always hoped that this was the unforeseen result, and not a deliberate achievement, of Lord Curzon's blunder. It has always been the proud boast of English rule in India that we have not interfered between the different races, religions and creeds which we found in the country. That he himself regarded the partition as not more than a mere matter of local administrative convenience may be gathered from the passage in his speech in which he says that, owing to the size of the old Province of Bengal, it had become necessary to draw a line dividing it into two; and he goes on to say "What was the particular line to be drawn was a matter not for the Viceroy." The creation of a vast new province, the

meddling with the lives of millions of people, with all the possibility of offending religious and racial susceptibilities, not a matter for the Viceroy! He looked no further than the necessity for instituting two small provinces where previously there had been one, and thought it not a matter for his concern what line the division should take. So far from being a reversal of Lord Curzon's policy, if policy it can be called, are the changes announced on December 12 last, that we maintained the necessity for the division of the province, but have made three where he made two divisions.

THE NEW POLICY.

Where the difference lies is in this: that we have endeavoured to look ahead, to co-ordinate our changes in Bengal with the general lines of our future policy in India, which is stated now for the first time in the Government of India's despatch that has been published as a Parliamentary Paper. That statement shows the goal, the aim towards which we propose to work—not immediately, not in a hurry, but gradually. Perhaps you will allow me to quote the sentence in the despatch which contains the *pfth* of the statement: "The only possible solution would appear to be gradually to give the provinces a larger measure of Self-Government until at last India would consist of a number

LIBERALISM AND INDIA.

of administrative autonomies in all provincial affairs with the Government of India above them all, and possessing power to interfere in cases of misgovernment, but ordinarily restricting their functions to matters of Imperial concern." We cannot drift on for ever without stating a policy. A new generation, a new school of thought, fostered by our education and new European learning, has grown up, and it asks "What are you going to do with us?" The extremist politicians, who form the outside fringe of this school, have made up their minds what they want. One of their leaders, Mr. Bepin Chandra Pal, has drawn up and published a full, frank, detailed, logical exposition of the exact form of "swaraj," or, as may be roughly translated, "Colonial Self-Government," that they want. The moderates look to us to say what lines our future policy is to take. We have never answered that, and we have put off answering them far too long. At last, and not too soon, a Viceroy has had the courage to state the trend of British policy in India and the lines on which we propose to advance.

THE TRANSFER OF THE CAPITAL.

As for the transfer of the capital from Calcutta to Delhi, Lord Curzon objects, as far as I can understand, because the Duke of Wellington thought

Delhi was a bad military centre. The Duke of Wellington was not one of our greatest contemporary soldiers. His interference in military matters dates from a time when there were no railways in India, and to mention even one detail, when artillery had not reached its present perfection. The battle of Waterloo is a long way removed from present problems; we have taken our stand and placed our king's Government in the historic capital of India. He talks of Calcutta, the capital of India of 150 years; Delhi, the scene of a King's Durbar—and, yes, of Lord Curzon's Durbar—has been the capital of India for dynasty after dynasty, for family of rulers after family of rulers, right back into the dim and distant epochs of Indian history, and it is revered from one end of India to the other. I venture to say that we have chosen a spot not only the centre of India from every point of view, not only the most convenient for the carrying out of administration effectively, but also one which would appeal to Indian opinion of all classes and all kinds from one end of India to the other. Lord Curzon goes on to say that if you put the capital at Delhi you will have a capital remote from public opinion, I say it will be remote from Calcutta opinion, and that the Government will survey India from the real centre of India, from an eminence in the midst of India.

LIBERALISM AND INDIA.

and not from a depression in the corner. It will no longer have its vision of the wood obscured by the obstruction of one single and very large tree.

IRELAND'S DEMAND.

You have been very good to me and have listened to the most dangerous of all kinds of men—the man who has mounted his own hobby-horse and rides it carelessly at the risk of boring those who have got to listen; but I should not be doing my duty, I should not be earning the salary which the Indian taxpayer gives me, if I did not on this, as on all public occasions, defend the policy which I believe is consistent with the highest traditions of Liberal Empire-building—(applause)—which, by the speech of Lord Curzon and the utterances of Mr. Bonar Law, the Conservatives have once more refused to take part in. And now they are going to have one more chance. We apply these same principles, with the consent of the nation to Ireland; we are reversing the one no more than we have reversed the other; we are going to bring about a union between the English and the Irish people. We are going to improve the government of Ireland by giving her a governing institution; we are going to improve the government of England by removing the burden which clogs her legislative machinery. The land purchase part of Mr. Gladstone's scheme is now an

accomplished fact—the adoption by the Conservatives of the Liberal policy, or a part of it. Ireland awaits the treatment which you have given to the rest of the British Empire. Ireland is anxious to have as good reason to be loyal to the British Empire as the rest of the British Empire. Ireland hampers us at home, and its discontent is a blot upon our escutcheon. Our Colonies, all of them sympathise with the ambition of Ireland to get what they have got. Ireland stands at your door asking that its demand, as the demand of Canada, as the demand of South Africa, as the demand of Bengal, shall be granted by the Imperial Government. We, the Government I represent, are prepared to grant it. The record of our Imperial achievements since 1839 is there for you to consider; the record of Conservative opposition, or refusal to move, is there for you to consider. If Conservatism moves, as it threatens to move, in opposition to Irish demands, then it will have set a hall-mark upon its Imperial incapacity, and we shall have once again the proud position of being the only party capable or willing to justify our British Imperial ideal. (Applause.)

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

SPEECH DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
ON APRIL 22, 1919.

Mr. MONTAGU, in moving the second reading of this Bill, said : The Bill which I ask the House of Commons to read for the second time to-day is a machinery Bill necessary to carry out the policy which was announced at the Imperial Durbar at Delhi last December. The House of Commons is proceeding to discuss it at a moment when it is safe to say that the policy has been acclaimed by the vast majority of all classes and all races concerned until its out-and-out opponents have come to occupy a position of pathetic, if splendid, isolation. The Bill begins with a preamble which recites acts which have already been performed, and since every act recited in the preamble is an act for which there is ample Parliamentary authority, the method proposed for carrying out these changes is strictly constitutional, and is, in fact, the only method that the Government could have adopted. It has been said that we are relying upon antiquated or even obsolete practice, but they are only obsolete in the sense that they are unfamiliar to members. They are perfectly

well-known to those who have to administer India. Acting under those powers, in a strictly constitutional way, the Governor-General of India in Council fixed by proclamation the limits of the Presidency of Fort William in Bengal and constituted a new Province of Behar and Orissa on March 22, 1912. On March 21, 1912, his Majesty appointed by Royal Warrant Lord Carmichael as Governor of Bengal, under Section 29 of the Government of India Act, 1858. On the same date, under Section 58 of the Government of India Act, 1869, His Majesty appointed three Councillors to be Executive Members of the Council of the Governor of Bengal. I have quoted these sections as the evidence on which I base the claim that we have acted strictly in accordance with the powers given by Parliament in past years and that we have proceeded in the proper way to carry out the changes as recited in the preamble of the Bill, which I ask the House to read a second time.

THE PROVISIONS OF THE BILL.

The first clause of the Bill gives to the new Governor of Bengal exactly the same powers as are now possessed by the Governors of Madras and Bombay. The Act of 1853 extended to the Governor of the new Presidency that might be formed all the powers of the Governors of Madras and Bombay at that

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

date. It is now only necessary, by Section 1 of the Bill, to extend to the Governor of this new Presidency the powers given to the Governors of Madras and Bombay since the passing of the Act of 1853—such powers as were granted, for instance, under the Councils Act of 1861, through the Governors of Madras and Bombay, to make rules for the conduct of business in the Legislative Council, and so on. The House will see, in Clause 1, that there are two provisoes added. The first reserves to the Governor-General who now ceases to be Governor of Bengal certain powers that have been exercised by the Governor-General in the past. The powers specially referred to are powers granted to the Governor-General under the High Courts Act of 1860 and 1911, which gives the power to appoint temporary and acting Judges of the High Court. At present the jurisdiction of the High Court sitting at Calcutta will extend beyond the limits of the Presidency of Fort William and Bengal as testified by the proclamation. It will extend to the Province of Behar and Orissa, and it seems right to leave the Governor-General the power of appointing Judges. The second proviso obviates the necessity of appointing the Advocate-General of Bengal as a member of the Legislative Council of Bengal. The reason is that the Advocate-General is a law officer who has to give advice by

the terms of his appointment both to the Government of Bengal and to the Government of India. Sub-section 2 of Clause 1 merely transfers from the Governor-General the power to alter the limits of the town of Calcutta, which was conferred upon him by Section 1 of the Indian Presidency Towns Act of 1815 and which is now obviously under the Government of Bengal. Clause 2 of the Bill gives power to establish an Executive Council for the new Province of Behar and Orissa. Behar and Orissa will have a Legislative as well as an Executive Council, and it is necessary to put in a provision for that in the Bill because, under the Indian Councils Act of 1909, it is possible to appoint an Executive Council for the Lieutenant-Governor. Clause 3 gives power to the Governor-General to appoint a Legislative Council for a province which is governed by a Chief Commissioner. The Governor-General has power to take under his own government, and therefore technically to appoint, a Chief Commissioner to govern a territory in India under Section 3 of the Act of 1854, just as Lord Curzon, when Viceroy, made the North-Western Frontier a Chief Commissionership.

COUNCILS FOR CHIEF COMMISSIONERSHIPS.

If the Government obtain the powers now sought it proposes to exercise them at once in two

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

provinces under a Chief Commissioner. The first is Assam. I do not think the House will deny that the case of granting a Legislative Council to Assam is a good one. Lord Curzon, in the speech which he made in the House of Lords, made a complaint against the scheme that it would detract from the position of Assam by removing it from conjunction with the Government of Eastern Bengal. Assam has been under a Legislative Council, and by giving it a Legislative Council through this Bill we shall enable the province to go on with the same representative Government as it has had in the past. The other province—the Central Provinces—to whom the Government of India propose to give a Legislative Council include the territory of Berar, with a population of 14 millions and extending over an area of 100,000 square miles. I think that those who have some experience of that part of the British Empire will agree that in education, in enthusiasm for progress, the claim of the Central Provinces to have the same legislative system as exists in the neighbouring provinces is a good one, and it is at any rate, a move strictly in accordance with the principle of the Liberal Imperial policy of devolution and the granting of representative government in response to the demands of the majority of those people in the country who have expressed an opinion. Clause 4, read with the

Schedule, repeals and amends certain enactments which now either require alteration to harmonise with the new condition of affairs or require repeal. The only one I need mention is the repeal of Section 57 of the East India Act of 1793, which dates from the time when the Civil Service of each Presidency was a separate Civil Service, and which prevents us from appointing civil servants from one Presidency to act in another. Now that the whole of the Indian Civil Service is an Imperial Service, it seems to the Government of India that that provision is unnecessary. The repeal of Section 71 is consequential, and the other provisions are merely slight verbal alterations. Perhaps I may make special mention of Section 50 of the India Council Act of 1861, the amendment of which makes it possible for the Governor of Bengal to act as Governor-General in the absence of the Viceroy. The Bill, it will be seen, consists merely of alterations in machinery to carry out a policy which has been generally accepted and which I believe the House will agree contains elements of lasting advantage and the germs of improved government for the great Empire of India. (Cheers.)

REPLY TO CRITICISMS.

I have not the right to address the House again, but perhaps I may be allowed to reply to some of

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

the questions which have been put to me. Sir John Jardine asked whether the repeal or alteration of certain sections of the Act of 1793 will affect the position of the Indian Civil Service. The answer is emphatically in the negative. This Bill only repeals parts of the Statute which were not repealed when the rest of the statute was repealed in 1865. Colonel Yate put three specific points. The first was as to the defence of Delhi. I want to assure him that, I think, the authorities are agreed that the strategical position of Delhi as the central point of the railway system of India is a very good one, but the weighty words which he addressed to the House will, of course, be noted by those who are concerned with these affairs.

THE MAHOMEDANS OF EASTERN BENGAL.

We come to a much more substantial point when we consider the position of the Mahomedans in Eastern Bengal. Much has been said in various places and in various newspapers on this point. It would be a mistake to talk of the Mahomedan people of India as though they were a homogeneous people of one nationality. The Mahomedans of Eastern Bengal are the descendants of Hindu converts, or are Hindu converts themselves, and have little or no relation except that of religion with three-fifths of the Mahomedan population of India outside the limits of Bengal, but also belonging to the native races of the north. So

far as the Mahomedan population outside Bengal is concerned, they have no objection to the restoration of Delhi, which they have always regarded as the capital of historic India. They have shown good will and have gratefully acknowledged and accepted the change. Their position is very carefully safeguarded under the Bill. They are perhaps the most backward part, or one of the most backward parts, of the population of the old Presidency of Bengal and they are keenly and eagerly desirous of new educational facilities. They are to have a new university which will be largely used for the benefit of Mahomedans, and that is one of the most valuable consequences connected with the new arrangements. They will form in the Presidency of Bengal rather more than half of the population. I could give the House statistics to prove that there will be more Mahomedans than Hindus in the new Governorship, but, roughly speaking, they are about equally divided. In the Executive Council which has been appointed by His Majesty the King for the Presidency, the Indian Member is a well-known Mahomedan. Again, it is the avowed and declared intention of the Government that the new Governor of Bengal must spend a substantial part of each year in Dacca in the Government Building. It is not to be a statutory provision, but the Mahomedans of Eastern Bengal are perfectly entitled to

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

policy. It has never been the policy of the British Government in India to interfere with and construct artificial regions, territories, and provinces for the benefit of one race or one religion. They have always tried to hold impartially the balance between different races and religions.

LORD CURZON'S POLICY.

If it be claimed that the policy of parting Bengal in 1905 was a policy intended to set up a Mahomedan province, then I say emphatically that that departure from British policy for which Lord Curzon will stand revealed to have been guilty was a far greater blunder than his worst critics have accused him of committing. But Lord Curzon will be the first to admit that there was no such policy. Sir J. D. Rees, who was welcomed back to the House in surroundings which will be more congenial to his ultra-Conservative views, talked about this new policy as a reversal of the old policy. I do not mean it disrespectfully of one of the greatest Viceroys we have ever had when I say that Lord Curzon, in this matter had no policy of any sort or kind. He was a great administrator. He produced efficiency which is one of the most cherished possessions of the Indian Government at the present moment. But his concern was with an unwieldy province. He found it too big, and deter-

mined to divide it. He moved nationalities about and he moved individuals about as though they were automaton.

MR. MALCOLM: The Hon. Gentleman is speaking now by leave of the House, and I wish to know whether he can enter into this controversial matter to which none of us can have the opportunity of replying.

MR. MONTAGU: I apologise to the Hon. Member if he thinks that I am doing something I ought not to do. I quite appreciate that it is only by the courtesy of the House that I can speak now. But Sir J. D. Rees charged us with reversing the old policy.

SIR J. D. REES: We did not discuss it. I would have done so if I had been at liberty to do it.

MR. MONTAGU: The Hon. Member made the charge that we were reversing Lord Curzon's policy, and I am defending the Government against that charge. I wish to point out that much of the criticism made by Hon. Members opposite this afternoon against this measure would have been more appropriate if it had been directed against a reversal or policy which is going to happen. Sir Gilbert Parker and Mr. Malcolm based their speeches upon the great constitutional outrage which had been perpetrated by the Executive Government, which is increasingly aggregating to itself powers, and which is bringing about these changes before the consent of the Parliament has been obtained. Mr. Malcolm is not quite

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

accurate in his facts. He talked of two opportunities which the House of Lords had no opportunity of discussing the matter before it was a settled fact. They took the opportunity of discussion on two occasions after it had become a settled fact. In this Session of Parliament Hon. Members opposite could have had similar opportunities by raising the subject on the Debate on the Address, or they could have asked a day for the discussion of it afterwards. They deliberately did not do so. Neither of these opportunities have been taken.

MR. MALCOLM : The speaker has already ruled that it is out of order.

MR. MONTAGU : I do not understand that the Hon. Member is in a better position than myself to decide points of order. The Bill concerns the whole of the re-partition of Bengal, the creation of the new provinces of Behar and Orissa, the segregation of Assam under a new Chief Commissionership, and these matters and nine-tenths of the Durbar policy could have been discussed under this Bill, and in so far as the removal of the capital was incidental to the changes in Bengal that was equally in order. That has not been done by Hon. Members. They claim great patriotism in refusing to discuss the matter. The fact of the matter is that there are some acts which this House, or the

great majority of its members, have never claimed, and rightly never claimed, to criticise I suggest with regard to policy in India that the practice of this House never has been to claim to criticise in detail the administrations in India before certain acts have been accomplished I base myself upon the speech made by Mr Gladstone on the Indian Councils Act Amendment Bill in this House on March 20, 1892.—“It is not our business to devise machinery for the purposes of Indian Government It is our business to give to those who represent Her Majesty in India ample information as to what we believe to be sound principles of Government, and of course it is the function of this House to comment upon any cases in which we may think that they have failed to give due effect to those principles” When Bengal was divided in 1905, there was no discussion in this House of Commons at all and no information or opportunity was given to the House of expressing any opinion until after the proposals of the Government of India had been accepted by Mr. Brodrick, who was then Secretary The fact is that these changes, in which so many interests are involved of grave Imperial concern and result, have always been dealt with by administrative action, and afterwards the House of Commons has had its opportunity of expressing its opinion upon them.

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

THE "AGITATION" AGAINST THE PARTITION.

Sir J. D. Rees has thought fit to revive the old charge that we are altering the partition of Bengal in response to an agitation. All the information at the disposal of the Government of India is to the effect that he is totally misinformed. Lord Curzon, in making precisely the same allegation in the House of Lords, relied on and quoted the authority of two gentlemen. One was an Indian gentleman who had long been absent from Bengal altogether, and another an English writer who never wrote the words which Lord Curzon quoted. I venture to suggest that the root of the Hon. Gentleman's objection is this, that there are in India, as has often been said in this House, two kinds of agitation. One is the agitation which is the genuine expression of a genuine grievance, or what the people believe to be one; a grievance against an outraged nationality; an agitation which is the genuine desire for redress of something which is wrong. Then there are those agitators often the anti-British purpose who take advantage of the existence of that grievance who are almost a parasitic growth upon the legitimate unrest. That kind of agitation is almost dead. It was wisely handled and severely repressed during Lord Morley's Secretaryship of State, when Lord Morley and Lord Minto used exceptional measures for dealing with

SPEECHES OF THE RT. HON. MR. E. S. MONTAGU.

that sort of agitation, which was not genuine and could not be permitted to continue. But the real, deep, bitter resentment against the line which Lord Curzon drew right across the Bengali-speaking district, the sentimental grievance, the grievance of unfair and disproportionate representation, remained as deep after that long interval as it did when the new state of affairs was first created. That kind of agitation was at the root of everything that was threateningly wrong in India. I conceive it to be the wisest kind of statesmanship to investigate this grievance to see how well-founded it was to remove the grievance and to settle a national wrong. So no one can say that we have responded to illegitimate clamour or have done more than merely redress a grievance which would remain as great as long as it lasted.

SIR J. D. REES Does the Hon. Gentleman include the compounding of a felony by the Government of India among these wise measures?

MR. MONTAGU The Hon. Member is bringing a new charge which I will be happy in a general Debate to prove to be as unfounded as any of the other charges which he has brought. But it would be trespassing too far on the matter before the House at present to deal with it now.

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

THE QUESTION OF FINANCE.

Mr. Malcolm asked me a question about the finance in connection with the establishment of the new capital. The estimate with regard to Delhi remains to-day what it was. It is not possible yet to submit the revised estimate. The Hon. Member is at liberty to suggest twelve millions. He has opportunities doubtless of arriving at a more accurate figure than the Government of India. But the estimate given was put forward by the Government of India and accepted by the Secretary of State with due regard to the existing difficulties. There are all sorts of offsets to be made. New buildings would have been necessary if the seat of Government had remained unchanged, and there is a certain amount of profit to set off against outlay, appreciation in the Government lands and the sale of certain lands and buildings. It is a rough general guess. The site is now being surveyed by an expert Committee, and as soon as the revised estimates are available they will, of course, be presented to the House. But it is as fair to assume that the expenditure would be approximately four million pounds as to assume that it would be approximately eight million pounds.

* THE PROMISE OF "FEDERATION."

Mr. Bonar Law, with other members, referred to the change of policy which was obtaining as the

result of this measure. He quoted the words of Lord Crewe and words of my own in Cambridge, and he suggested that there was a discrepancy between them. The despatch and the answer to the despatch have been published in the White Paper, and the words of paragraph 3 are definite and unmistakable, and I should have thought would have admitted of no possible doubt. If a microscopic examination can detect any difference of meaning in the words that I used at Cambridge and the words which my chief used in the House of Lords, I will ask the House to attribute the difference to the obvious difference of atmosphere between the other place and the platform in my own constituency. There is to be no immediate step, no resulting step as a consequence of the changes which the House this afternoon is passing, but surely, when every moving section of the people of India has got a policy, when there are preachers and teachers all over the country advocating this and that course of action, and some are advocating policies which are hostile to British interests, it was not out of place, I conceive, to show to the people of India, as Lord Hardinge did in paragraph 3 of this despatch, that there was a direction in which the British occupation was tending, that there was some definite aim and object in which, in the opinion of the Government in India, all these

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

changes might be co-related, that we were there, not merely to administer, but to develop India on a plan which had been brought out by those who had been advising the Secretary of State. That is, as I understand, the meaning of paragraph 3, and as such I regard it as one of the most important parts of that historic despatch.

THE POLICY OF THE OPPOSITION.

If there is one other matter which I might respectfully venture to put forward, it is that I feel a deep regret that even those who confine their remark entirely to the way in which these changes have been brought about took an opportunity by some side phrases to express their doubts of and their disagreement with the policy and the Bill which carries it out.

SIR. GILBERT PARKER. I expressly said that I would forbear from making a single remark about change of policy, and I did not make any such remark.

Mr. MONTAGU : And then you added that there were large numbers of people in India who had grave doubts as to its efficacy. What I mean to say is that I should have thought it was quite clear to the people of India that what they believed to be a great step forward in the process of governing that country was the gift offered by His Majesty at the Durbar

on the advice of his responsible Ministers from the people of Great Britain in respect of party. And it is a matter, I think, for regret that Lord Curzon, who has spoken most on the subject, adopted an attitude of complete hostility, and so far as in this debate any expression of opinion has come from those benches at all it has been either like that of Mr. Malcolm or like the assertion of Mr. Bonar Law. Why was it wrong for His Majesty most graciously to make this announcement himself at the Durbar? Is it that Mr. Bonar Law objects to the policy of Durbar boons altogether, or is it simply that people feel that there is a peculiar sanctity about a policy recommended by His Majesty the King on the advice of his Ministers which does not touch the ordinary policy recommended by the Viceroy on behalf of His Majesty the King, and with the sanction of the Ministers? If that is the criticism, then it is based upon the partition of Bengal, and very much of what has been said falls to the ground. The same sanctity, in our opinion, would have attached to the Proclamation had it been made by the Viceroy as attached, and I think rightly attached, to it when it was made by His Majesty the King.

SIR J. P. REES : The Opposition have not had an opportunity of discussing what was done under the cover of His Majesty's prerogative, and the Opposition and those who oppose this policy are really deprived of the opportunity of stating their objections.

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

Mr. MONTAGU: I am merely suggesting that there has been no difference in the treatment of the question from the announcement having been made by His Majesty instead of by the Viceroy. It was announced in His Majesty's gracious speech from the Throne at Delhi, instead of by Lord Curzon, as in the partition of Bengal, by Viceregal Proclamations. In spite of the criticisms which have been made, and notwithstanding some small questions of boundary readjustment which remain, I am profoundly convinced that this policy has been welcomed by the overwhelming majority of all races and all creeds, and that it will open, as Colonel Yate has said, a new era of peace, contentment and progress in India. There is every sign upon the horizon which gives those who are proud of the achievement of the Government in India of great hope of increasing contentment, increasing prosperity, and increasing consent of the Government to be governed by those whose policy shows sympathy with their legitimate aspirations.

Replying to the criticisms in the House of Commons on June 10, 1912, on the third reading of the Government of India Bill, Mr. Montagu said:—

He would leave the discussion of the finances of Delhi to the Debate on the Indian Budget. All he

would say now was that Delhi was being financed out of windfalls which were due to exceptional circumstances which did not render them available for the reduction of taxation. It did not very much matter whether debts were paid off with surpluses such as these, and fresh loans contracted, or whether these surpluses were used directly for purposes for which they were bound to borrow.

The scheme in the Bill provided for the removal of the seat of the Government of India from Calcutta to Delhi. Calcutta was the seat of the Government of Bengal, and the difficulty of disentangling the Government of India from that of Bengal was so great that it would be far better for both the Government of India and the Government of Bengal if they removed the seat of the Government of India to Delhi, which was not the centre of any provincial Government. The word "provincial" was used in this sense, that it merely referred to the fact that the Government, whilst at Calcutta, was the centre of the Government of one of the provinces of India. It was provincial in the sense that Calcutta was the provincial centre of Bengal, and, therefore, the Imperial Government of India was in the provincial centre of Bengal. He asserted without fear of contradiction that students of the Government of India for generations

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

past had been impressed with the growing difficulty which was presented by the two sets of Government in the same place, interlaced and intertwined, so that those who were affected by the decisions of one or the other had difficulty in disentangling the responsibility. The Government of India was now going to Delhi, which was not the centre of a provincial Government, because it was strictly the enclave of India, as Washington was the enclave of the United States of America. Sir J. D. Rees so far as his position was based on the statement that we were going from one province to another, was misrepresenting the true state of the facts to the House. The same object might have been achieved possibly by making Calcutta the enclave, and transferring the Government of Bengal out of Calcutta. But, as the Hon Member would be the first to admit, Calcutta was far too large and important a commercial centre to be adapted to the purposes of the Imperial Government.

Sir J.D. REES . In what respect are the Government of India and the Government of Bengal interlaced and intertwined ? Their functions are quite distinct

Mr. MONTAGU said that he would send the Hon. Gentleman papers which would instruct him. Delhi was the historic centre of India, and it was also the railway centre. It was from many points of view the

most acceptable part of the great Empire to which to remove the seat of the Government of India, for it was far nearer to Bombay and the whole of the East of India than Calcutta was. It was also a considerable manufacturing town already. He could not enter into the dispute between the Hon. Member for Nottingham and the Government of India as to the reverence felt for Delhi by the various peoples of India. He would only say that his description of Delhi did not carry conviction to him when he read such words as these which appear in paragraph 6 of the White Paper —“ Throughout India, as far south as the Mahomedan conquest extended, every walled town has its ‘ Delhi gate,’ and among the masses of the people it is still revered as the seat of the former Empire ”

THE FUNDAMENTAL ERROR OF THE CRITICS.

So much for the removal of the Government to Delhi. The fundamental error made by critics of the policy of the Government of India was the suggestion that there had been a reversal of the Partition of Bengal. He had been accused of speaking in derogatory terms of Lord Curzon when he suggested that Lord Curzon in these matters had no policy at all. It was merely a well-known fact. Lord Curzon was as great an administrator

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

as India had ever had. He had found a great province of 98,000,000 people—(An Hon. Member : “Eighty-five millions”)—and had become acquainted (as he had said) with the scandalous mal-administration which was going on in the eastern parts of Bengal. He had found that owing to its vast size, it was quite impossible to administer the province according to modern ideas. So Lord Curzon decided to divide it, but he did not divide it with the idea of making a Mahomedan State, or with a view to redress alleged Mahomedan grievances. There was no policy underlying it; it was merely an administrative reform to produce efficiency. He could quote from Lord Curzon's own words:—What was the particular line to be drawn was a matter not for the Viceroy. The line was settled by consultation and discussions between the Local Governments and the officials.” Lord Curzon was not concerned to find where the line was drawn at all. He wanted to split up an unwieldy province and make two parts of it which would be more wieldy. Bitter experience had taught that even in the sacred cause of efficiency we could not move masses of the population about and destroy their national ideals without regard to their thoughts and opinions.

The EARL of RONALDSHAY: What am I to understand by the Hon. Gentleman's statement as to moving masses of

SPEECHES OF THE RT. HON. MR. E. S. MONTAGU.

population about? Nobody has ever suggested moving the population.

Mr. MONTAGU explained that he meant moving them from one Government to another. You could not order the man to cease to be a subject of the Government of Bengal and put him into Eastern Bengal without very serious consequences, even in the cause of efficiency. It did require investigation as to whether the line—

Sir J. D. REES: The man remains where he is.

Mr. MONTAGU: The Hon. Gentleman is perfectly right in saying that the man remains where he is, but is no longer in Bengal.

Sir J. D. REES: He is subject to the same class of administration.

MR. MONTAGU, continuing, said that the Government had therefore, because the unrest produced militated against the efficiency which Lord Curzon desired, done over again in the light of experience of Lord Curzon's work.

A BETTER PARTITION.

There was now a partition of Bengal, not into two pieces, but into three pieces, and all they claimed was that, having regard to the fact that they had kept the national boundaries, their partition was a better one than Lord Curzon's, and likely to produce greater

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

efficiency, because it was more acceptable to the population. Lord Ronaldshay might say that whatever the motives of Lord Curzon were, a Mahomedan State came into existence, and the Mahomedans had a right to expect that the state of affairs should remain for ever, and that the Government had in that sense broken their pledge to the Mahomedans of Eastern Bengal. These were serious charges. Nobody knew better than the member for East Nottingham how what was said in these Debates found its way to India. Nobody had been more vehement in criticising members below the gangway on this ground, and he hoped the Hon. Member would have serious misgivings about his own utterances that afternoon, when he had brought accusations of breach of faith and of pledges, not only against Lord Crew and the Government here, but against the whole fabric of the Government in India, who were jointly responsible for these great changes. The Hon. Member regretted, and the noble lord regretted, that there should be any idea in India that we had broken our pledges. But how much had the Hon. Member not done to encourage that idea by words carelessly thrown out which were without a shadow of foundation?

SIR J. D REES said he only pointed out the facts

MR. MONTAGU said the Hon. Gentleman's alleged facts were not facts. The words which had

been continually quoted against the Government in that Debate were the words of Lord Morley, "The partition is a settled fact." He would ask the noble lord to be good enough to read Lord Morley's own speech on this subject in the House of Lords. Lord Morley was a member of the Government responsible for this Bill, as he was when he used the famous words, "The partition is a settled fact." What Lord Morley meant was that the great improvement of administration which was to result from the sub-division of Bengal could never again be sacrificed, and that the partition of Bengal could never be reversed. There had been no reversal. What was to be the meaning of the words "settled fact" in politics? Were they to mean that a thing once done should never be modified in the light of experience? However badly it had been done, were they all to sit and admire it for generation after generation without having the courage to alter it? That was a theory of crystallised conservatism which he believed to be the worst that could be applied to a quickly changing and developing country like India.

THE MAHOMEDANS OF EASTERN BENGAL.

The Mahomedans of Eastern Bengal had lost nothing by this change. At the commencement

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

Eastern Bengal was not the overwhelming Mahomedan State some critics seemed to think it was. At the commencement of last year the Legislative Council in Eastern Bengal included ten Hindus. What had the Mahomedans got now? They had got their new university. One of the seats of Government of the new Presidency of Bengal was at Dacca. They were governed under Lord Carzon's scheme from Dacca by a Lieutenant-Governor—the Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal, who had no Executive Council. Sir J.D. Rees poured scorn on the difference between a Lieutenant-Governor and a Governor. Surely he forgot that the Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal had no Executive Council. The Governor of Eastern Bengal has an Executive Council.

SIR J.D. REES : And the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal had an Executive.

Mr. MONTAGU : The Hon. Member is wrong in his facts. The Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal had no Executive.

SIR J.D. REES : Bengal, I said.

Mr. MONTAGU was afraid the Hon. Member was now getting excited. (*Laughter.*) He was referring to the Mahomedans of Eastern Bengal.

The Mahomedans were in ~~form~~ governed under Lord Curzon from Dacca by a Lieutenant-Governor, who had no Executive Council to assist him. Under the new scheme they were governed still from Dacca for certain portions of the year by the Governor of Bengal, who would be assisted by an Executive Council, and they would, therefore, have a more modern and up-to-date system of Government. Further than that, when the Partition of Bengal was brought about, Eastern Bengal had no representative Legislative Council, because the Reform Bill of Lord Morley and Lord Minto was in 1909. The form of Government Mahomedans would enjoy now would be better and more efficient than the old Government. When the partition was brought about, the Mahomedans of Eastern Bengal were 30 per cent. of a population of over 80 millions. Now they would be about 50 per cent. of a population of 50 millions. Under the partition they were about 35 per cent. of the old population of Eastern Bengal. In numbers, in form of Government, in position, the Mahomedans of Eastern Bengal had lost absolutely nothing by the modification of the partition. In addition, though it was only a side question, the present Indian Member of the Executive Council of the Governor of Bengal was a Mahomedan from Eastern Bengal.

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

THE CLAIM OF CALCUTTA.

He desired, in conclusion, to deal with two criticisms made by Sir J.D. Rees. The Hon. Member had referred to the position of the member for Commerce and Industry. He said he had been asked to voice the opinion of the Chambers of Commerce, and then showed that he meant the Chamber of Commerce in Bengal. He would be the last to detract from the great importance of that representative Chamber of the greatest commercial community in India. But it was only that Chamber which was anxious to have its objections to this policy represented. Naturally, what Calcutta lost, Bombay and Karachi gained. If the Hon. Member would come to the India Office and read the files of the newspapers in India, which he had carefully collected ever since this reform scheme came into being, he would be struck by the remarkable way in which the serious alarm of the Chamber of Commerce in Calcutta had been isolated and ignored by the rest of European opinion from one end of the country to the other. He thought that alarm was probably based on a misapprehension : and he believed that when the scheme was seen at work the fears of the commercial community in Calcutta would be allayed, and that they would share in what was the enthusiastic welcome of this scheme from the vast

majority of the people of all classes and races in the great Empire of India.

THE CHARGE OF SURRENDER TO AGITATION.

There was one further matter he felt bound to refer to. The Government had been accused of giving way to agitation and irresponsible clamour. The House would have noticed a very curious inconsistency in the way in which this charge was brought. It was levelled with great vehemence by Sir J. D. Rees, who immediately afterwards quoted from Lord Minto an assurance that there was no agitation and no clamour to which to give way. He could not have it both ways; he could not say that there was no agitation to which to give way, and immediately afterwards award blame for having given way to an agitation that never existed. The fact of the matter was that in Bengal, as in so many other countries, the large, overwhelming, and almost universal number of the inhabitants were peaceful, law-abiding, and loyal citizens. There was a small—very small and insignificant—minority of irresponsible agitators. He challenged the House to say, looking back over history since 1906, that the Government which he was there to represent had been supine in putting down the agitation which was the work of that insignificant, disloyal, and rebellious minority. Lord Minto himself

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA BILL.

brought back from India, as one of the greatest triumphs of his rule, the way in which he and Lord Morley put down and, as he believed, stamped out what was known as the seditious movement in India. But there were two ways of stamping out sedition, and neither was complete without the other. They had not only to punish the seditious, but they had to remove the just causes of complaint which brought recruits to the ranks of the seditious, and which, therefore, prevented repressive legislation from having the effect they desired, whilst there was the slightest suspicion to make honest men's minds uneasy that those responsible for the Government of the country were not quick to redress legitimate grievances. The Government of India believed that the real feeling—spreading far beyond the miserable confines of the seditious, disloyal, and rebellious—of wounded nationality, of wounded race susceptibilities, of unfair treatment, which had resulted from the Partition, was as strong on Durbar Day as it ever was when the irresponsible agitation existed.

He hoped Lord Ronaldshay would not think he was making any accusation against him, but no greater disservice could be done to the Government of India than carelessly to lump together in speech an agitation such as the presentation of a petition against the University at Dacca, and, let them say,

the agitation that was punished by deportation. The one was a legitimate Western method of gaining access to those who were in authority and in a country like India the responsibility of those who governed to listen to grievances when they were represented was even more vital than in a country where votes were the armoury of those who were governed. If in any part of his speech he had shown irritation with anything that had fallen from Hon Members opposite, he could only plead as an excuse that a charge of broken pledges against a Government, annoying and irritating and wounding as it might be in domestic affairs, could not be ignored and must be met by a Government which had the overwhelming responsibility of the good Government of India to answer for. It was because he believed he had answered a charge which he wished had never been made on a subject in which party politics played no part that he ventured confidently to commend this Bill to the House, a Bill which, he believed, would lead to the improved Government and the greater peace of a country which benefited to a greater degree every day by the fact that the British people were responsible for its government. (*Hear, hear.*)

OPIUM TRAFFIC

SPEECH DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
IN MAY 1913

Mr. Montagu said that in the unavoidable absence of the Secretary for Foreign Affairs it fell to his lot to explain the policy of his Majesty's Government and the Government of India on the subject of the resolution before the House. Personally he welcomed the fortune of the ballot which had given them an opportunity of discussing the question, not only because he thought the discussion itself would be of considerable value, but also because it would relieve the always inadequate debate on the Indian Budget of one of the subjects which always loomed very largely. Any one listening to the debate might, be pardoned for thinking that the House of Commons was once again reiterating its detestation of this trade, while there was a Government in office deaf to all entreaty which refused to take any steps to translate the views of the House of Commons into action. Mr. Taylor had been the first

of the speakers to pay a tribute to the Government for what had taken place in recent years. The opium traffic was in a flourishing condition at the beginning of the sixteenth century. It had been going on ever since. No member of the House could read the history of the traffic without serious misgivings as to whether Great Britain had not fallen far short of her Imperial ideals upon several occasions during that time. There was satisfaction in the fact that there had always been in the House of Commons a small but growing number of men who had never faltered in their determination to urge the cessation of the traffic, and its ultimate extinction of this trade ought to be placed first and foremost to the credit of such men as Sir Joseph Pease, Mr. Samuel Smith, Sir Mark Stewart, Mr. Henry Wilson, and Mr Taylor himself. When the present Government came into office in 1906 the opium traffic with China was flourishing, legalised, unthreatened. No end was in sight. If anyone had then predicted that in a short period of years an Indian Finance Minister would have viewed without excessive emotion or even panic a total loss of the Indian revenue derived from the Indo-Chinese opium traffic he would have been regarded as a wrong-headed visionary. But the whole complexion of the situation was changed when it was demonstrated beyond doubt that there was