

Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4.

VOL. XXII, No. 6. } POONA—THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1939. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	69
ARTICLES :	
Reflexions on Rajkot	72
The Bombay Shops Bill.—I	75
REVIEW :	
The Indian Cotton Textile Industry. By Principal D. G. Karve	77
MISCELLANEOUS :	
Indians in Malaya.— Mr. Kundru's Speech	77
CORRESPONDENCE :	
Small States and Responsible Government. By H. Mahtab	79
BOOKS RECEIVED.	80

Topics of the Week.

The Late Maharaja Gaekwar.

THE death of Maharaja Sayajirao Gaekwar of Baroda removes one of the very few rulers of Indian States who were concerned about the welfare of their subjects. During his long regime of sixty-three years the late Maharaja of Baroda introduced in his State many social reforms like free and compulsory primary education, the separation of the judiciary from the executive, abolition of early marriage, and so forth. In respect of all these reforms he was a pioneer in India. He was noted for his patronage of art and learning and also for his enthusiasm for the village library movement in Baroda. In his early years of administration Baroda acquired, and justly, the reputation of being the most advanced State in India, but the glamour wore off in the latter period mostly because his zeal for political reform was nothing as great as his zeal for social reform. He was keen to do all he could for the welfare of his people but was distrustful of letting the people manage their own affairs. So, politically, Baroda has remained in a backward condition, and the political aspirations of the State have remained stifled. This is all the more regrettable because of the wide diffusion of education in the State and the absence of those communal feuds which make political advance difficult. As an administrator the late Gaekwar was alert and keen, looking personally even into small details of administration, though a great part of his time was latterly spent abroad. His death will be regretted all over India.

Subhas Babu and the Congress.

THE election of Babu Subhas Chandra Bose to be President of this year's Congress is not, Mahatma Gandhi declares, the defeat of Dr. Pattabhi but his own defeat. This statement may have been made for the purpose of publicly placing all his influence and power at the disposal of the present High Command in the Congress, but it represents the literal truth. Nothing of any importance was done in the Congress except at his command and at any rate except with his approval, and if, as the election shows, the Congress rank and file is discontented with the right wing, the discontent must be interpreted as being directed against Mahatma Gandhi's leadership and a move towards the left that is contemplated as a revolt against that leadership. Frankly recognising this fact, Mahatma Gandhi proposes that the Working Committee should now be composed exclusively of such men as Subhas Babu considers radical in their outlook; and in fact several members of the Working Committee have declared themselves unable to continue their places on that body. This may be due to a desire on their part to intimidate Subhas Babu by a threat of non-co-operation and to put a curb on his leftist proclivities; and indeed on some of the so-called leftists the announcement has had a very disconcerting effect. But we cannot see how, if his complaints had any foundation and the election had any significance at all, Subhas Babu can help administering a drastic purge to the Working Committee. This of course should not be done from any vindictiveness, but it becomes a necessity from the point of view of principle.

THE two issues on which Subhas Babu fought the election were democracy in the Congress organisation and the maintenance of the anti-federation struggle. The first requires a remodelling of the Working Committee, which we believe the President will carry out. The second requires great deliberation before any measures can be devised for effective resistance to federation, but the object has in some measure already been achieved. It will no longer be possible for the British Government to carry on negotiations with Congress leaders of pro-federation proclivities, whoever they may be. These negotiations will have to be, insofar as the Congress is concerned, with Subhas Babu and men of his choice who can be relied upon not to accept federation unless it is made really acceptable. The British Government cannot hope any longer that some Congress leader or other will wangle the consent of the Congress to federation as perhaps it had hoped before. If the federal scheme is still put in force, it will be known to be an act of naked coercion. And whether resistance

to it is ultimately successful or not, the British Government now knows that it will at any rate meet with very rough weather. Its final decision will now depend upon whether it is going to cope with such weather. During the current year at any rate all private discussions with the Congress are estopped, and the chances of the federal scheme surviving the current year are not very bright. One reason for this is that the Indian States are given six months within which to say whether they will join the federation or not on the basis of the revised draft of the Instrument of Accession which has been sent to them but kept as a close secret from British India. The Princes will certainly want to know by that time whether British India will also cheerfully join and whether they can depend upon loyal co-operation from that quarter. He will be a daring ruler who, knowing that British India is bent upon frustrating the scheme, will enter federation. So long they inwardly felt that, despite the flaming resolutions of bodies like the Congress, federation would be allowed to work smoothly. This hope is now shattered, and both the British Government and the Princes will think a hundred times before one thrusts federation on British India and the other put their necks in its noose.

* * *

THE new Working Committee will also try, we believe, to radicalise somewhat the policy followed by the Congress Ministries in the provinces. In this matter the Election Manifesto of the Congress will continue to be the basis of policy as at present, but in giving effect to the policy laid down therein, the tempo can be heightened. In doing so the Working Committee must of course pay due heed to the views of the constituencies, who after all are the supreme masters. But where so far a brake was unnecessarily applied, the new Working Committee can remove the brake and accelerate the pace of reform. In any case this can only come about gradually, and no revolutionary change can be expected. In order to allay fears that a split in Congress ranks is intended or will be precipitated, Subhas Babu says in a statement :

Assuming for argument's sake that the result of the election implies a victory of the Left, we should stop to consider what the Leftists' programme is. For the immediate future the Leftists stand for national unity and unrelenting opposition to the federal scheme. In addition to this, they stand for democratic principles. Leftists will not take the responsibility of creating a split within the Congress. If a split does come, it will come not because of them, but in spite of them.

A certain amount of apprehension has been caused in the minds of many as to the policy which people like myself will follow in future. Let me make it quite clear that there will be no violent break with the past in the parliamentary or the extra-parliamentary sphere. So far as the parliamentary programme is concerned, we shall only try to implement our election pledges and our parliamentary programme with greater speed than in the past. In the extra-parliamentary sphere, we shall endeavour to rally all our strength and resources for combating federation and for pushing on towards "Purna Swaraj." And we shall, of course, act in accordance with the principles and policy of the Indian National Congress.

* * *

Highly Retrograde.

IT is surprising that in these days of widely-awakened national consciousness, the Bengal Ministry is bringing forward a bill to amend the

Calcutta Corporation Act which will not only replace joint electorates by separate electorates so far as the election of the Muslim members to the Corporation is concerned, but will also introduce a number of other separate electorates for the representation of the other communities. In 1923, when the present Calcutta Corporation Act was framed, it had been provided that for territorial constituencies separate electorates for the Muslims would be in existence for nine years only. Then they would be replaced by joint electorates with reservation of seats for the Muslims. Secondly, besides nominated seats and seats reserved for special constituencies there was no other kind of communal representation in the Calcutta Corporation. Now by virtue of the present Bill, the constituencies of the Calcutta Corporation will be divided into five categories, viz., (1) general constituency, (2) Muhamadan constituency, (3) Anglo-Indian constituency, (4) special non-territorial constituencies and (5) special constituency for the representation of labour. Thus, where there had been only two constituencies, five separate constituencies will come into being mostly carved out on a communal basis.

* * *

THIS, in a nutshell, will give us an idea of the retrograde nature of the coming legislation. But this is not all. Allocation of seats among the different constituencies has been so made that the members returned from the general constituency will be always in a minority in the Corporation. According to the new Bill, the Calcutta Corporation will have 99 seats. Of these only 39 will be returned by the general constituency while the rest will be returned by communal and special constituencies. Thus, the representatives of the majority of the people of Calcutta can never hope to have control over the Corporation, nor can the Corporation be controlled by any single homogeneous party which has a definite policy and programme. The control of the Corporation must necessarily vest in a coalition of different parties and groups, which may have nothing in common among them except the desire to be in power. We fail to understand how this state of things will improve the civic affairs of the Calcutta Corporation. It will be remembered that ever since the passage of the present Corporation Act, the Congress has been in a majority in the Calcutta Corporation and is naturally wielding the reins of power. The Bengal Ministry seems to be determined to put an end to this. Otherwise, there is no reason why it should have thought fit to bring forward such a retrograde legislation.

* * *

IN sharp contrast to the proposed amendments of the Calcutta Corporation Act are the changes recently introduced in the Bombay Corporation. By virtue of these changes, the Bombay Corporation has become a purely elected body with no provision for any kind of nomination by the Government. Secondly, there is no communal representation in the Bombay Corporation as is sought to be introduced in Calcutta by the Bengal Ministry. The Bombay Corporation has a total strength of 117 members of whom 106 are elected by the various wards and the rest by special non-territorial constituencies. It has again been decided that the Bombay Corporation will have adult franchise by 1942. Thus, while one of the premier cities of India is taking rapid strides in civic development, the largest city of India has fallen a prey to thorough communalists in the Bengal Govern-

ment who are trying to undo whatever Sir Surendranath Bannerji had done for the benefit of the Calcutta Corporation.

Kashmir.

THE All-India States' People's Conference has rendered valuable service by publishing a small but illuminating brochure on Kashmir which has been aptly described by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as "the glorious valley darkened by ordinances which are monstrous in their severity." The brochure traces the development of the people's struggle in Kashmir, which began only as a mild agitation against outsiders who occupied positions in Government service, but which, after passing through various stages including that of extensive civil disobedience followed by extremely severe repression including hundreds of human lives in its toll, has now assumed the form of a great and united movement of the people for responsible government.

A VERY large majority (nearly 80 per cent.) of the population of Kashmir are Muslims, and so the movement for political emancipation first took its inspiration from what was formerly called the Muslim Conference. The Conference was then dubbed as a communal body and its activities were described as selfish and harmful to the State as a whole. Under the very able leadership of Mr. S. M. Abdullah, however, the Conference soon entirely shed its communal character and is now called the National Conference of Kashmir with full responsible government in the State as its present political goal.

THE description of the development of the present cosmopolitan character of the Conference given by the brochure makes very instructive reading, especially as it is sure to furnish a valuable lead to the people's movement for responsible government in the Hyderabad State where narrow communal outlook is quite likely to mar the proper development of the struggle. The brochure describes the Kashmir people's struggle thus:

In the past the Government had shown no anxiety about the development of and the demand for responsible government. Their composure was perhaps due to the thought that the constitution of the Muslim Conference, which was carrying on the agitation, could not allow the entire people to join hands against the Government. Moreover, it thought that it could easily play off the non-Muslim communities against the Muslims in the name of Hindu Raj. These calculations of the Government were, however, soon upset, with the introduction of the change in the name and the constitution of the Muslim Conference. The progressive elements among the Kashmiri Pandits and Sikhs responded to the call of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah after the successful passage of the resolution proposing to nationalise the Conference.

The Kashmir Hindu Progressive Party, which claims for its following the intellectuals, the youth and the peasantry among the Hindu and Sikh communities, accorded full support to the movement. The Government could no longer tolerate these developments. ... Extensive schemes of repression were quickly framed.

In spite of the wishes of the leaders in that behalf the Government was in no mood to enter into negotiations. It had made big preparations; orders had already been issued to the military and police to

hold themselves in readiness. A special *lathi* force had been created.

WITH a Government so frantically on the war path the leaders of the popular movement felt the necessity of making their position clear and thus strengthening their movement organisationally. They issued a manifesto acquainting the Government with their minimum demands and giving a fresh assurance to the minorities of Kashmir that their legitimate linguistic, cultural, religious, political and economic rights would be safeguarded by the National Conference of Kashmir according to the principles "enunciated, accepted or acted upon by the Indian National Congress." The manifesto was signed by most of the leaders of the erstwhile Muslim Conference and the Hindu Progressive Party.

SINCE then there has been a great deal of very significant political configuration in Kashmir. It is not only the State that is trying to put down the movement by fair means and foul. There are a host of others from among the ranks of avowed communalists—both Hindus and Muslims—who have vested interests and who stand to lose their extensive privileges with the widening of the people's political powers who are also obstructing this movement. Thus the present political spectacle in Kashmir has become illustrative and instructive—illustrative of the fact that in a struggle for political emancipation it is not the colour or the religion of the ruling power that matters but it is the classes from which that power proceeds that do; and instructive in the sense that this fact must be borne in mind by political workers in other Indian States who are apt to base their movements on communal considerations.

The Dun Express Disaster.

IT is a matter of some satisfaction that the Government of India have agreed at last to conduct a judicial enquiry into the terrible happenings of the Dun Express Disaster. It was feared in the beginning that the railway authorities would try to hush up the matter or conduct a departmental enquiry at the most. It must be said again that the Government of India took an inordinately long time to decide about their duty in the matter. The demand for a judicial enquiry into the Dun Express Disaster was first voiced by the Bihar Assembly as the party most affected by the disaster. The Bihar Government strongly supported this demand and represented the matter to the Government of India. But the Government of India were indecisive. The question was again brought to the fore in the Council of State when Mr. P. N. Saprú moved an adjournment motion demanding a judicial enquiry into the Dun Express Disaster. But even then, the Government of India could not give the assurance asked for by the Council of State. It is only when the question was raised a third time in the Central Assembly that the Government of India expressed their desire of conducting an enquiry which would be strictly of a judicial character. This hesitancy of the Government of India over a matter which affected the lives and property of hundreds of people had greatly agitated the feelings of the public in the country and it is a great relief to the public therefore that the Government have agreed to discharge their obvious duty in the matter.

THE Dun Express Disaster culminates a series of disasters that have recently taken place on the E. I. Railway. It is only year before last that the Bhetā disaster convulsed the country by its terrible casualties. Since then, five accidents of a major character have occurred on the E. I. Railway. Whether the accidents are due to the inefficiency of the railway management or to the nefarious plans of a group of miscreants, their effects on the travelling public have been the same and it cannot but be a blot on the administration of the railway which fails to take steps to stop these accidents. The circumstances connected with the Dun Express Disaster are again of such a nature, that one cannot but blame the railway authorities if not for the cause, at least for the difficulties arising out of the disaster. Just after the derailment of the Dun Express, a number of bogies caught fire and it is admitted that the fire kept on blazing for 36 hours and could not be put out by the railway management. Secondly, some of the trains passing on the same track did not halt to afford relief to the suffering passengers and in many cases, the pitiable cries of dying people for help went almost unheeded. Thirdly, the congress volunteers who wanted to give relief to the passengers were studiously kept out of the place of the accident. One may understand, the railway management's inability to cope with the situation, but it is impossible to understand why the railway authorities should reject the proffered help of the congress volunteers.

* * *

ALL this, leads one to suspect that the railway authorities handled the situation in a mechanical manner and did not show that regard for human life which under the circumstances was expected of them. Therefore, as Mr. Joshi pointed out during the discussion on the subject in the Central Assembly, the committee that will be appointed to enquire into the Dun Express Disaster should not rest satisfied with finding out the cause of the disaster alone, but should proceed further and see whether the railway authorities discharged their duty towards the travellers committed to their care. If it be found that the railway officers failed in their duty in the matter, then the committee should suggest the ways by which the Railway can be brought to book. We think that this is a very serious matter and deserves the utmost consideration at the hands of the tribunal. Of late, the railway authorities in India have been showing callous disregard for the welfare of the travellers and drastic steps should be taken to check the same. Not long ago, the G. I. P. Railway went to the length of contending before a court that it was not responsible for the safety and the convenience of the passengers and therefore could put as many passengers as it liked

in a single bogey. Of course, this contention of the railway concerned was totally rejected by the court. But this incident reveals the callous disregard that the railways show towards their passengers. The railways are a great national concern and have been flourishing at the taxpayer's expense. Therefore every care should be taken to see that they cater to the safety and welfare of the passengers. Any other attitude on the part of the railways cannot be tolerated by the Indian public.

* * *

India and the League.

THE keen dissatisfaction felt in India at the League's utter ineffectiveness in preventing and even in punishing unprovoked aggression is growing apace as country after country is being gobbled up by expansionist nations either by the actual use of force or by a mere threat of the use of force. Now in fact no one even thinks of invoking the League's mediation or calling for the application of the League's sanctions when a Member State is either wholly absorbed by a dictator country or is deprived of large chunks of its territory. Austria and Czechoslovakia are standing monuments of the fact that the League is more dead than alive. Both friends and foes of the League were entirely oblivious of the League's existence or convinced of its impotence when these happenings were going on.

* * *

THIS bitter discontent of the Indian people was voiced in the Central Assembly last week in a demand for India's withdrawal from the League. Even when the League had not gone into the limbo but was an active force, India's complaints against that body were many and serious. Her excessive contribution to the League's funds was the least of it. This country is represented by the Government of India's nominees who more often than not speak in a sense contrary to the prevailing sentiment in the country. India does not therefore even get the satisfaction of having spoken out her mind, whether it helps to shape League policy or not. Further, India, being a dependent country, can never hope to influence the international policy of independent countries. Superadded to it is the League's abject failure to provide collective security in face of aggression. It would, therefore, be extremely hard for anyone, in the present posture of affairs, to convince India that the League is of any use at all to anyone, much less to herself. All one can say is that it may be possible to revive the League at some future time, and that in that hope it should be supported now. But, in view of India's disabilities arising from political dependence, this hope cannot arouse any enthusiasm in the people of this country.

REFLEXIONS ON RAJKOT.

IN the Rajkot affair the accusation which Mahatma Gandhi has brought against the Government of India is that though the Thakore Saheb was and is willing to implement the terms of settlement arrived at between him and Sardar Patel, the Resident is compelling the Thakore Saheb to go back upon them in several

particulars. The charge is very definite. He repeats it several times in the last issue of the *Harijan*. He says, the breach of the covenant has been committed at the "bidding" of the Resident; before the Thakore Saheb could carry out his promise to his people the Resident "made him break it;" the Resident "instigated" the

breach; and so forth. From this his conclusion is clear: "The struggle now is not between the ruler and his people, but in reality it is between the Congress and the British Government represented by the Resident;" and the struggle can be ended only by the Viceroy asking the Resident "to restore the (Thakore-Sardar) pact."

If the accusation is well-founded, the demand is entirely fair and just. It only means that when the Princes desire to confer responsible government on their people the least that the paramount power should do is to put no impediments in the way of the rulers. It may be that the particular scheme of constitutional reform that any ruler might have framed appears to the paramount power to go too far and even to be revolutionary in the direction of democracy; even so the paramount power should give a free hand to the ruler. As it does not compel rulers to introduce even what it considers to be necessary reforms, so it should not hinder the introduction of reforms which, in its opinion, are excessive. Otherwise it will mean that its influence is always on the side of conservatism and reaction. In fact, the British Government has already announced its policy of offering no obstruction to the constitutionalisation of the States machinery. On the facts as stated by Mahatma Gandhi, the paramount power is clearly guilty of a violent reversal of the announced policy.

Nor does Mahatma Gandhi ever make a charge without verifying all the statements on which it is based, and the charge is so grave and has been so often repeated that one would be justified in taking it as proved and convicting the British Government, in the words of the Mahatma, of "a cold-blooded breach of a solemn covenant." But if we leave on one side this all-important factor, some misgivings cannot fail to arise in one's mind on a perusal of only the correspondence published. The terms of the covenant were such that hardly a man with a steady mind and with a grasp of all the consequences involved would ordinarily agree to them. Let us assume that the Thakore Saheb was not only willing but eager to give full self-government to his people and to abdicate his own powers. Even on this assumption one would not expect him to undertake in advance to give effect to whatever recommendations were made by a body of men, of which a large majority was nominated by another person, however great may be his own faith in the latter's judgment. Such blank cheques are much too rare in politics to induce in one the confidence that the man who signs them knows what exactly he is about.

The fact that this happened in Rajkot cannot but lead one to wonder whether in this instance the Thakore Saheb did not honestly recoil from what he had done when he realised the full im-

plications of his action. Over against this we must set the other fact that Mahatma Gandhi has reached a definitive conclusion, which he must have founded on his personal knowledge of the Thakore Saheb, that there is no backsliding, on the part of the latter, but that the paramount power has forced him into a position in which he appears in a false light to the outside public. Cannot the Thakore Saheb resolve any lingering doubts on the subject by issuing a statement that he is still willing to abide by the terms to which he has put his hand? Ordinarily, perhaps, he must suffer, in private when he is coerced by the paramount power; but this is an exceptional situation in regard to which a grave crisis is threatened, and he may certainly give himself the liberty of removing the screen of the usual niceties of diplomacy from what would reveal itself as a dishonourable transaction? It is only he that can set the doubts completely at rest amidst assertions which are directly contradictory one to the other.

In the published correspondence Sir Patrick Cadell does not come out too badly. He found when he took charge of the administration that things were going to the bad; that the ruler was grossly neglectful of his duties; that as a result the people were suffering from many just grievances; and that, the ruler doing nothing to redress them he was himself reduced to the necessity of repressing a people groaning under manifold complaints. Some words from his letter to the Thakore Saheb may be quoted here:

The condition of affairs in the State is very serious. Many of the complaints against the State are based on your behaviour. It is believed that you spend too large a share of the State's revenue, that most of your expenditure is on unworthy objects, and that... you take no part in the administration of the State, and show no interest in the welfare of your people... It is not fair to your officers to expect them to bear the burden of repressive methods while you do nothing.

But the Thakore Saheb, on his own showing, had requisitioned the services of Sir Patrick with the view that the latter would "put down the situation," and had evidently thought that, being a Britisher, the Dewan would rule the people with a strong hand, leaving himself in peace. The Dewan, however, proved himself much too exacting and bullying for the pleasure-loving Thakore Saheb, who thereupon planned to get rid of his would-be task-master by making his peace with his people, possibly without a full understanding of what this would involve. Sardar Patel offered terms to him which no one, however friendly to popular government, would be expected to agree to. One may agree to the grant of full self-government, but would not agree to adopt, without consideration, a scheme for constitutional change that another might suggest. But the Thakore Saheb's repugnance to what he regarded as overbearing conduct of his European Dewan was so unconquerable that he

agreed to the proffered terms. We do not say, not knowing the facts, that this is just what happened, but this is a possible explanation which one cannot shut out completely from one's mind.

If the explanation suggested is true—and the correctness of this hypothesis can be affirmed or denied only by those who know the character of the Thakore Saheb—then it is not impossible that, after having sent the harassing Dewan away, the Thakore Saheb may have tried to wriggle out of his undertaking with the Sardar. Apart from any inner knowledge that Mahatma Gandhi may have but which is denied to the public, the charge levelled by him against the Resident of coercing the Thakore Saheb into a withdrawal of the agreed terms is based upon the talk that the Resident had with the Thakore Saheb, in which the former pointed out the inexpediency of the latter agreeing beforehand to give effect to the scheme that might be put forward by a Committee to be appointed. We cannot in fairness quarrel with this advice of the Resident. When in Mysore the Congressmen in the State refused to end their civil disobedience campaign unless the Dewan gave a prior undertaking that responsible government would be introduced in the State after the Committee's report was submitted, Mahatma Gandhi expressed the opinion that such a demand would be unreasonable though he personally held the view that full responsible government should be immediately introduced in the State. The reason was obvious. No one in authority will bind himself, before appointing a Committee, that its recommendations shall be carried out *in toto*, without leaving any room for variation therein. Although the Resident was thus justified in advising the Thakore Saheb against accepting the terms offered, it would be entirely wrong on his part to make the Thakore Saheb go back upon them after having signified his acceptance thereof. And the one question at issue here is whether the going back is a voluntary act on the part of the Thakore Saheb or is an act of compulsion on the part of the Resident.

So far as the public is concerned, the issue is reduced to one of giving credence to one party instead of another; and while it is true that in this position the public will believe the Mahatma's statement rather than of the Government of India, we cannot help saying that it is hard on the public to present it with an issue in this form. And the issue can certainly be simplified. If the Thakore Saheb is burning with democratic zeal and is really straining at the leash to establish responsible government in his State, why does he not of his own motion or at the Sardar's instance announce his intention of establishing full responsible government and then appoint a committee to work out the details if he thinks it necessary? Everyone will then see if the paramount power interferes and ties the ruler's hands. Aundh has been

allowed to go ahead, when its adviser was Mahatma Gandhi. There is no reason to assume that Rajkot will be held back when its adviser is Sardar Patel. But if the paramount power does interfere it will be a straight issue, and the public will be able to judge of it. However, as it is, the issue has been unnecessarily complicated, and the public will not have all the materials before it to form its judgment thereon, though perhaps when it is a question between the Mahatma and the Government of India, the public does not require much convincing. Yet we believe it would be a mercy to those who would exercise their own minds on the subject that the issue would be made an impersonal one in some such way as we have suggested.

Mahatma Gandhi intends to bring matters to a crisis by asking the Ministry in Bombay, and perhaps the Ministries in other Congress provinces to resign if the Viceroy does not compel the Thakore Saheb to give his adhesion to the original pact or rather to remove the Resident's veto on such adhesion. It is true that the Congress has the power now of making the British Government agree to an even admittedly unreasonable demand by threatening a crisis in a major portion of India. For the sake of preserving peace, the Government will have to yield. But it would certainly be best, if such a crisis is to come, that it comes on an issue of which the merits are not in the slightest degree in doubt. If the paramount power is really found to bring pressure to bear upon the States, not in the direction of introducing but in the direction of obstructing the establishment of responsible government, such a crisis would be justified. But that cannot be said to be the policy of the paramount power. It has, if not encouraged, at least permitted the introduction of constitutional reforms in some States; negatively, there is no proof, leaving Rajkot aside, of its having interposed its veto on constitutional reforms. In Rajkot itself the charge of hindering reforms cannot be preferred against it except on the basis of an inner knowledge which is not available to the public at large. In these conditions we very much doubt whether there is sufficient justification for recalling the Congress Ministries from work which, if they are not doing it too well, must at least be kept going. This, however, is a question which the Congress alone can answer for itself; outsiders can only express their views on the situation as it unfolds itself before their eyes.

In Jaipur the issue is a very small one; it has assumed the proportions it has for two reasons: a ban is put on the movements of a high Congress official and the Jaipur officer who put the ban is a Britisher. Several men of equal eminence have been banned from several States before, although their object was equally inoffensive and unobjection-

able as that of Mr. Jamnalal Bajaj. They may not have been such prominent Congressmen, but a ban like the one put on Mr. Jamnalal's entry into Jaipur is a common enough occurrence in almost all States. The Congress of course has a right to choose its battle-ground, and if it selects this particular occasion of the ill-treatment of an influential official of its own, it may well do so. But the public at large will be excused if

it gives greater attention to States like Hyderabad where the grievances are of a more general character and have been voiced for a long time without any avail. That the officer in question in Jaipur is a Britisher is neither here nor there. An oppressive officer is no less blameworthy because he is an Indian. We are concerned more with oppression than with the pigment of the oppressor's skin.

THE BOMBAY SHOPS BILL.

I.

FOR some time past the Government of Bombay have been giving thought to the advisability of enacting a piece of legislation intended for the protection of workers engaged in retail trade in shops, commercial establishments, restaurants, eating-houses, theatres, etc. Government had informally circulated their draft proposals about this time last year. The proposals have now been given a definite shape and published in the form of a Bill.

The provisions of the Bill will come into force in the first instance only in the cities of Bombay, Ahmedabad, Poona and Sholapur including cantonments. The Bill, however, empowers the Provincial Government to extend its application to other places and areas as the need is felt. The recent Ceylon Shop Ordinance has been made applicable to all parts of the island and not merely to big cities like Colombo. We realise the difficulties of such a course in this Province, but all the same we wish the provisions of the Bill had been made applicable to some other important towns like Hubli and Surat. According to the Census Report of 1931, the population of Hubli in that year was 89,982. It may be well over a lakh by this time. Moreover, it is admitted by all that Hubli is "a town of considerable industrial and commercial importance," having nearly 2,000 shops and a large number of hair-cutting saloons, tailors' establishments and laundries all of which are going to be covered by the provisions of the Bill.

EXCLUSIONS.

Clause 4 of the Bill excludes from its application certain categories of workers engaged in establishments enumerated by the clause. It may be contended with some show of reason that the provisions of the Bill should not be made applicable to workers engaged in bazars or fairs for the sale of work for charitable purposes or in work of an intermittent character like that of a traveller or a canvasser. But the clause is very much more comprehensive. It makes discrimination, among others, against workers engaged in hospitals as well as clubs and residential hotels. Much more indefensible is the exclusion from the benefits of the Bill of "persons engaged in pre-

paratory or complementary work such as clearing or forwarding clerks responsible for despatch of goods by rail or for customs formalities or messengers" and also of "persons employed in the collection, delivery or conveyance of goods." Workers with such duties are mainly to be found in commercial establishments and, as we shall have occasion to say later on, the Bill deals with such establishments with studied caution and inordinate moderation. It must be admitted that duties such as these are of an urgent and important nature and cannot brook delay; but at the same time it must also be admitted that this is by no means the fault of the workers and that the proper way of getting this kind of work done with the efficiency that it requires is, not to overwork the persons engaged in it, but to add to their number to the necessary extent. On top of this again the omnibus sub-clause (j) of clause 4 empowers the Government to exempt from the operation of the Bill "any other establishment or class of establishments or persons or class of persons." Even assuming that the Provincial Government will be very sparing in the exercise of their powers under this clause, it cannot but be said that these powers ought to be very rigidly limited and if possible even specifically defined.

EXEMPTION.

Clause 29 of the Bill empowers the Provincial Government to suspend the operation of the Bill altogether for the maximum period of twenty days in a year. These powers are meant to be used mainly during Christmas or Diwali when provisions regarding the closing hours of shops may have to be relaxed. But such relaxation should not be allowed to encroach upon provisions regarding hours of work of shop assistants.

It is true that during these festivities business is brisk and the number of customers is largely augmented. Everybody is in a holiday mood, but not exactly everybody under the provisions of this Bill. The shop assistants will find that while all or most of their fellows are having holidays, they are being made to work harder than usual. There is nothing wrong about Government endeavouring to look after the convenience of the consumer, but that need not necessarily involve hardship to the shop assistants. If custom

is augmented during Christmas and Diwali days, the profits of the shop-owners are also proportionately augmented. It would not at all be unjust to expect them to spend a little more money on such occasions to keep up the efficiency of their service to their customers. They can and should engage the necessary number of additional assistants so that none would be compelled to work longer than usual in what really ought to be, and for other people is, holiday time. It is possible that some small shopkeepers may not be able to maintain additional assistants with full pay. After examining their case Government may issue special permits to them to allow their assistants to work for longer hours which should be statutorily fixed. They should, however, be required at least to pay overtime allowance to the overworked assistants. The period of overtime per day and the proportion of overtime allowance to the usual wages should be statutorily fixed. The principle is admitted in our factory legislation, and there would be nothing wrong in introducing it here if necessary. The same considerations hold good in the case of shopkeepers requiring additional help at the time of annual accounting. It is only fair that additional remuneration should be made available for additional work.

HOURS OF WORK.

The report on an enquiry conducted by the Labour Office of the Bombay Government reveals the following facts :

The average hours of work of shop assistants in Bombay city are 12.25 per day. The predominant range of the hours of work in restaurants, *pan-bidi* shops, grain and provision stores and cloth and clothing shops is 10 to 15, 9 to 16, 12 to 15, and 10 to 13 respectively. The daily hours of work in Bombay city are longest in vegetable shops (14.51) and shortest in books and stationery shops (12.24). The hours of work in restaurants and *pan-bidi* shops in Ahmedabad are longer than in most other types of concerns, being 12 to 16 and 9 to 12 per day respectively. . . . The longest hours in Ahmedabad are, however, to be found in hair-cutting saloons. . . . For Poona, Sholapur and Hubli. . . it would appear that except in the case of restaurants and *pan-bidi* shops, the hours of work in other categories of shops are lower than in Bombay and Ahmedabad.

The object of this Bill is to afford some relief to these thousands of workers, "while not overlooking the requirements of commerce and the consumer."

The hours of work for workers engaged in shops, restaurants, theatres and similar establishments (excluding commercial establishments) are fixed at not more than ten per day exclusive of the period of rest which is prescribed to be at least half an hour after six hours' continuous work or one hour after eight hours' continuous work. Working hours and periods of rest will together be allowed to spread over a period of as many as fourteen hours during the day except in the case of shops which do not close for at least three hours between the opening and closing time. In their case the spread-over will be only

twelve hours per day. The weekly maximum of the hours of work is curiously enough not prescribed at all. The closing hour for shops, but not for restaurants etc., is fixed at 9 p. m., for it was found on enquiry being made by the Labour Office that nearly 60 per cent. of shops in Bombay are closed about that time and a very large majority of shops in the other places are closed even a little earlier.

We submit that the hours of work proposed by the Bill, viz., ten per day are much too long. Even the original draft proposals of Government were somewhat more progressive. There they were placed at the maximum of not more than nine per day; and in the case of commercial establishments, over and above this, a weekly maximum of fifty-four was also prescribed. There is no justification for whittling down the original proposals in this respect. The Shops Bill sponsored by a non-official Congress member of the U. P. Legislative Assembly provides that "no employee shall work in a shop for more than 48 hours a week or more than eight hours a day." All over the civilised world, with the possible exception of Japan which is generally backward in labour legislation, working hours in shops have been brought down to not more than nine per day and 54 per week. In many cases they are even less. In Cuba, Belgium and Danzig, for instance, they are limited to eight per day and 48 per week. In Tanganyika the maximum weekly hours are 54, in Kenya 50 and in British Honduras actually 45. The Shop Ordinance of Ceylon provides that the working hours in shops shall not exceed nine hours on any one day and shall not exceed 50 hours in any one week. These periods include meal times, which means that the working day in Ceylon actually consists of eight hours.

In these circumstances, the Bombay Government would do well at least to stick to their original proposal of limiting the daily working hours to nine and weekly hours to 54. These should be inclusive of rest intervals as in Ceylon. In the Bill, however, Government have receded from their first plan to a very great extent. Over and above the number of daily hours being raised to ten, no limit is placed on weekly hours at all. In some weeks they may be even 70. It is true that provision has been made for four holidays in a month, but that does not necessarily mean that there will be a holiday in every week. That will depend upon the caprice of the employer. It is quite possible that employers in some cases may not choose to allow a holiday to some of their assistants continuously for two or even three weeks so that they may be required to work during the whole of that period at the rate of ten hours a day. This undesirable eventuality will be avoided only by fixing the number of weekly hours also. Government had actually done so in their original draft of the Bill. What makes them change their mind in this respect passes comprehension.

The hours of work of workers engaged in restaurants, cinemas etc., though limited to ten per day, are allowed to be spread over a period of fourteen hours. The period is much too long and will be extremely tiresome to the workers. In such establishments business is rather slack for some hours during the day and it is possible that employers will ask their assistants to be away from duty exactly during this time and return to it again. They will thus be able to usurp for themselves all the advantage from the slackness of the business which should legitimately result to the assistants who are naturally required to work with greater speed during the brisk hours of business. Thus if the spread-over of work during the day is not limited to the actual hours of work plus the rest period, the result is disadvantageous to the workers. The period of spread-over allowed in the Bill, therefore, should be reduced.

Review.

THE INDIAN COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY.

THE INDIAN COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY: ITS PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE. 1937. 24cm. 178p. Rs. 2-4-0.

THE INDIAN COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY (1938 ANNUAL). 1938. 34cm. 100p. Rs. 2-4-0. Both by M. P. GANDHI. (Author, 14/2, Old China Bazar Street, Calcutta).

MR. M. P. GANDHI has long been known as a careful recorder of the progress of Indian industries with many of which he is closely connected. In his present work Mr. Gandhi traces the history of the Indian textile industry from the earliest times to the present day. He naturally gives prominence to recent rather than early history. That India is the natural home of the cotton textile industry is well-known. For this as also for other reasons the fortunes of this industry are a particular concern of the Indian nation.

IN the past few decades this industry has benefitted by the combined advantages derived from natural situation and public protection. Even to-day national feeling and a protective tariff put the industry above the level of many other struggling industries. With all this national succour the internal efficiency of the industry does not show a sufficiently rapid progress. The position of the workers employed in the industry is far from satisfactory and the competing position of the Indian producers *vis-a-vis* the foreign, especially the Japanese, producers has not materially improved.

It is noteworthy that Mr. Gandhi supports the movement for the preservation and progress of the handloom industry sponsored by his better known namesake. He feels that both on social and economic grounds there is enough justification for protecting even at a sacrifice village industries generally, and the handloom industry in particular. Taking the present and prospective needs for textile consumption in India Mr. Gandhi feels that there is enough room for both the mills and the hand-looms.

The book contains a good deal of statistical, historical and descriptive material about all the branches of the industry. Advice is tendered to Government to continue granting protection and to the people to continue to cultivate the habit of Swadeshi. As for the industry's own duty to the workers, consumers and taxpayers there is no mention, except in the preface of the 1938 Annual. It is to be hoped that the spirit of the author's exhortation in this respect will be taken to heart by the Millowners in all parts of the country. The books are a valuable source of reference to all those interested in the progress of what still is India's premier manufacturing industry.

D. G. K.

Miscellaneous.

INDIANS IN MALAYA.

MR. KUNZRU'S SPEECH.

At the Penang Town Hall Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru spoke on 20th January to a crowded audience. The STRAITS ECHO from which the following account of the speech is taken, wrote: "Seldom had the Town Hall been more packed." Mr. Kunzru said:

"I have taken interest for a number of years in the condition of Indians settled outside their land for I strongly feel that the honour of India is intimately bound up with the treatment accorded to these children of hers. I have been to many parts of the world where Indians are settled and I find that the treatment received by our countrymen is in the last resort conditioned by the respect in which India is held."

The Pundit said that the position of Indians abroad was one of the major problems India had to deal with. There were certain facts regarding the Indians resident here which had to be dealt with in order to understand the point of view from which the problems relating to local Indians had to be studied. The first and most important fact to bear in mind was that Indians came here at the invitation of the British authorities to contribute to the material development of this country. They did not come as exploiters but to perform an indispensable task which could not be performed by other sections of the population. The second fact was that their rights had been ignored for a long time. Indians were called "immigrants" and that word was, he supposed, used to prejudice their case and to place them at a disadvantage with the other communities. Malaya, however, was overwhelmingly inhabited by immigrant communities to whom it owed all its development. If Indians were immigrants, then other communities including a large number of those who are supposed to be the original inhabitants of these countries, were immigrants too.

INDIANS NOT DEMANDING SPECIAL RIGHTS.

It was too late now to discriminate against any community and the only test to apply was whether by their presence in this land, they had contributed to its uplift or not. If this test were applied to Indians, they were entitled to equality of citizenship with the other races. "What is it the Indians are wanting? Are

they asking for any rights specially for their own community, or social or economic or political privileges exclusively for themselves!" the Pundit asked. No fair-minded man could accuse the Indians of being actuated by purely selfish motives, for their interests were the same at bottom as those of the other communities and if they succeeded in changing the point of view of the authorities, it would result in the common good. Coming to the question of Indian labour, the speaker spoke of the factors that had led to the departure of the Government delegation to New Delhi. The question of wages was naturally the first factor in the dispute and critics had always maintained that the Indian labourer was better here than in his own country. "Is it the right point of view to adopt?" the Pundit asked. "Let us apply this point of view to Englishmen themselves. Are they permanent residents of this country or have they come here to seek their fortunes? It is obvious that they have come here in the hope of being able to advance their interests more quickly and to a greater degree than they would have been able to do had they remained in their home land. "Why should the Indians alone be asked to be content with the low standard of living which obtains in their country which is over-populated. People leave their country and go outside in search of better conditions than are available in their home-lands."

The Pundit spoke at some length on the wage paid to Indian labourers and commented on non-Indian labour, working side by side with Indians.

NO REASON FOR DISCRIMINATION IN WAGES.

"I recognise," he said, "the efficiency of the Chinese worker, I admire his enterprise, I respect those solid qualities of industry and skilled craftsmanship which have enabled him to settle down as a colonist in many parts of the world, but is there any reason to discriminate between the wages of Indian and Chinese labour?" They had been told that Chinese labour was more productive than Indian. If such was the case was it only philanthropy or self-interest that made the planters employ 95 per cent of the Indian labourers in this country. Taken all in all, the Indian labourer was equal in efficiency to, and cheaper than, any other race and this accounted for the preference. The speaker discussed the housing of labourers and said that Indian labourers could not, humanly speaking, feel that they were masters of themselves. An immediate solution to this question might not be feasible but he recommended that it be borne in mind in connection with all schemes for the housing of labour and said that the Government should shoulder the burden in this respect. The next most important question which related to Indian labour was that of education. His suggestion was that the Government should run all the estate schools and ask the planters to make a contribution for relieving them of their obligation.

Coming to his next point, the Pundit stated that, wherever Indians were settled an attempt was made to separate the interests of the Indian workers from the Indians of other classes. "It is made out that the educated Indians, the traders, the merchants and the professional men, are a sort of parasite class whose numbers should be kept under strict control in the interests of Indian workers. Indeed, it seems to me that in some cases if the local Governments had their way they would stop the immigration of educated Indians altogether." Nothing had done more

harm to the reputation of India than the migration of ignorant and helpless labourers. The interests of the Indians of the labouring and non-labouring classes were bound together. In this country, for instance, the bettering of the labourers' condition was entirely due, not to the authorities, but to the work of the educated Indians.

INADEQUATE FACILITIES FOR CHILDRENS' EDUCATION

Regarding the educated Indians themselves, they had one point of vital interest to them—as it was to the labourers—and that was the education of their children if they looked forward to moral and intellectual advancement. He had received certain complaints to the effect that adequate opportunities were wanting for the education of the Indian children in schools other than primary. He had been shown a letter received from an Inspector of Schools by an Indian in Kuala Lumpur stating "that the schools in this country were not meant for foreigners." The man had sought to admit his son and the Pundit wondered if such an answer would have been given to the parents of a British boy seeking admission. Such difficulties, he was informed, existed in the case of Raffles College too, and he thought that the Government should consult Indian leaders and make arrangements for students to be admitted with absolute impartiality.

"Another important point," said the speaker, "is the services. In the Colony, which is directly under the control of the British Government, the Straits Settlements Civil Service is, I understand, of the same grade as the provincial service in India. One would think that, even if the Indians were not given the opportunities of entering the higher services, they would be appointed freely to the posts of this service; yet I am told that there is only one Indian in the whole service.

"There may be no bar theoretically to the admission of Indians but if this is the practical state of things, it is idle to contend that Indians are not being discriminated against."

RULERS OF STATES IN MALAYA.

He commented on the absence of Indians from the Malayan Civil and Administrative Services and stated that, in view of the vast work they had performed, they should have the rights of full citizenship but this point of view, he was informed, had not been accepted by the Rulers of the States. "I do not know what the wishes of the Rulers themselves are," he said, "but I do know that in all vital matters they are subject to the control of the British authorities. Their position here seems to me to be even worse than that of the Indian Rulers in my country. The British Government having brought Indians into the State is morally bound, considering the fact that fourth-fifths of them are working in these States, to advise the Rulers—or if this is considered too strong a term—to plead with them to place these people on a footing of equality with the other communities living in the States." In wanting these jobs the Indians were not hankering after well-paid jobs but for the different light in which they would be regarded if they held such jobs.

Pundit Kunzru next spoke on the refusal of the Government to form an Indian volunteer unit on the ground of lack of funds. This indeed, was surprising when he was told that "surplus budgets were the rule in this country and that the Legislative Council of the Straits Settlements recently decided to contribute the sum of \$10,000,000

to the British Exchequer within a period of five years." This was another case of discrimination against Indians.

He also deplored the lack of Indian representation on public bodies. Perhaps Indians were of so little account that their interests were unconsciously ignored but it might even be that the Indians were being deliberately kept in the background. The word "coolie", the Pundit said, should be banished from the official phraseology of this country and it was only when the Indian was regarded as a "labourer" or a "worker" would the condition of Indian labour be improved. He exhorted the educated Indians to improve the lot of the labourers by taking more interest in them and advocated that they should seriously take up the question of labour organisation.

FORMATION OF TRADE UNIONS.

"The trade union movement has been found necessary in several countries for the protection of the rights of the labourers. It has been found necessary in India also for the same reasons. Malaya can be no exception to the rule," he said. "We may be certain that it is as much necessary in the interests of the employees as well as the employers and the Government and trade unions should be organised on sound lines as in other countries. "I have no doubt that there are serious impediments in your way. I know that there is no law of the kind that exists in other countries regarding the formation of labour organisations but you must be prepared to make sacrifices to vindicate the honour of your country. "This is one of the most vital problems calling for your attention. You have neglected it so far but you neglect it in future only under pain of remaining for ever in the depressed condition which you find so galling at the present time."

The Pundit asked them to interest themselves in the conditions of shop assistants from South India and said that another matter which called for their attention was their obligation to the other communities of this country.

He called upon Indians to recognise the social obligations of wealth and told them that they must be prepared to help and encourage local charities and make benefactions for other purposes. They should take a leaf out of the book of the other communities and come forward to place their resources at the disposal of the public. It was not that Indians had not observed these obligations but he wanted them to do so more than they had done in the past.

CO-OPERATION WITH OTHERS.

"I would ask you to remember in all your activities here that you do not constitute the entire population of this land... If the questions of citizenship which trouble your mind are to be satisfactorily solved it will be, I venture to think, only with the co-operation of the members of all communities. "If you are conscious of this fact you will take active steps in order to promote closer relations between yourselves and the other people." The Pundit asked them to call upon the services of the Indian Government when vital issues were at stake.

In conclusion, the Pundit said that these were troubled days and the steps taken to develop Singapore from the point of defence was an eloquent illustration of what he had in mind, and he felt that a contented Indian community would be a source of no little strength to the British Empire in the days to come.

Correspondence.

SMALL STATES AND RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—I am surprised at the comments that you have made regarding me on page 43 of your paper of 26th January. I thought you usually took all possible steps to be precise and accurate. It appears to me that your information regarding my attitude towards the States' movement is incorrect and also your study of different kinds of States in India is incomplete. I think it is only I who have been advocating the cancellation of sanads of the Orissa States, and had you taken a little care to keep yourself informed of the activities in the Orissa States you could have easily seen in the press my public statements and comments thereupon by many leading papers in India. If it be not outside your jurisdiction to know the actual working of the Congress mind now, I would request you to refer to writings of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi who openly advocate abolition of small States.

Besides, the question of smallness or largeness is irrelevant so far as Orissa States are concerned. For your information, I quote the following extracts from the sanads granted to the Rulers of Orissa, which will show the powers they have got. Please know that the Orissa States are not treaty States. They are simply sanad holders like so many landlords of British India but who enjoy powers owing to the fluctuating policy of the British Government. The sanads lay down:

You shall consult the Agent to the Governor-General or any other officer authorised by him in all important matters of administration and comply with his wishes. The settlement, collection of land revenue, imposition of taxes, administration of justice, etc., etc., shall be regarded as specially important matters, and in respect to them you shall at all times conform to such advice as the Agent may give you.

In view of the above terms in the sanads, I have been agitating for cancellation of sanads and pressing the Political Department to come out for responsible government in the Orissa States.

If you care to know and study problems I thought you would not indulge in mass propaganda as is generally carried on to run down political opponents.

Now I hope you will be sorry for your loose remarks: "Mr. Mahtab is using the great influence that his position gives him actually to discourage a movement for constitutional reform that the newly awakened political consciousness of the people in Orissa States has been attempting to bring into existence." If you care to know things you may consult the States' people here in Orissa except those in Dhenkanal with regard to the humble part that I take in their movement. You may consult the refugees as well.

Hope you will not mind this long letter. I would request you not to indulge in writing comments without knowing facts thoroughly.—Yours, etc.

H. MAHTAB.

[We confess that we are not quite as conversant with the workings of the Congress mind on the Indian States problem as we might wish. But perhaps one reason for this is that the Congress

mind is somewhat wayward on this question. Everyone knows including such ignoramuses as the Editor of this paper that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is in favour of abolition of all States, small and big, but we did not know that Mahatma Gandhi was also in favour of abolition, restricting this operation, however, to small States. But Mr. Mahtab says he is, and we are quite willing to believe that it is so. Thanks for this enlightenment.

Mr. Mahtab himself favours cancellation of the sanads of small States which restrict the freedom allowed to them, so that they may introduce responsible government within their borders. He feels that such cancellation is a necessary preliminary to a move in the direction of democracy. But cannot he take his stand on Earl Winterton's statement, though it does not specifically relate to the sanad States, and maintain that such restrictions as now exist in the way of establishment of responsible government in the States may remain on paper but shall not be allowed to operate in practice? By this statement the British Government says in effect to a State like Travancore: "Your powers are no doubt limited, but limitations are intended to be brought into force when it is feared that you will be oppressive in your dealings with your people to whom we are pledged to insure good government. If, however, you wish to introduce popular government, which would remove all misgivings on our part that the people may perchance be oppressed, then you can certainly go ahead. Our supervisory powers, being no longer necessary, will then cease to be exercised." Smaller States necessarily have more drastic and more detailed restrictions imposed upon them than larger States; but the principle holds good in all States. The easiest way for all States to get rid of these restrictions on their powers is to make over these powers, such as they are, whether large or small, to the representatives of the people.

The point that is of great practical importance in this matter is that when a popular agitation was commenced in the Orissa States for responsible government, Mr. Mahtab, instead of lending his active support to it, raised the legalistic objection that the States themselves were helpless in the matter of establishing responsible government until the British Government first conferred unrestricted powers upon them, whereas, if what we have said above is true, responsible government would be feasible even when the restrictions remained but were made inoperative except when the Princes misgoverned their States. The result of Mr. Mahtab taking up this position was that his influence was, for all practical purposes, cast on the side of maintenance of autocracy in the States and against the agitation of responsible government. This was no doubt far from his intention, but that was the practical outcome of what he did. For his propaganda amounted in effect to a plea for giving full powers to the States. The removal of the existing restrictions on the States' powers was to come about immediately, whereas the replacement of these bureaucratic restrictions by popular restrictions might or might not come about in future. Aundh is not a treaty State or a full-powered State; but Mahatma Gandhi did not begin his move for persuading the ruler to grant responsible government by first making a petition to the British Government to make the

Chief Saheb of Aundh a complete autocrat. Nor need Mr. Mahtab show his zeal for democracy in that unheard-of way and he certainly need not boast of his being the only publicist who asks for widening the area of autocracy in the States of Orissa.

We wonder whether he is conscious that at any rate in Dhenkanal State, which he excepts from the other Orissa States about which he is confident that they will testify to his beneficent activity, the people labour under the oppressive feeling that Mr. Mahtab has put an unnecessary brake upon their movement for responsible government.—Ed., *S.o.I.*]

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- PRIMARY EDUCATION IN INDIA. By DINKAR DESAI (Secretary, Servants of India Society, Bombay.) 1938. 18cm. 128p. Re. 1-4-0.
- K(G)ANTHI OR THE SPIRIT AND SERVICE STORIES. By K. G. REDDIAR. (Natesan.) 1938. 18cm. 152p. Re. 1.
- GITA MALA AND THE HEART OF GITA. By NARAYANA SWAROOP. (Author, Aminabad High School, Lucknow.) 1938. 18cm. 91p. As. 12.
- HINDUTVA. By V. D. SAVARKAR. (The Central Hindu Yuvak Sabha, New Delhi.) 1938. 18cm. 184p. As. 12.

JUST OUT!

JUST OUT!!

Primary Education In India

From the Poor Man's Point of View

By DINKAR DESAI, M.A., LL.B.

Member, Servants of India Society

Fine get-up :: Antique Paper :: Pages 128

Price Re. 1/4 net.

Can be had of:—

- (1) Servants of India Society, Bombay 4.
- (2) International Book Service, Poona 4.

BHULABHAI DESAI'S SPEECHES

Published in Book Form. Of particular interest to students of Politics, Law, Economics and Commerce.

The Book contains the great leader's lectures on these and other subjects of national interest.

Price:

Rs. 3/8/- India

Sh. 7/6/- Foreign

Postage extra.

Can be had of all leading booksellers,

WHEELERS BOOK STALLS,

or please write to:

G. A. NATESAN & COMPANY,
Publishers, MADRAS.