

this table, or by some one similar to a statesman; and I would like you and your Parliament to approach it from the point of view of the statesman. I know that as a Prime Minister and as a party politician it may be safe to rely on certain phrases, but let me tell him that it would be a great mistake to dispose of those words "it is desirable" as not morally binding upon him—I do not care whether they are legally binding upon him or not.

Hopes for Good Result from Appointment of Committee.

I am inspired by the hope, and particularly by the manner in which Mr. King has spoken, that the result of the conference of the committee which we propose to send to Canada with the committee going to be appointed there to consider the questions of franchise cannot but lead to satisfactory results. I will not anticipate the verdict of the conference of the two committees, which Mr. King has to a certain extent attempted to do. I will leave it entirely to the hands of the committee to come to their own conclusions, and then will be the time for us to discuss how far we are in agreement or how far we are separated. But I recognize his spirit of support and of sympathy with me, and I appreciate that. I do thank you, Mr. Mackenzie King, for the spirit in which you have spoken this morning.

Comments on Statement of Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia.

From Mr. Mackenzie King I shall pass on to Mr. Bruce, and let me express my unreserved admiration for the manner in which he has spoken this morning, and the tribute he has paid to my countrymen and our civilization. I note that he considers it unnecessary for my Government to send any committee to his country because he thinks the problem is such that it may be settled without any discussion. Well, that is encouraging to me, but I do venture to express a hope that, if we do decide to send a committee just to place our case before him and his Government, he will not refuse to accept that committee. We do not want to send a committee to create any agitation in his country—or, for the matter of that, any agitation in any country—and I can absolutely feel sure that that is not what is at the back of my mind; but, if it is necessary for us to explain our position to you and to help you in the problem, for Heaven's sake do not refuse to accept a committee like that. We want simply to help you, and if without receiving a committee from my Government and my country you can solve the problem, so much the better for you, so much the better for us, and so much the more creditable to you and to your Government.

Comments on Statement of Prime Minister of New Zealand.

Well, my thanks are also due to Mr. Massey. I hope Mr. Massey will recognize that in my speech of Wednesday I thanked him. I very much appreciate his reference to the services of India during the war, and I do sincerely hope that such grievances as there may be in his country will receive sympathetic treatment at his hands. I do hope that he will accept the substance of my resolution. We wish to help him in every possible way; we do not want to harass him in his own country or in his Government.

Comments on Statement of Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa.

Now, from Mr. Massey I propose to pass to General Smuts. I am sorry to miss him here, but I will say he has never replied to the points I raised. He referred to my description of him as subtle: well, if he objects to that I will withdraw it, but I will say that his present speech is remarkably illusory and evasive.

I raised questions with regard to specific grievances, relating to residence, acquisition of land, and trading licenses in his country, and I find no expression of opinion upon those questions. He then said my resolution had nothing to do with him.

It has primarily to do with him. I made it abundantly plain in the course of my speech that I did not make an appeal to him on the basis of the resolution of 1921, but that my appeal was made to him independently of that resolution, and that I wanted him to join hands with me in investigating the facts and in trying to devise some methods of solving this problem, which he probably thinks is insoluble, but which does not appear to me to be insoluble. Again, he referred to Mr. Sastri, and to the prejudice he has caused. I have already said what I felt about Mr. Sastri, and I do not want to say more. If Mr. Sastri's fault was that he pleaded for his countrymen in the Dominions, then that is a fault which can reasonably be found with the 320,000,000 of his countrymen.

Meaning of British Citizenship.

Now, I will come to one particular portion of the speech which struck me as based on an entire misconception, legal and constitutional: that is the question of citizenship. He said that India was the only country which probably claimed all political rights merely from the fact that Indians were British citizens. Let me warn him that India is not the only country which holds that view. There are other countries which hold those views. Well, he absolutely confuses the territorial law with personal law; in other words, his position really is this: that, if in my own country I did not enjoy full rights of citizenship, when I go to his country I must be under a disability. I will put to General Smuts what would have happened if an Irishman, before the new constitution came into force, had gone from Ireland and had settled down in Natal, or any other part there, and was told, "Because you are not a free nation within your own borders you dare not claim those rights, although you are qualified according to our franchise law to claim them." There is an essential confusion in the position which General Smuts takes. Really, the fact of the matter is this: that you cannot, according to modern law of citizenship and according to the latest development of thought on this subject, have two kinds of citizenship in the same Empire—a higher and a lower.

When I go to your country, and I do satisfy the requirements of the law of franchise, you have no right to tell me that because I am an Indian subject of His Majesty I shall not be entitled to exercise my parliamentary rights. Therein lies the whole position General Smuts has taken; and, with regard to the disability of Indians in the purchase of town lands and in respect of trade licenses and other things, General Smuts, as I have said before, had not a word to say in his speech this morning.