

Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XVIII, No. 27. }

POONA—THURSDAY, JULY 4, 1935.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	345
ARTICLES —	
Sparks from the Parliamentary Anvil	347
After the Anglo-German Naval Agreement. By Madame L. Morin.	355
REVIEWS:—	
World Economic Crisis. By Prof. D. G. Karve, M.A.	357
Modern Indian History. By Prof. S. R. Sharma, M.A.	357
Indian Economic Problems. By Prof. S. G. Puranik, M. A.	358
SHORT NOTICES.	358
MISCELLANEA:—	
Press Comments on S. I. Society's Report. ...	359
Liberal Offer of Co-operation.— Indian Nation's Comments.	359

Topics of the Week.

Quetta.

DESPITE strong public agitation there is no sign yet of an early start with the excavation work in Quetta. The Government are now anxious to impress the public with the care and attention bestowed by them upon the protection of property buried under the debris. To this end batches of representative property-owners would be given facilities for visiting the earthquake area. But to judge from the number of applications for the provision of such facilities received so far, not much anxiety is noticeable to profit by those facilities. The public apparently hold the view that it is not enough at this time of day to try to convince it that property is safeguarded against loot by freebooters. What is urgently necessary is that its destruction and damage by rains should be prevented by its early recovery from the debris. Loss of valuable documents could only be avoided if excavation work is over before the rains set in. We hope the Government will lose no time in relieving public anxiety on this score by making their intentions authoritatively known as soon after the Viceregal visit to Quetta, which is now in progress, as possible.

THE Baluchistan emergency regulation or ordinance, call it whatever you will, saw the light of day last week. As expected, its provisions are drastic enough. It empowers the local administration to make rules for the public safety, health and convenience and for the protection of public and private property and prescribes a maximum of two years' imprisonment and fine, whose amount is not mentioned in the regu-

lation, or both for any breach of those rules or any orders issued under them. Anybody in any way obstructing the operation of any of those rules makes himself liable to a maximum penalty of six months' imprisonment and fine whose limit is left unspecified or with both. The regulation grants indemnity to civil and military officers in regard to their official acts since the occurrence of the earthquake, and protects them from any legal proceedings against them in respect to such acts. It is to be hoped that care will be taken to prevent the misuse of such wide powers by local officials; and to that end the central Government must not lose touch with the local administration.

The Ferozabad Inquiry.

THE U. P. legislative council is to be congratulated on carrying against Government a non-official motion demanding a public inquiry into the conduct of magistrates and police officers in connection with the Ferozabad firing incident. The riot cases are being heard by the courts and the matter is *sub judice*. Participants in the discussion were under the necessity, under the rules of procedure, of avoiding any reference prejudicial to the decision of issues awaiting decision by the court. The Home Member alone was guilty of a lapse when he used language which could be construed, as an attempt to anticipate the findings of the court. It is a thousand pities that the Home Member should have forgotten himself to that extent.

THE usual bureaucratic rule of refusing all requests for inquiry into the conduct of Government servants was somehow not rigidly followed on this occasion. Whether it was a realisation of the strength of non-official feeling on the subject or a conviction about the reasonableness of the non-official demand that prompted this attitude on the part of the Government, we need not pause to inquire. Suffice it to note that the Home Member, sheltering himself behind some obscure police regulation, expressed his readiness to arrange for an inquiry if the sessions judge hearing the riot cases saw the need for it. In this case the inquiry would be publicly conducted by a commission consisting of two officers, one of whom has had judicial experience and neither of whom belongs to the police department. Whether this kind of official inquiry would inspire sufficient public confidence we do not know. The Opposition in the Council apparently holds the view that it would not. Otherwise it would not have insisted, even after the Home Member's offer, upon carrying the non-official resolution asking for an inquiry after the riot cases had been concluded, should it be necessary in the light of the decision of the court. The difference between the Government offer and the non-official demand would

appear to be nominal at first sight. But it is not so. While the Government inquiry would be by officials, the non-officials want one by a body from which non-officials would not be excluded. If the findings of the inquiry are to have any weight with the public, it is necessary to associate non-officials with it. We hope this will be done if and when an inquiry comes to be instituted.

Financial Help to Small Industries.

THE Bombay Government have at last been awakened to the need of giving financial assistance to small industries, an awakening which, though very much belated, is not the less welcome on that account. Their rules governing the grant of such help provide for the applicant stating clearly the purpose for which the loan is required. The purposes for which loans may be granted include construction of buildings, wells, tanks, etc., purchase and erection of machinery and purchase of raw materials. The maximum amount of loan that can be sanctioned by the Director of Industries has been limited to Rs. 2,000, while for the grant of larger loans the sanction of Government will be required. But in no case will the amount of the loans be allowed to exceed Rs. 10,000. Besides the collateral security which the borrower will be expected to provide, he will be required to pledge to Government any buildings that may be erected or any plant that may be purchased out of the loan money.

IT is a wholesome safeguard against the misapplication of the loan money that it should be advanced according to the actual requirements of the borrower and not handed to him at once at the start. The provision about charging compound interest on such loans is likely to result in much hardship to the borrower and needs to be carefully reviewed. The maximum period of repayment has been prescribed as ten years; and the borrower will be required to satisfy Government that the loan has really and truly been expended on purposes for which it was intended. Should it be found that a loan is misapplied, the Director of Industries has been empowered to order the whole of it to be refunded. Promoters of small industries will, we are sure, not fail to take the utmost advantage of these concessions which become operative from the 1st of next month.

Education in Rural Punjab.

THE only noticeable feature in the working of district boards in the Punjab during 1933-34 was a small increase of Rs. 2 lakhs in their educational expenditure which stood at a little over Rs. 111 lakhs. Rs. 76 lakhs of this represented grants by Government, while Rs. 9 lakhs came from fees. The boards' share thus amounted to Rs. 26 lakhs, which works out to 23.2 per cent. of their total expenditure as against 20.9 during the previous years. It is strange that this proportion should vary from 3 to 47 per cent. and that in one or two cases the whole expenditure on particular branches of education should be contributed by the Government. If there are any reasons for this kind of favoured treatment they have not been stated in the Government resolution. Explanations of such departures should be invariably given. Else the bald statement about some boards being required to spend nothing on education of one variety or other hardly assists in a proper appreciation of the situation by the public.

IT is a matter for regret that the growth of girls' education is very slow in the villages, the expenditure under that head showing a slight rise of Rs. 6,000. The education of the depressed classes, far from

registering any advance, however slight, has suffered a little set-back. It is to be hoped that local boards, realising the importance of female and depressed classes education to nation-building, will do their best to push it on. Not long ago the Punjab carried the palm in the matter of adult schools; but public enthusiasm for that kind of educational activity seems to be on the wane with the result that the number of adult schools has gone down from 584 in 1931-32 to 222 during the year under report. Unless this decline is quickly checked, the work to the credit of the Punjab boards in the matter of educating the adults runs the risk of being undone. The least that is expected of the boards is that they will maintain the status quo if indeed they are unable to show any progress.

Bombay Excise Administration.

THE Bombay Government are committed all these years to the goal of prohibition, but their actions seem designed to delay, if not directly to defeat, the attainment of that goal. Plentiful evidence of this paradoxical attitude is furnished by their excise administration report for 1933-34. A Government really keen on prohibition would not go out of its way to extend facilities for drinking. And yet that is what the Bombay Government have been guilty of doing. The number of shops for selling country liquor was increased by 458 and their closing time too extended by half an hour. The result is to be seen in increased consumption—a fact partially admitted in the report at any rate in regard to some districts. In Sind alone the consumption increased in a single year by as much as 23 per cent., while the per capita consumption rose from 0.98 in 1930-31 to 1.23 in 1933-34. Increased consumption has generally the necessary, though very undesirable, concomitant of increased drunkenness. The year under report witnessed a rise in the number of convictions for drunkenness—3,155 as against 2,900 in the previous year. Cases of drunkenness on licensed premises also increased from 4 to 18 in like manner.

THE official contention that increased consumption results in a reduction in the number of offences against the abkari law seems to be flatly belied by the happenings during the year. Far from there being any falling off in the number of such offences, there was actually a rise of nearly 400. So far as country liquor is concerned, the number of liquor cases went up by 456, those of illicit distillation showing a rise of 566. Whatever else all this may indicate, the last thing that can be inferred from it is a desire to hasten the advent of prohibition. We hope the legislative council will exert strong pressure on the Government with a view to forcing them to take practical action to that end.

ALONG with country liquor, the consumption of intoxicating drugs too showed an upward tendency during the year. Ganja was consumed to the tune of 25,000 seers as against 22,000 in the previous year. 1,400 more seers of bhang were consumed than during the previous year; but the rise in the consumption of charas was most disquieting, it having risen from 4,702 seers to 7,425 during the year under report. All which points to the necessity of the excise authorities being reminded about the goal of the Government's excise policy.

Exclusive Licences.

A FEATRE of the native marketing legislation pending consideration by the Kenya legislature is the system of exclusive licences which it seeks to

bring into being. The system is strongly opposed by the Indian trading community there on the ground that the holder of an exclusive licence would enjoy a virtual monopoly in respect to the commodity concerned. But what really is an exclusive licence? The Kenya legislation is admittedly modelled on that in force for nearly three years in Tanganyika, where the grant of an exclusive licence entitles its holder "to trade in a specified area and in a particular product for a given length of time." The exclusive licences proposed to be issued in Kenya would hardly be substantially different in their nature, though there may be some difference as regards details. In Kenya, as the Kenya Government's despatch to the Colonial Office points out, "such licences would be confined in all cases to a particular area, which might or might not be co-terminous with the boundaries of an administrative district, as in the case of cotton in the Nyanza Province, or extend beyond it as in the case of cashew nuts on the Coastal belt." But the test is very simple. Would an exclusive licensee in Kenya tolerate any other person dealing in the same commodity and in the same area for which he is licensed? There can be no doubt as to the answer which is bound to be in the negative, and the Indian merchants in Kenya are making no unreasonable demand when they ask for the deletion of the clauses validating the grant of such licences.

THEY are also apprehensive that once the power of issuing such licences is vested in the executive, it might be used to the detriment of Indian interests. A safeguard was therefore suggested by them that every proposal for the issue of such a licence should automatically come before the legislature in the form of a bill which would ensure its discussion from all possible standpoints. If the number of such licences had been very large, the proposal could have been laughed at as impracticable owing to the practical difficulty of arranging for so many Council meetings. But the experience of Tanganyika, where the number of exclusive licences has not exceeded two, shows that such licences would always be strictly limited in number. In these circumstances the Kenya Government seem to us to have needlessly alienated Indian opinion by their failure to meet its wishes in this respect.

* * *

BUT though that suggestion has failed to receive acceptance at their hands, it is something that they are prepared to provide that the application of the principle of an exclusive licence to any particular type of produce shall be effected by a motion in the legislative council after fourteen days' notice has been given. This tardy concession can never prove satisfactory to the local Indian trading community.

SPARKS FROM THE PARLIAMENTARY ANVIL.

House of Lords: 18th, 19th and 20th June.

SKATING ON THIN ICE.

THE Second Reading debate on the India Bill took place in the House of Lords on these three days and concluded with the defeat of Lord Lloyd's hostile amendment by a vote of 55 in favour and 236 against. The new Secretary of State, Marquess of Zetland, moved the Second Reading in a speech which was temperate in tone but was marked by hardly any other quality. It certainly did not contain any elaborate justification of the Bill. Lord Zetland contented himself with a few brief remarks in defending the Bill's provisions against the Labour Party's attack and for the rest occupied himself with a defence of the provisions against the attack of the right wing of the Conservative Party. "In your Lordships' House," he said, "the Government need not give any serious consideration to the Labour Party's contentions, but only to those of the group led by the Marquess of Salisbury." In this, of course, he was quite right. Even in the Commons' House Sir Samuel Hoare did not find it necessary to pay too much attention to the Labour Party; in the Lords' House the Party could be safely ignored. Lord Zetland had to skate over thin ice on the question of the communal award. It will be remembered that he had moved an amendment in the Joint Select Committee leaving it to the minority communities in each province to decide whether communal electorates or general electorates should be introduced in the province. This amendment was rejected by the Select Committee, and Lord Zetland was naturally in some difficulty in regard to this matter. Referring to this, Lord Middleton said:—"I think in most pro-

vinces you may expect that the curious human mosaic of Parliament will function fairly satisfactorily, but it is impossible not to feel anxiety about Bengal. I am sure we all admire the skilful way in which the noble Marquess, Lord Zetland, played upon the soft pedal, when he mentioned this matter on Tuesday. I am sure, we all appreciate his position in the matter now and rejoice that his strong views on the subject did not prevent him from accepting his present office." The sly hit implied in this observation must have gone home.

NO DISSOLUTION OR NO DIVORCE!

LORD LLOYD moved his anti-Federation amendment in a speech of conspicuous ability. The amendment itself did not express opposition to Federation as such, but only on the ground that the Federal proposals were premature. He himself however was opposed to Federation on the ground that it was "an entirely wrong and impracticable conception of the best form of government for India. One point that he made was fully justified, and it is a point to which few publicists have paid any attention. This point is that Federation is irrevocable and must not be hastily brought about. "One thing", he said, "we must bear in mind, that is, that in a Federation there is no dissolution or divorce once it is entered into. You cannot make an experiment in Federation and then get out of it. Once you have made the experiment you are committed to it all the time... It needs bearing closely in mind, when the Government are proceeding hot-foot to bring in provincial autonomy and Federation in one fell swoop, that whatever they

do now, they will find it impossible to undo." Another point that he made was equally convincing. A federal government is always a weak government, and in India, where a strong central government is particularly needed, a Federation must not be established without proper safeguards. The proposed Federation, Lord Lloyd argued, goes against the whole trend of history and experience of India. "The unification which at present India enjoys, and which is the goal of every constitutional development in all Federal countries, is to be smashed into pieces. Provinces hitherto subordinate are to be made co-ordinate with the Federal Government and get adrift on the uncharted Sea of Federalism. It is an experiment as rash as it is unprecedented, and the result of it no man can foresee. Union is now being deliberately suppressed in favour of disunion." The *Indian Social Reformer* has long been pointing this out and urging that provinces be first knit into a union and before an All-India Federation be undertaken. But this advice has been consistently ignored both by British and Indian politicians.

UNALTERABLE.

IT may not be wholly correct, as Lord Lloyd said, that "every single Federal country would discard to-day (the Federal system) if it knew how to get out of it." But the many difficulties through which he said the Federal countries were passing at present were not imaginary but very real. He referred particularly to the obstacle that the federal constitution of Canada presented at the present day in combating the economic depression. "However great," he said, "the economic needs of Canada which have prompted him (Mr. Bennett) to put forward these (New Deal) proposals, they will probably never be put into operation unless the provincial governments and the legislatures of Canada can be persuaded—which is considered impossible—to agree to such a drastic amendment of the constitution as will endow the Dominion—that is the Federal Parliament—with the necessary powers." We have ourselves brought these difficulties that are experienced in Canada to the attention of our readers on more than one occasion, and we have shown how very much greater will be difficulties that we shall have to face in India in the matter of constitutional amendment. If nine provinces of Canada are found to hold up vital legislature in regard to industrial matters, will not the several hundreds of States that will join the Federation in India make all constitutional change utterly impossible? Lord Lloyd then referred to Switzerland where too, he said, "it has been found necessary to enlarge the Federal powers by twelve amendments of the constitution in a single generation." It cannot surely be that no amendments of the constitution will be found necessary in India, but here no amendment, however necessary, it will be possible to carry in a legislature in which the representatives of every single state have been given the power of vetoing any amendment which they do not like. Lord Lloyd on this ground pleaded

holding in abeyance the structure of what he called "this mad Indian Federation."

CENTRAL RESPONSIBILITY NOW SAFE.

HE also showed very skilfully how the Federal proposals went against the recommendations of the Simon Commission. The general belief is that the Simon Commission refrained from recommending Federation because they did not expect the Princes to plump for it as they afterwards did. That however is not the correct picture. For the Simon Commission had said, "Even if we were to ignore the Indian States and were to rest content with the provinces as at present constituted the necessary conditions for bringing a fully Federal constitution into being are not yet present." Lord Lloyd also showed how Lord Hardinge had changed his position on the question of central responsibility. He quoted the following passage from Lord Hardinge's speech with great effect:

I wish to urge on the Government the adoption of a policy of greater prudence and caution, and that there should be no question of conceding responsibility at the centre until events proved that self-government in the provinces is a practical and justifiable policy. No risk should be run of administrative chaos, of which I am profoundly apprehensive as certain to follow if self-government in the provinces and in the centre be conceded simultaneously.

Lord Hardinge was naturally much chagrined to hear these former views of his being resurrected, and he interpolated the remark, "That was two or three years ago." Lord Lloyd retorted: "It was, but the situation has not changed." Really, however, the situation *has* changed. The change consists in the fact that the central Parliament will in a Federation be an absolutely safe Parliament. One-third of the seats in it will be occupied by the nominees of rulers, nominally independent but actually under the control of the British Government. To such a Parliament why should not Lord Hardinge be willing to concede power? The power, though transferred in name to Indian hands, will in fact rest in British hands. Lord Hardinge had not realized when he opposed central responsibility that there would be such a large element of the Princes to hamstring popular power in the central Government.

Finally Lord Lloyd appealed to the House of Lords to throw out the India Bill, although it had been passed by the House of Commons, just as a hundred and fifty years ago the House of Lords rejected Fox's Bill, "an iniquitous and, I believe, a corrupt India Bill which had been passed by large majorities in the House of Commons just like this one." The Fox Bill was thrown out and the Pitt Bill was adopted. Similarly, Lord Lloyd urged that the House of Lords should intervene, not to throw out the Government's bill, but only to suspend it. As we have said above this amendment was heavily defeated.

A LARGER PRISON!

THE Labour Opposition was represented in the debate by Lords Snell, Olivier, Strabolgi and Ponsonby. They adhered generally to the Labour Party's

position in the House of Commons, but they put forward their case much more feebly and opposed the Bill much less thoroughly than Major Attlee, Mr. Morgan Jones or Mr. Seymour Cocks did in the House of Commons. Perhaps in the House of Lords nothing better is possible even for radical politicians. Lord Snell stated the general attitude of the Labour Party towards the Bill in the following significant words :

First of all, we do believe in the principle of self-government. Now this Bill does not honour that principle in the sense that it makes it fully effective. It too frequently withholds the substance of self-government and grants only the shadow. It appears to offer freedom whereas what it really does is to construct a larger prison of which the Government holds the key. Thus, when this Bill is passed into law, the Indian people will be free as a bird is free that is put in a larger cage, and this cage is apparently an inescapable, rigid machine. The Bill's provisions appear to us to imply distrust of the capacity of the Indian people, and it does, in spite of what the noble Marquess (Lord Zetland) has said, place the masses at the power of wealth to a degree which fills me, at least, with anxiety and with dismay.

Our main objections to the Bill are just these. It does not provide, or if it does it does only in a limited and uncertain way, for the natural and desirable development of self-government without further legislation. The result of that will be to divert the minds of the Indian people from essential social issues to political issues. It establishes a kind of finality in the matter. The Indian people may develop within the framework of this measure, but not grow outside it; and, on the other hand, the liberty accorded to them is hedged around by conditions and safeguards to a tantalizing degree. Some of these may be necessary, but do not let us call it self-government. Let us frankly say: "This is as far as we can see at this stage," and leave the door open for further development.

One cannot but feel satisfaction at the way in which the Labour Party members put their finger on the right spot by referring to the rigidity of the constitution and its unalterable character. Lord Snell then goes on to develop his objections to the Bill on the ground that it omits mention of Dominion Status, saddles provinces with second chambers, gives inadequate representation to Labour, and substitutes indirect for direct election. But all these objections are familiar to us in India, and they need not detain us here.

PRINCES, AN ELEMENT OF STABILITY.

LORD HARDINGE'S intervention in favour of the Bill was for assuring the Lords that the Princes would join the Federation and that political parties in British India would loyally work the constitution after the Bill had gone to the Statute Book. With regard to the Princes he said: "They appreciate the fact that the States will be in a stronger position in India within the Federation than outside it. And we also should recognize that the States will be an element of stability within the Federation, and should do all we can to facilitate their accession." It is just because British politicians are conscious of the fact that the British Government would be entrenched in power by the Princes being brought into the constitution that they are so solicitous for the forma-

tion of a Federation. Lord Hardinge's own change of front, as was shown by Lord Lloyd, was solely due to the recognition of this new factor. On the attitude of Indian politicians in general, Lord Hardinge said:

As for the general question of the Bill, I do not propose to discuss it beyond saying that, from all the information that I receive from India, agitation has completely died down since the appearance of the Bill, and there is a general inclination on all sides to accept it as a genuine advance in fulfilment of the pledges given over and over again by the British Parliament. Even in Madras, one of the most advanced political centres in India, Congress has decided to accept and to work the new Constitution. Surely it is not too much to hope, with great respect, that the opponents to the Bill in this Parliament may follow this example, and, when the Bill has become law, that they will do all in their power to make its execution a complete success.

Lord Hardinge must be strangely misinformed to think that agitation against the Bill has died down. On the contrary never was there such unanimity in opposition, and violent opposition, to the Bill.

ANOMALIES OF FEDERATION.

LORD CHARNWOOD showed how great were the anomalies of the Federal constitution resulting from the position of the Princes. He said:

Other Federations imply a fiscal unity throughout their Federal dominion. Here the Princes will generally keep, and I believe they value the right of maintaining the internal customs barriers within the Federation. Surely, my Lords, a great cause of affection in itself. Next, there are the taxing powers of the Federation. Taxes may be imposed by the vote of the Indian States and it might be impossible to carry those taxes without that vote. British India will pay these taxes. Will the States pay them? The Bill says that they may or they may not... Next, as to legislation apart from taxation, the Seventh Schedule contains a long list showing matters on which the Federation has power to legislate exclusively or concurrently. On each of these matters the vote of the States may result in the passing of laws to which British India will be subject. To how many, and which, of those laws which the States pass will the States themselves be subject? Would the Federation, for example, be able to apply to the states some of the provisions of the admirable Indian Penal Code? Would it be able to pass Factory laws which would apply to the states or to any of them? We do not know in the least, because it is always, I understand, to depend upon the numerous instruments of accession by which these very numerous States are to come in.

This much we know for certain, that criminal law, which is everywhere regarded as a subject of national concern requiring uniformity in management, will not be accepted by any State as a Federal subject. Indeed, no one from British India made such a demand, and why should the States be in a hurry to concede something which everyone is agreed in thinking it would be injudicious and imprudent even to ask for?

The Government makes light of the popular opposition to the Bill. Referring to this Lord Charnwood pointed out how contradictory the position of Lord Halifax and other spokesmen of Government was. He said: "In substance I think he (Lord Halifax) said two things—I. trust these Indian

statesmen with generous confidence; 2. brush aside almost entirely all that they most solemnly say at this most serious crisis in their political history. Which way is he really going to have it? Either it would seem they would be peculiarly irresponsible people, incapable of treating any important matters seriously, or Congress leaders have seriously warned us by proclaiming to their followers that this Bill is but the feeblest substitute for what they want and will continue to work for. No Liberal section of Indian opinion has taken a line of strong support to the Bill. . . . Only let us pay them (the Congress and the Liberals) the respect of recognizing that they do sometimes mean what they say. "

VERBAL POINTS.

LORD OLIVIER, whose speech in this debate was the most disappointing of all the speeches from Labour benches, thought that the question of Dominion Status was merely a verbal point. Nevertheless he thought that it should have been incorporated in a preamble to the Bill. He said :

I do think it is a very great pity, from the point of view of courtesy and good feeling and of promoting a more favourable atmosphere, that that was not put into the Bill. Nobody can say definitely that there will be Dominion Status, but all the probabilities and all the necessities, so far as we can see them, of political evolution point to that fact. And although it would not be possible to put into the Bill actual provisions for the establishment of Dominion Status, yet it might have been possible to go as far as we did in the Government of India Act, 1919, and definitely put on record the fact that India as a community, like South Africa, Canada, and the Australian Commonwealth, is to be a self-governing Dominion of the British Commonwealth. From the point of view of the Empire and of India it is very much to be regretted, and I share the views of my noble friend Lord Snell on that point.

Another verbal point, according to Lord Olivier, was the question of safeguards. The numerous safeguards with which the Bill is overloaded are not, in his view, contrary to the principle of self-government. On the contrary they seem to him to be " a practical necessity " and " a beneficial necessity. " Lord Olivier is a supporter of the indirect system of election to the assembly. " I am not at all convinced, " he said, " that this system of delegated election is not the best working arrangement. " He however opposed the system of communal electorates. On this point he observed :

It has been a source of great gratification to me in this House to have the support of the noble Marquess, Lord Salisbury, in his denunciation of the principle of communal representation. Twelve or thirteen years ago when I was on that Bench I had the indiscretion to commit myself to a public expression of opinion condemning the principle of communal representation. I was bitterly attacked by the late Lord Curzon, with the murmured applause of the noble Marquess, for venturing upon such an indiscreet and dangerous exhibition of folly. I am delighted to find that we have now converted members of the Conservative Party who formerly were so hostile to our idea of representation, and I hope that is a favourable augury that people in India, and even Indian political parties themselves, may in time to come to share our opinion.

CENTRIFUGAL FORCES !

THE supporters of the Bill have one uniform reply to make to those who oppose Federation : " Provincial Autonomy by itself is impossible. The provinces will develop centrifugal tendencies, and the present unity will disappear. Provincial Autonomy must therefore be accompanied at least by partial responsibility at the Centre, and the concession of Central Responsibility would from the British point of view be safer under federation than otherwise. So a federation must be brought about. " If this argument is cogent, why did not the supporters of the Government's proposals object to the Simon Commission's recommendation for mere Provincial Autonomy ? At that time they said : " Of course to give Central Responsibility and Provincial Autonomy together would be unthinkable. Let Indians make two bites at the cherry. Let them first exhaust the potentialities of Provincial Autonomy ; Central Responsibility will then come in its own good time. "

The Marquess of Crewe spoke thus of the disintegrating forces that would be set in motion if Provincial Autonomy without a measure of Central responsibility were introduced :

What I would ask noble Lords to consider who may be disposed to support Lord Lloyd's Amendment is : How is it possible to combine any measure of real provincial Home Rule for these vast Provinces with a Central Government which, in effect, is only responsible in the first place to the Viceroy, the Viceroy being responsible to the India Office and to Parliament in England ? It seems to me an absolutely unworkable combination and puts the holder of that office in an altogether untenable position. Even now I venture to think it is true that the Viceroy with his Legislature finds himself placed in a very factitious position. He has a Legislature composed of men, many of them of considerable personal eminence—I have no doubt a great many. They are altogether irresponsible. They can say what they like without any fear of being called to account by constituents or by public opinion. But, they being what they are, the Viceroy has to treat them as though they were responsible persons, because many of them are much too distinguished to be ignored and to be set aside.

If that is the position with the Viceroy at present, as I am pretty sure it is—and I should be surprised if any noble Lord contradicts it—how much worse the position of the Viceroy would be with these powerful self-governing Provinces, whose proceedings will, in one form or another, come before the Central Legislature ? I cannot help thinking that the result of the noble Lord's Amendment—assuming it to be carried, which I trust is not likely to occur—might be the ultimate break-up of India into completely separate provinces, as distinct from one another as Gambia and Sierra Leone. I rather think that John Bright thought that that would be the future of Indian Government, but it is absolutely opposed to the hopes and beliefs of all progressive people in India at this moment, and it is one of the dangers which the noble Lord's Amendment seems to involve.

But why did not the noble Lord think of this in criticising the Simon Report which to him as to most other British statesmen was at the time a political Bible ?

CLIQUEISM WILL BECOME RAMPANT.

LORD CREWE considered it " a strong order " to take away the right of direct representation on the Assembly which the people had enjoyed at present

and appealed to the Government to reconsider the decision about indirect election particularly because indirect election would virtually deprive the Governor-General of the right of dissolution of the Assembly in a moment of crisis when such a right would be invaluable to him. He said:

The point on which the possible Amendment appeals to me is in relation to the position of the Viceroy. I have already said something about the position of the Viceroy in relation to the Legislature, and it would be a parallel position of difficulty in which, I think, you would be placing him if indirect election is left in the Bill. He will be completely at the mercy of a small body of provincial opinion. I am assuming, of course, a case occurs in which he will think it his duty to override what has been considered proper. He will be placed in a position of subserviency to the particular provincial opinion. It will be quite useless to dissolve the Assembly, because the question would simply go back to the same small clique who had been responsible for the original proposition, and therefore he would be in the position, in which I think he ought to be placed as seldom as possible, of having possibly to override what would be considered Indian opinion, but which would be merely the expression of a local section of Indians, and have to do so with the authority of the Secretary of State. I want the Viceroy to have as little as possible to do with officers and Parliaments here, and I hope that when the time comes noble Lords will give serious consideration to the possibility of some kind of Amendment which would help to ease matters in this particular relation.

POSTPONE FEDERATION!

LORD ISLINGTON has a very high conception of the role that India is destined to play within the British Empire. "India has been and is to-day," he said, "the linch-pin of the British Empire. Remove that linch-pin, and the future of the British Empire is made extremely difficult—to put it in the most moderate form." It is just because of this that he opposed the Second Reading of the Bill, because he thinks that "the Government have taken a leap in the dark in their measure." "It is perfectly true," he said, "that there are a host of safeguards. . . . I have had a list shown to me of the powers that a Viceroy has, which he can allocate to the Governor of the Province (when the Governor has to take decisions contrary to the decisions of the Provincial Legislature). They fill a thick foolscap book." But Lord Islington feels that no such safeguards will be of any practical utility in actual administration. One wonders what this foolscap book is?

His alternative to the present Bill is simple: postpone federation and introduce provincial autonomy:

I am asked, what is the alternative if we destroy the Bill like this? My own belief is this; and here I differ, with great respect, from my noble friend Lord Crewe, for whose opinion in all matters, and especially on India, I have very deep respect. We are told by my noble friend that there is no alternative. I would say, however: postpone Federation. There is no immediate hurry for Federation. It would be better to postpone it than to have it started in a premature fashion before it is thoroughly thought out and the financial items concerned with it have been thoroughly investigated. I would say: go back to the 1919 Act, with all its imperfections, as your basis, and apply to it, with certain exceptions, the recommendations which the Simon Commission gave in

its extensive Report. It would give a very liberal set of Provincial Governments—dangerously liberal—but at the same time it would leave a Central Government which might be quite what the noble Marquess suggests and what the Simon Report suggested: it might be temporarily an advisory committee.

ORIENTALS NEVER ACCEPT!

LORD HUTCHISON of Montrose had a very simple explanation of the widespread and violent denunciation the Bill is meeting with everywhere in India. Nothing else can happen in an Oriental country. He said: "No matter how many people say that India does not want and will not accept this Bill—I maintain that when you are dealing with Orientals they never will accept what is offered—I believe in my heart that when the Bill becomes an Act the people of India will work it, and use it for their great advancement, for their better political knowledge, for the development of their own people, and for the preparing for the next step forward, which we have promised to give when they are fit for it." Lord Bingley voiced the same feeling. "I do not know," he said, "why any one should expect Indians to tumble head over heels to ask for this Bill. We know the Oriental spirit of bargaining, and when noble Lords opposite (of the Labour Party) have already more or less promised to give the Indians everything they ask, and have already assured us that after the next Election they will be in power, is it likely that the Indians are going to be satisfied with anything less than the whole of their demands?" Orientals never accept! Why did the Government then call Orientals who never accept what is offered to a Round Table Conference with Occidentals who, we suppose, never wait for being asked, but always give more than what one may dare to ask?

INEQUALITIES OF FEDERATION.

LORD RANKEILLOUR'S was a very weighty contribution to the debate on the dishard side. He mercilessly exposed the inherent defects of the federal scheme. He said:

The weakness (of Federation) arises partly from the inequalities and reservations among the units of the Federation. One State will have greater powers than another. All the States will have greater powers than the Provinces. You will have men at Delhi who will have the power to vote for laws which they will not obey and which will not affect them, and for taxes that they will not pay. This is a very great weakness, and I venture to think that a Federation which is based on unequal contribution cannot endure. And especially will this appear in the question of taxation, because we know that the States, save to a small degree and in exceptional circumstances, will not pay direct taxes, and the result of that will be that the Federal Government, if an increase of taxation is necessary, will have to fall back upon indirect taxation perhaps to the grievous hurt of the consumer, certainly to the unbalancing of the whole fiscal system.

These difficulties of Federation under these unequal conditions will be accentuated and embittered by the conflict of law. You will have Federal laws, Provincial laws, and State laws. It was said by Lord Hutchison just now that the Federal law will always prevail over the Provincial law and in theory it will prevail over the State law

also. But how are these laws to be enforced? Where is the sanction for these laws? I remember very well in the Select Committee, when the late Secretary of State gave evidence, that he was pressed time after time upon this; and all that he could say was he could devise no sanctions, it was a matter of good will. You cannot have Federal officers everywhere, and if they were everywhere how can you be sure that what they did would prevail, any more than the Federal prohibition agents in the State of New York prevailed? I think that it would be possible to devise sanctions for Federal laws in the Provinces, but only financial sanctions. It is not the time to go into that now. But in the States you have no sanction at all. In the States the Governor-General may direct their enforcement, but actual power to see that the Federal law is carried out he has none, unless, indeed, he falls back upon the other part of his multiple personality and uses his paramourty, if he has paramourty, to that effect.

VICEROY'S MULTIPLE PERSONALITY.

THE Viceroy will have to be a super-man if he is to exercise all the functions and powers assigned to him wisely and well. On this point Lord Rankeilour observed :

Consider the position of that one man who is to be the supreme ruler in one case, the fountain of rewards and honours, the autocratic ruler of the Army, the director of foreign relations, the paramount ruler over one-third of the whole of India; and yet, on the other hand, he is a constitutional ruler. Under the provisions of the Bill he may have to be his own Prime Minister. All the time he will be thinking how he is to get his Bills through and have to grapple with the arts of the lobbyist to do so. But he is not wholly a constitutional ruler in the sense in which we understand it, because all the time his constitutional position will be complicated by the use of discretionary reserve powers. These separate functions cannot be kept in watertight compartments. At all times they may impinge one on the other. Every moment of the working day he will have to think in what capacity he is acting and with what powers. . . . I imagine his valet will be daily concerned to know whether to put out his despotic uniform or his constitutional short jacket.

A friend of incomparable industry tells me that he has worked out that there are eighty occasions laid down of departure from ordinary constitutional practice. On eighty different occasions he is able to use his discretion entirely apart from his Ministers, or else he has to consult his Ministers but need not follow their advice. I do not say this is not necessary, but see how enormously it adds to the complications of the position. Let me give one or two examples. Under Clause 9 he is given judicial powers; he may determine in certain cases the limits of his own jurisdiction. Under Clause 104 he may decide in certain cases whether the Federal or Central Legislature can deal with a new subject. Under Clause 11 he has protective powers in all sorts of important spheres. Under various clauses he has legislative powers by various processes more or less summary. Then he has power of veto, to forbid legislation. He has power to restrict debate. He has, under Clause 7, great financial powers. He has enormously difficult problems of discrimination under Clause 111. He has what may be of intense importance and even danger, the prerogative of mercy, and under Clause 54 he has the ultimate power to direct the operations of all the Provincial Governments.

NO INDUCEMENT!

LORD HASTINGS, who, like Lord Hutohison, was a member of the Davidson Committee, was at great pains to show that, in recommending remission of tributes in favour of federating States, no induce-

ment was offered to the tribute-paying States; but his attempt did not attain any conspicuous success. For he admitted that the Davidson Report contained a statement "implying that certain things would be done in the event of States entering Federation which would not be done if they did not enter into Federation, and to that extent the criticism which had been levelled at the Report and the consequences of the Report in the Bill are perfectly justified." Then what is it that is not justified? He went on to state that the Davidson Committee could consider questions like the remission of tributes only with reference to federation, unlike the Butler Committee whose examination of such questions had no reference to constitutional reform. The answer to this is quite obvious: in such a case the Davidson Committee should have considered the question of financial obligations of the States on the present basis, without touching the entirely unconnected question of whether tributes paid by the States, irrespectively of their joining the federation or otherwise, should be remitted or not. If they consider the question of tributes and then recommend that they should be remitted only to federating States, they certainly give ground to critics to maintain that remission of tributes was certainly intended as an inducement to States to join federation. The suggestion itself appears to Lord Hastings to be preposterous. "Can it be seriously supposed," he asks, "that, in these great matters of far-reaching and everlasting importance, the entry of any State into Federation is really going to be affected by the question of whether or not it receives remission of tribute or loses its immunities? That is to underestimate, not only the intelligence of the Ministers of that State, but the loyalty, the far-reaching and enduring loyalty, of the rulers of the States of India." Where does the States' "far-reaching and enduring loyalty" come here, one wonders? Is a loyal State bound to join federation, even without a prospect of gain? Does then the condition that the Princes laid down—that the federal government must be a responsible government if it is to induce them to accede to it—imply disloyalty on the part of the Princes?

FINANCIAL FETTERS.

LORD STRABOLGI of the Labour Party showed a clear grasp of the main features of the Bill. On the financial safeguards he made the following observations:

My noble friend Lord Snell spoke of India being a cage, "an enlarged cage," under this Bill. Not only is she in the cage, but her pinions are shackled; they are shackled by financial fetters placed upon them under this very Bill. The Governor-General, the Viceroy, will be advised by a financial expert, reared, brought up and soaked in the traditions of the City of London, who will in effect, I presume, have a superior position because of his statutory position, because of his titular position, because of his position in the Vice-Regal Court, to that of the Finance Minister. He will veto any attempt to alter drastically the financial and economic situation in India. One of the great complaints—I ventured to mention this in a previous debate in your Lordships' House, and the noble Lord, Lord Lloyd, from his different point of view, reinforced it also—which the Indian people have to-day is that they have not been allowed to put their own financial house

in order; that they have been dominated by British financial interests. Whether they are justified in that belief or not is not at issue, but amongst the mercantile and financial classes in India that is the belief, and the noble Marquess, with his great knowledge of India, knows that that is so. There is a strong antagonism in India to the idea that this financial control will be continued by means of the clauses relevant to that control in this Bill.

THE REAL SAFEGUARD OF MINORITIES.

LORD STRABOLGI roundly denounced the communal electorates and blamed the Government for making them virtually eternal in India. He said :

There are two religious minorities in this country, who, in the past, have suffered persecution—the Roman Catholics and the Jews. Nonconformists also have suffered in their time, but I am thinking now particularly of those two minorities. The Nonconformists are in such large numbers, and so powerfully organised, that perhaps they may not be considered as a minority any longer, but the scattered Catholic and Jewish communities could have looked for no protection or support from such members as they could have returned on a communal register. But where they are fairly numerous in a constituency, every noble Lord who has had experience knows that once a member has been elected to Parliament he looks upon the minorities as his special care. It is not only a question of getting their votes, though in certain constituencies the Catholic and Jewish vote is very important and in a closely contested election may just make all the difference. That, however, is not the main reason why the Jewish or Roman Catholic electors can with confidence look to the member for the constituency to redress their grievances. It is the member's general sense of responsibility for all the electors of his own constituency. That is the real safeguard of minorities in any country, and the Indian politicians are not going to be so very different from ourselves; they are very much the same under the skin as we are.

I believe that we made a blunder in not insisting upon a common electoral roll. The Hindu candidate with a Moslem minority would have been very careful to give certain pledges to his prospective constituents of the Moslem faith that he would see that they were not persecuted. And he would have kept the pledges so as to rely on their support in the future. Now the Secretary of State declares that nothing can be done until the different communities have agreed. I consider that this communal register is so mischievous and so dangerous, and unfortunately it will be so permanent, that I would have postponed all Federal reforms in India until the communities had agreed together. Instead of that, the Prime Minister who has just left office, Mr. MacDonald, forced the Communal Award when these matters were under discussion three years ago, and in so doing I consider that he committed a very great error of judgment.

RIGHTISTS CAN NEVER SOLVE THE PROBLEM.

THE Indian problem is so difficult, said Lord Strabolgi, that a Government of the Right can never solve it, and he thought that it was a great tragedy for India that it had fallen to such a Government to solve it. "It would have been far better," he said, "to have left this matter alone, as indeed our best friends in India have begged us to do. It would have been far better to have left this matter until the people of England were in a progressive mood and ready to return a Left Parliament, and then to bring in a reform which would have won Indian acceptance and support." He feels, however, that what a Right Parliament has done a Left Parliament will eventually undo, a hope which does not appear to be

justified, for even a Left Parliament in England will be powerless to amend the constitution without the consent of several hundred autocratic rulers in India. On this point Lord Strabolgi said :

I am perfectly certain of this, that eventually the Party to which I belong, and for which at the moment I am speaking, will have to resettle this question. This is not the end of the drama which has lasted seven years. This is not the final word. This is a stop-gap measure despite its size and formidable content. The problem will be thrown back on some future Government. It may be a Government of the Right or a Government of the Left; I think it will be a Government of the Left that will have to settle this question. I only hope that matters will not deteriorate in the interval so as to make it too difficult to deal with. The right reverend Prelate spoke of China and drew a terrible parallel between conditions in India and conditions in China. I hope he is wrong. Democracy in China has not been tried. It is the very generals of whom he spoke who are suppressing democracy there, just as it is suppressed in Chicago by the gangsters. We are not trying democracy in India under this Bill. It will not be a fair test, and it is for that reason that we feel bound to criticise and oppose this Bill.

RIGIDITY OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION.

LORD PHILLIMORE emphasised the rigidity of the federal constitution as the principal defect of the measure. He observed :

When I ventured to address your Lordships' House on the Motion to debate the Report of the Joint Select Committee, I explained that there was one thing, and one thing only, which worried me more than any other in the proposals, and that was the rigid effect of these proposals on the future course of Indian development. For that reason I am most heartily glad that Lord Lloyd has spoken on this question of the Federal system proposed for India. I have no desire to see the legitimate aspirations of the Indian people thwarted. Indeed, it is largely because I believe that this measure is more likely to hinder than to promote progress, that I venture to oppose that portion of it which is concerned with Federation.

We regard the proposed Federal system for India as, in the first place, unworkable. You have only to turn to the Bill to see that. In the second place, we regard it as likely to hamper the future course of development of the Indian people. Thirdly, we think it is an attempt to force the development of our Empire along far too rigid lines—lines so rigid that they can only be upset by a more or less violent disturbance in the future. I, frankly, am still puzzled to know the Government's true mind on this question. Why this insistence upon Federation?

Lord Lloyd has been at great pains to draw your Lordships' attention to recent chapters of the history of the Federated Commonwealths which I have named. It has been a very unhappy chapter of history—a chapter to which the rigidity of a Federal Constitution makes it difficult to supply a happy ending. My Lords, are liberty and federation really indissoluble elements of one whole? Can you not have liberty without federation, and self-government without federation? The noble Marquess, the Secretary of State for India, told us yesterday that "to those who have directed their gaze forward it has been obvious that the eventual Government of India at the Centre must be of the Federal type." Persons who for years crave forward in one posture, regardless of the draughts and currents that may blow across the world, may sometimes end up by getting stiff necks. This Government suffers from a very considerable dose of self-complacency, and may possibly have a neck that has become too stiff.

What exactly are the reasons why the Government are so anxious to force the development of the Indian Constitution into this particularly rigid channel? For my part, I am

persuaded that the late Secretary of State for India was dangerously addicted to cross-word puzzles, and that this Bill has strayed from a back sheet of the *Times* to lie across the path of Indian progress.

A CUP OF BITTER ALOES.

THE EARL OF MANSFIELD received loud applause at the end of his speech and Lord Halifax paid him a high compliment for his eloquence. He drew attention to the fact that the Bill had no friend in India. He said:

An intelligent and impartial observer, say someone from Mars or Venus, might say: "No doubt this is taking a great risk, but it must be, doubtless, because the vast majority of the peoples of India desire this legislation," and he would be encouraged in his view by the magnificent peroration of the noble Viscount, Lord Sankey, when he said that we had placed the cup at India's lips and we ought not to dash it away. But unfortunately, as far as one can judge from the comments that have been made in Indian newspapers, Indian periodicals, and from Indian platforms, the ordinary Indian, whatever his creed, whatever his sect, seems to regard the cup that is being held to his lips, not as being full of refreshing nectar, but rather of the essence of bitter aloes. I have not been able to discover one single person in the whole of India who is enthusiastically in favour of these so-called reforms.

PRINCES MAKE GOVERNMENT STRONGER.

EARL PEEL could not understand why the die-hards should oppose the Federation. If they want to strengthen the British power in India, there is nothing in the world which can do it better than the introduction of the Princes who will even after Federation remain under the suzerainty of the British Government into the Indian constitution. Lord Peel's argument is really unanswerable. We give it below in his own words:

I am still a little unable to understand why it is that some of my noble friends seem so very opposed to the entry of the Princes into Federation. Federation may be a bad thing, as some of those noble Lords say, but surely, if you had your choice of a Federation with or without the Princes, you would every time come down for a Federation with the Princes in it. If this evil thing is to be established is there any one in this House who denies that the entry of the Princes will be a great element of stability in the Government and will make the Government stronger than it is now? There is not only the Princes' great devotion to the Crown, but there is the great responsibility of India for defence and so on to be considered. The Princes, therefore, would surely add greatly to the strength of a Government which had their support. In these circumstances my noble friends will excuse me if I say I do not understand why they have been trying all along to show a curious objection to the Princes coming in.

Lord Peel was very angry that the die-hards persisted in believing that the Princes had no love for Federation, when they were declaring from house-tops, or rather from palace-tops, that they were willing to join Federation. Their declarations must be taken, Lord Peel thought, at their face value. But he does not think that the declarations of Indian politicians should be taken at their face value. These politicians show a preference for the existing constitution over the new one. Still Lord Peel believes that they inwardly prefer the new one, or at any rate come to prefer it when they will come to realise

its immense potentialities. On this point he remarked:

I do not think it is foolish to suggest that, when these criticisms are over; when the bargaining time is over; when the matter is settled; when the Ministers and so on find that, subject to certain limitations, these wide powers are being conferred upon them—wide powers which have the sympathy of the noble Marquess and of my noble friend Lord Lloyd—there will be a great revulsion of feeling. The limitations and the safeguards will drop a little into the shade and they will concentrate themselves upon the great duties, responsibilities and opportunities that then lie before them.

VIOLENT OUTBURST WOULD FOLLOW WITHDRAWAL!

LORD PEEL also dealt with the emphatic disapproval of the Government's proposals by the Legislative Assembly. He said:

It has been said that here you have the Assembly, representative of British India, and has not the Assembly by votes condemned your proposals? I am not, I may say, deeply impressed by the fact, because I know very well—we all know very well—that every Assembly has its corporate sense and its corporate dignity. Considering the fact that under the new Bill that Assembly is going to be entirely abolished, how is it possible that you should get from an Assembly of that kind any very enthusiastic vote in favour of a Bill which destroys its very existence? But if you have not got the negative test, I should like to place the positive test before you. If it were to be announced that, following the behest of my noble friends, this Bill had been dropped, you would then see such an outburst of feeling in India as would astonish those who think that this Bill is being rather coldly received in that country.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru in his Poona speech dealt with the first point. If the Assembly is not the proper body to consult on the question of reform, why does the Bill propose to consult the Provincial and Indian Legislatures on several matters like the franchise concerned with reforms? If the Assembly is bound to vote against a Bill which seeks to abolish it, will not a Legislature elected on a certain franchise necessarily vote against any proposal intended to effect a change in the franchise? The Government cannot make the Indian legislatures criteria of Indian opinion on certain matters and treat them as of no account on certain others. On the other point all one has to say is: why do not Government test Indian feeling by temporarily withdrawing the Bill? Will not they be in a much stronger position afterwards to go on with the Bill? Why do they deny themselves this tactical advantage?

INDIAN CONSENT NECESSARY.

THE MARQUESS OF LINLITHGOW can lay down sound principles of government when it suits him to do so and can also ignore them when they are somewhat inconvenient. In answering the die-hards who were unwilling to concede central responsibility, he said: "It is clear that no system at the Centre which does not command the confidence and support of the Provinces and of politically-minded India can for long successfully perform that function of unification." Again: To introduce provincial autonomy but to withhold central responsibility "would be to secure for the

Central Government the mistrust and hostility of politically-minded Indians throughout the country, and to invite Governments and Legislatures in every Province to dedicate themselves to the task of rendering unworkable the system of Central Government." But this is just what is going to happen by forcing upon India a constitution which is unacceptable to politically-minded Indians. It will secure their mistrust and hostility and will be rendered unworkable.

Federation must be brought about now or it will never come about; and Federation would strengthen the British Government as nothing else will. These propositions, with which we have now become very familiar, were repeated by Lord Linlithgow. But he did not care to say, as no one has done yet, why Federation, it dropped now, should become impossible in future. Lord Linlithgow said:

If we fail to set up now an All-India Federation with responsibility, we shall let slip, perhaps for ever, the prospect of calling to the counsels of the Central Government and to the service of the Central Legislature the representatives of the Ruling Princes in India, whose adhesion, it is generally agreed, will lend to the Government of India strength and wisdom and those instincts which go with ancient traditions, and whose loyalty to the Throne and person of the King-Emperor is part of the very breath of their nostrils. Next, and for the reasons which I have ventured to submit, it is not the case that it is safer and more prudent to postpone Federation while immediately setting up Provincial Autonomy. Indeed, your Lordships' own Committee, for weighty reasons, some of which I have cited this evening, and after deliberations extending over a period of a year and a half, advised you that the reverse is the case. They said that the Government of India as now constituted is a weak Government. They said that it is destined to grow weaker; and they said that if it is to hold together the great autonomous Provinces which we all, without exception, propose to set up, it must be strengthened. Finally, they told your Lordships that in their best view the only way to strengthen it is the way proposed in this Bill.

PERMANENT CHECKS.

LORD PONSONBY, as the leader of the Labour Party in the House of Lords, defined the attitude of Labourites towards the Bill in the following words:

There must necessarily be adjustments, adaptations, and tentative beginnings. That can be admitted. But the essential principle to be followed must be two-fold. Allowance must be made for an easy opportunity for expansion towards full representative government without fresh legislation here, and no permanent barriers should be set up, either in the Provinces or the Centre, to check the full attainment of autonomous democratic institutions.

This is where we consider the Government are making a crucial mistake. In their timidity at the outcry of some of their supporters against according a democratic Constitution to India at all, they have peppered the Bill with checks and safeguards, some of which, in our opinion, seem calculated permanently to thwart the attainment of fully representative government. We are apprehensive of the dangers of a gift from the Mother Country to this great Empire which contains elements which will be discovered to hamper the expression of the popular will, and which may therefore be condemned as spurious. It appears to us a thousand pities that this great opportunity which lies within the reach of a very powerful Government in this country should be missed, and that they should show lack of confidence in the democratic principle and lack of confidence also in the people to whom they are reluctant to accord it in a more complete form. The points in the Bill which illustrate my meaning are the predominant position given to the Princes, the under-representation of the workers, the restrictive safeguards placed in the hands of dominating authorities outside the Legislatures, and the establishment of hampering Second Chambers.

SIR TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU.

SIR TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU was referred to by name on more than one occasion in this debate. The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury expressed himself as being "not the least alarmed by the reception (of the Bill) in India" and to show how favourable Indian opinion was he referred to Sir Tej's article in the *Twentieth Century* as reflecting the Liberal Party's opinion. The Archbishop seems to think that Sir Tej is the leader of the Liberal Party in India. The Marquess of Salisbury challenged the representative character of Sir Tej in this matter. He said that Sir Tej had no following in India. "I am told," he added, "he could not get elected for any constituency under any circumstances. Do not let us be led away by glib phrases."

AFTER THE ANGLO-GERMAN NAVAL AGREEMENT.

FRENCH opinion is awaiting somewhat anxiously the result of the present talks between Mr. Eden and M. Laval. It is no use denying that the hasty signature of the Anglo-German naval agreement has been viewed with surprise and displeasure here. Mr. Eden will have a delicate task in finding suitable arguments and explanations in view of appeasing legitimate anxieties. Let us hope that he may succeed. After Paris, Mr. Eden proposes to tackle Rome. A great diplomatic "season" seems thus to be opening out. May it result in practical realisations!

Owing to the changes and difficulties in her home politics, France has been less watchful of late. Moreover, the meeting at Stresa and the unanimous verdict of Geneva had perhaps too readily been considered as decisive.

In the meanwhile, Germany did not remain inactive; somewhat discountenanced at first by the Geneva decision, German diplomacy has not been slow in launching a new campaign, beginning with Herr Hitler's speech as a preface. Pacific assurances, conciliatory gestures, offers to respect the Rhine frontier providing the loosening of her links with Soviet Russia, exclusion of the latter from any system of European peace and security—Herr Hitler's thirteen points have clearly indicated the main trends, and action has closely followed upon certain items of this profession of faith. With great shrewdness, the Reichsführer has taken full advantage of the impression produced in England by his speech, of the present pre-occupations of Italy in Africa, and of the political and financial difficulties in France. A series of manoeuvres in London and

Rome has enabled Germany to regain a position of initiative.

The Anglo-German naval agreement has proved the test of success. The British Government has recognised the right of Germany to build a fleet equal to 35 % of the British naval forces. As M. Jules Sauerwein points out in *Paris-Sair*, the essential point is that the German naval power must henceforth be determined by the British naval power. If the latter is increased or decreased, the German power must observe the same proportion. This link is more important than any figures.

It practically amounts to Great Britain controlling Germany's naval force. One can expect that a similar agreement regarding aviation may follow soon. These vital problems will be dealt with in a concrete spirit by the British Cabinet. England has always shown more consideration for accomplished facts than for theoretical agreements or promises.

Endeavours to establish a disarmament convention between sixty nations has failed in Geneva. However unfortunate this may be, other means are being resorted to.

France must not forget that while England may be a good judge as far as naval and air forces are concerned, she may prove somewhat excessively disinterested as regards the army proper. Logically speaking, if Germany is to regulate her naval forces by England's, she ought to do the same with France as regards her land forces; on this element, France's interests are far more important than those of Great Britain. The opportunity of a separate agreement with Germany on the question of armaments had in fact presented itself in the past; but out of loyalty to previous allegiances (and especially to England) the French have always refused to consider any agreement which would not include other powers. Placed in similar circumstances, the English have shown less delicate scruples, and more realism.

To the French, it has come as a disappointment, but also as a lesson. France and Italy will consider themselves entitled to practise the same matter-of-fact policy and eventually regain their entire liberty of action. Monsieur Fabry, in the *Republique*, says: "The English have a sense of humour. In the way of limitations of naval armaments, this curious agreement consecrates first of all the increase of the German fleet". M. Fabry also believes that this might well be the signal of a general increase and competition of naval armaments, if the financial conditions of all powers were not so low at present. If Germany is limited in the increase of her naval forces, she can devote so much more to her army.

The Anglo-German agreement also places France in a position of inferiority because she has got to provide for naval defence on two fronts which have no direct communication with one another, and also to think of her possessions overseas.

But the importance of the Anglo-German negotiations is not so much technical as diplomatic. "If one doubted it, it would be enough to wonder whether

the Reich has ever thought of claiming from the French an army equal to 35 % of the French army. The answer is so evident that the question appears a joke".

The agreement concluded by the English gives them the precious assurance that Germany will never attack them on the seas, which is as important for England as a similar assurance regarding her territorial frontiers would be for France.

Nevertheless, it is more generous to suppose that the English have been actuated by other and more far-reaching reasons than mere national egoism. The idea, for instance, that acceptance of Germany's offer would relieve that country from a feeling of isolation (which might eventually result in dangerous consequences) may well have haunted the mind of our neighbours across the Channel. Unfortunately, it is equally legitimate to wonder whether the breach in the Stresa front will not confer on Germany something more than psychological relief, namely an encouragement to pursue her ambitions in Eastern and Danubian Europe. "If one considers the German policy as a whole," further says M. Fabry, "their refusal to participate in any pact of mutual assistance in Central and Oriental Europe is a clear indication that they wish to leave every door opened to all possibilities of revisions of treaties, and even if necessary to open a door themselves".

But pessimism is of no avail, and side by side with the present disappointment, there is a deeper current of opinion here wishing and hoping that all misunderstanding should be dispelled and France and England may continue to act in collaboration as they have done up to now. Apart from the German naval re-armament, there are many other problems to be solved at present. If unity of views and action could be realised between the two governments in facing those difficulties, misunderstandings would readily disappear.

What is Mr. Eden going to offer us in the name of his government? As we have already indicated, France is not primarily interested, as England is, in air forces and submarines, but especially in infantry and frontiers subject to surprise-invasions. A simple question of geographical situation!

How far will England be prepared to commit herself to ensure security in Central and Eastern Europe? How far could she command Germany's adhesion to combine the Franco-Russian pact with other pacts of mutual assistance or non-aggression? The future only will tell.

In the meanwhile, let us not come to hasty conclusions, but rather await with hope and confidence the result of conversations where two men of goodwill are endeavouring to reconcile their points of view and to give a novel significance to the Franco-British collaboration for peace.

L. MORIN.

Paris,
21st June.

Reviews.

WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS.

A BUSINESS MAN'S VIEW OF THE WORLD CRISIS. By L. POTTER. (Williams and Norgate). 1933. 20cm. 151p. 3/6.

THE world is so anxious to know the cause and cure of the all pervading economic *malaise* that any new book on the subject is scanned with the greatest interest and hope. Business men are to a certain extent the patients most directly suffering from these ills; economists are like doctors consulted intermittently and followed with reserve; politicians are like dispensing chemists who administer the doctors' prescription if and when the patient allows. Sometimes the patient thinks that he knows a lot more about his malady and the way to cure it than all the physicians combined. As an indication of the inward pathological conditions such efforts are interesting and often helpful. Mr. Potter's book is written from the standpoint of a sober but disappointed man of business and it must be admitted that he has produced a highly interesting book.

What caused the crisis? Some think it was over-production, others that it was currency contraction and certain others that it was maldistribution. Mr. Potter feels that breakdown of confidence was the principal cause. Obviously this is straining a good point too much. The crisis was ushered in by a breakdown of confidence as most crises are. But that is not the primary cause of the dislocation and downward movement of economic life. In fact for students of the historical side of crises what is more singular in the course of the recent crisis than anything else is the comparative lack of panic among citizens as well as governments. Miscalculations about the conditions of the world markets as radically altered by the heritage of the war and the incomplete apprehension of the role of currency and credit control in the economic functioning of the community must be jointly credited with the responsibility for the great disaster. It is gratifying to note that in his suggestions for the future Mr. Potter has taken note of this truth.

Unlike the common run of business men Mr. Potter recognises the shortsightedness of tariff barriers and the superficiality of a proposal for raising the price level by artificial means for purposes of inducing a boom. He is a sober supporter of a policy of stable money and recognises that steps taken initially to raise prices and then hold them in comparative steadiness would be welcome. But when he comes to the indication of the ways whereby this can be achieved he very nearly falls into the same fallacy which has beset most members of the new school for a 'stable money policy.' Till recently very few, even among the experts, were prepared to recognise that a conscious control of the price level through currency and credit was feasible and desirable. Now many people are placing too great a reliance on currency and credit expedients for a rise in prices and earnings. It is not yet adequately realised that supply of the means of payment is only one of the factors that affects the level of prices, including in this term prices of services as well as commodities. There are several other factors which are remote, yet more fundamental. Conditions of demand and supply must be better studied, regulated and allowed for in our future economic life. In this task of regulating the conditions of a healthy economic life, control of currency and credit and the ensuring of a compara-

tive stable price level are only two features. It is, however, most refreshing to find that businessmen are learning from recent experience to welcome a regulative influence in business conditions. Mr. Potter's book should be read by all who are interested in finding out a remedy for the recurring disturbances of our economic life.

D. G. KARVE.

MODERN INDIAN HISTORY.

TEXT BOOK OF MODERN INDIAN HISTORY VOLS. 1 & 2. By S. C. SARKAR and K. K. DATTA. (Bihar Publishing House, Patna.) 1934 & 1935. 24cm. 1099+LXX p. Rs. 13.8.0 for 2 vols.

THE volumes under review comprise the history of India from 1526 to the present day. They are designed for undergraduates of Indian Universities and aim at a standard higher than the usual run of college text-books. The treatment is mostly topical and the work is fairly well documented. Maps provided in a wallet separately at the end of each volume are calculated to facilitate reference. Bibliographies on every chapter are likewise given at the end of each volume. The printing and get up are good.

Part I deals with the Mughal period down to the death of Aurangzeb. The Later Mughals and the break up of the Empire form the subject of the second chapter of Part II. It would have better contributed to the unity of the theme if this had been taken up earlier. So also the Mughal administrative system and survey of economic and social conditions under the Mughals, as well as the study of Mughal civilisation as a whole have been relegated to Part III. The rest of Vol. I, dealing with the European doings in India, naturally hangs together with Vol. II. In a work specially designed for college students, the arrangement of chapters and sections ought to have been less confusing. The separate paging of each Part makes reference more cumbersome.

The book starts with a brief Introduction which surveys the main currents of life both in Europe and India during the period of transition from mediaeval to modern times, and thereby gives the right perspective to the reader, though one may not quite agree with the authors when they speak of the Mughal conquest as not 'proving quite a constructive factor in Indian History' because it 'ultimately became an agency for prolongation of mediaevalism.' Similarly, their characterisation of the Marathas, taking the cue from Sir Jadunath Sarkar, is more facile than fair to the people who, with all their faults, were as much the victims of the *zeitgeist* as any fallen power in history. "No nation that would rise," the authors say, "can afford to cultivate virtues alien to honesty or truthfulness. The Marathas committed a said mistake in relying too much on finesse or intrigue." (vol. I, Part I, p. 198.)

The chapter on the break up of the Empire looks a bare summary of the events of this most fateful period where one would have desired a more coherent analysis of the complex issues involved in so sudden a collapse as followed the death of Aurangzeb. Apart from the section on 'The Religious Policies of the Mughal Sovereign' and occasional verdicts, one also misses the personalities of the Emperors upon whom the fortunes of the Empire so much turned.

The second volume is divided into two parts: one dealing with the growth of British Dominion in India; the other giving a critical account of the evolution of British administration in this country. The chapter on the great upheaval of 1857 is significantly entitled 'The Last Test of the New British Supre-

macy' and inclines to the view that the attempted revolution was only a 'leap in the dark'. It is interesting to read in a foot-note (Vol. II, Part I, p. 138)—'In fact, the progressive and educated sections of the Indian people (as in Bengal) kept aloof and stood by the established government, for they had learnt to esteem the British connexion for its civic and cultural value, and through it they saw a path to a greater nationalism than the Peshwa or the Padishah could lead to.'

The most interesting and valuable part of the book, however, is the closing section which attempts a comprehensive survey of the growth of Indian nationalism in all its phases and aspects—political, social and cultural—in all the provinces, from 1821 to 1933.

This is on the whole a welcome production which has been the result of conscientious labour on the part of the authors who seem to have spared themselves no pains to bring out a useful text-book on quite rational and modern lines.

S. R. SHARMA.

INDIAN ECONOMIC PROBLEMS.

INDIA ANALYSED, VOL III—ECONOMIC ISSUES. By A. N. MAINI and others. ED. by FRED A. M. BEDI and B. P. L. BEDI. (Gollancz.) 1934. 20cm. 222p. 5/-

THIS is a little volume that makes a bold and direct approach to five different topics of urgent economic importance to India. The Editors deserve our warm congratulations on having secured the services of eminent Indian economists who can write with conviction and authority on these different problems. Writing first on "Taxation and Social Services" Mr. Maini points out how the Indian tax system suffers from the inequities of repression and falls short of the ideal of distributive justice. These inequities, he fears, would be perpetuated even under the new scheme of federal finances as Indians would be having no real control over them. Yet he hopes that the acceptance of the new constitution "will result in a school where the future youth of India will be trained in traditions of democracy."

Dr. B. Ramachandra Rau next contributes a chapter on "Banking and Foreign Investments." His is a powerful plea for the establishment of a Reserve Bank of India to remove the existing anomalies and to co-ordinate the present currency and banking systems. The Reserve Bank of India has now shifted its place from the realm of controversy and become a settled fact. "The Rupee and the Pound"—that eternal muddle of the Indian currency system—is the third contribution by Prof. Brij Narain, wherein he launches a vigorous criticism of the recent linking of the rupee to the depreciated sterling at a parity fixed by the Hilton-Young Commission. He also resents the Government's inaction in freely allowing exports of vast quantities of "distress gold" during the last three or four years and he believes that this has forced the country to live on its capital. "We went off the gold standard following Britain's lead. "The next step," he argues, "is going off the sterling and leaving the rupee to find its own level." This is a piece of advice that may come as a shock to many.

Next comes a masterly analysis of the "Public Debt of India" by Prof. K. T. Shah, which, we are sure, would arouse our sense of justice against the inequitable burdens that have been imposed on us for long. The last but not the least important is an article by Prof. Radha Kamal Mukerjee, on the limits and potentialities of agriculture. Being dissatisfied with

the slow rate of progress of the Indian peasantry, he becomes a confirmed advocate of agricultural protectionism as initiated by Chancellor Von Bülow for Germany. Such a policy, broadly interpreted to include the rationalisation of agricultural produce, prices and marketing, of land tenures and revenue policies would be the watchword of the planned economy of India in future.

The book keeps up an unflagging interest in the subjects boldly tackled and makes the readers all the more conscious of the grim problems that face the country today. We would heartily welcome the publication of similar volumes on topics that have been left untouched in this interesting series.

S. G. PURANIK.

SHORT NOTICES.

SHREE BHAGVAT SINHJEE. BY ST. NIHAL SING. (Golden Jubilee Committee, Gondal.) 1934. 25cm. 380p.

THIS volume is issued in connection with the Gondal ruler's silver jubilee which was celebrated last year. It is nothing more than what such publications usually are—full of praise for the object of the celebration. For aught one knows, all the praise may even be well-merited in the present case. But it would be more impressive if it is backed by statistics showing the progress in the moral and material condition of the subjects of the State during the last half a century. In the volume before us statistics are not altogether conspicuous by their absence; but they are of little use in making up a connected and consistent story. Still it is gratifying to learn that the educational expenditure has increased by 19 times what it was at the beginning of the present regime. What is even more noteworthy is that the civil list instead of showing an upward tendency has been stabilised at Rs. 14,000 since the present ruler assumed the reins of his high office. We had expected that the medical expenditure of a State presided over by an M. D. of Edinburgh would be very large but find that it has only gone up from Rs. 12,500 to Rs. 27,500 in the course of fifty years. This is rather disappointing. Though the volume under notice suffers from lack of connected statistical information, there is no doubt it tells us a good deal about the life of the present ruler which is worth knowing.

D. V. A.

A DERELICT AREA. A STUDY OF THE SOUTH-WEST DURHAM COALFIELD. By THOMAS SHARP. (The Hogarth Press.) 1935. 20cm. 49p. 1/6.

IN this pamphlet the author pictures the derelict condition of the older industrial regions. Durham is the oldest coalfield in the country and coal has been mined there for upwards of eight hundred years; but now this industry is dead. Some 75 per cent. of its total population is reported to be unemployed. With facts and figures for about a dozen villages and towns, the author describes how the working population has lived for years, and according to the present indications they are to continue to live for the rest of their mortal days on the few shillings a week allowed them by their charitable countrymen.

Out of several causes of dereliction in such an industrial area as this, the drying up of natural resources is the main cause. Bad management of the pits and lack of co-operation between adjoining colliery companies are also some of the causes and the author gives instances of these.

Mr. Sharp says very little towards the solution of this intense local unemployment problem. The only two courses open to them are either that the work must be brought to men or men must be taken

where the work is. Anything is preferable to the present dreary drift.

N. S. K.

The Servants of India Society.

REPORT FOR 1934-35.

Following are the comments in some of the newspapers on the Servants of India Society's Report for 1934-35:

OUR hearty congratulations to the Servants of India Society on the completion of its thirty years of existence. Founded by the great patriot and stalwart among politicians, the late Gopal Krishna Gokhale, in June 1905, this institution has to its credit a splendid record of service in various spheres of human activity—social, educational, economic and political—which any institution in this country can well feel proud of. Nation-building requires simultaneous efforts in many directions and the Society, with its devoted and selfless band of workers, men of such outstanding position and ability as Messrs. Sastri, Kunzru, Devadhar, Joshi and Thakkar, has rendered truly notable services in various spheres of national activity. However much one may differ in politics with the viewpoints of this institution—and we, no doubt, differ from it widely in this respect—the fact that the Society has done a great deal for the promotion of labour organisation, co-operative societies, rural reconstruction, boy scout movement, education, social service and, last but not least, for the sake of the removal of the curse of untouchability from this unhappy land extorts the unstinted admiration of one and all. It is, no doubt, a fitting memorial to its distinguished founder and

we wish it many more years of successful and useful career.—*The Searchlight.*

The news that six new members have been added to the Servants of India Society will gladden the hearts of sincere lovers of India. Sanatanists notwithstanding, the Society has also decided to associate women in its work, thus acknowledging the value of the services that women have rendered in activities that have been allied with the Society. The Society was started in stormy days and stood unflinchingly for political action which was not popular at the time or since. Lesser men than the sturdy patriots who form the Society would have been swept away by the strong currents of the day, but the amount of sound political thought and literature that the Society has given to the country is an index of the firm basis upon which Gokhale planted his followers. Even more remarkable is the social work of the Society. The result is that even those who have differed widely from the political views of the Society respect its members and regard them with affection. The sacrifices that the members have made will never be known. Its financial difficulties do not speak well of the public spirit of men of wealth in the land. A similar institution in the west, during twenty years of its existence, would have survived storms and found donors who value research and serious study of politics. May that day come soon in India too!—*The Guardian.*

LIBERAL OFFER OF CO-OPERATION.

NO one who is seriously and genuinely interested in the welfare of the country can afford to minimise the significance of the statement made by Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru, President of the Indian Liberal Federation, at a meeting of the Western India Liberal Association in Bombay. It contains a candid and authoritative exposition of the attitude of the Liberal Party in regard to the Reforms Scheme and in particular to the relationship of the Party with other political organisations in the country. The Indian Liberals are a much maligned body of individuals, and in a world where gratitude, public as well as private, is so rarely to be found, their contribution to the evolution and progress of Indian constitutional development has been only insignificantly acknowledged. We cannot say that, to a certain extent, the Liberals themselves are not responsible for it, because by their consistent indifference to undertake the primary obligation of a political party of getting into touch with and educating the masses, they have sorely missed their vocation as such. It inevitably follows that it is only when they are able to shake their lethargy and organise themselves for effective political action that they can reconquer the lost ground and regain the position in Indian politics which is rightfully theirs. Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru is not unaware of this indispensable factor, for in his speech he regretted the lack of enthusiasm among the Liberals, and exhorted them to shake off their lethargy and devote more time to the propagation of Liberal principles.

The fundamental need of the hour now, as much

as it has been at any time previously in the history of the country, is unity among the different political organisations; and Pandit Kunzru has done well, though not exactly to define, at least to state in general outline the Liberal Party's policy in this regard. There has been so much talk of unity during the last ten years or more and so little genuine effort to achieve it that to indulge in shibboleths about it naturally imparts to the effort an air of unreality. But it will be generally recognised that the ostensible return of Congressmen to constitutional fields of action by their decision to enter the Legislatures affords a favourable atmosphere for launching upon another determined attempt to explore the chances of unity. The move, however, must, as Pandit Kunzru said, come from Congressmen, who are apt to deride all efforts in that direction made by other political parties by a too conscious feeling of their own self-importance. If Congress leaders, as representatives of an important political organisation, genuinely feel that unity in Indian political ranks is essential, it is for them to move in the matter and secure the adherence and co-operation of other parties, who may have been willing always to co-operate but who have been repelled by the hauteur of the former. We hope, therefore, that the offer made by Pandit Kunzru that Liberals are willing to join hands with other Nationalist parties in India for common action will be responded to in the spirit in which it has been made. There are just as many chances of Congressmen in their present chastened mood accepting the suggestion made, as there are of their rejecting it; in pursuance of their old policy of treating with contempt every offer of co-operation coming from others. We, however, prefer to wait and see.—*The Indian Nation.*

ESTABLISHED 1911.

The Bombay Provincial Co-operative Bank Ltd.

(Registered under the Co-operative Societies Act.)

Head Office: **Apollo Street, Fort, BOMBAY.** (Branches: 28)

Apex Bank of the Co-operative Movement in Bombay Presidency.

WORKING CAPITAL Exceeds Rs. 2,00,00,000

FIXED, CURRENT AND SAVINGS DEPOSITS ACCEPTED.

Terms on Application.

ADVANCES made only to registered Co-operative Societies.

COLLECTION WORK undertaken at almost all important towns in the Bombay Presidency.

Money deposited with this Bank directly benefits the agriculturists and persons of small means.

For further particulars write to Managing Director.

The Industrial and Prudential Assurance Co., Ltd.

The Premier Indian Life Office.

Estd. 1913.

Head Office — **BOMBAY.**

UP-TO-DATE BENEFITS.

LOW PREMIUMS.

BONUS:

Whole Life—Rs. 22-8-0 per Thousand per Year.

Endowment— „ 18-0-0 per „ - „ -

For Agency apply to—Secretaries and Managers,

Industrial and Prudential Assurance Coy., Ltd.,

Esplanade Road, Fort, BOMBAY.

SUPREME FOR YEARS SUPREME TO-DAY— QUALITY ALWAYS TELLS



Mysore Sandalwood Oil B. P. quality, the finest in the world, is perfectly blended and milled by a special process with the purest ingredients to make.

Mysore
Sandal Soap

“It's good through and through
to the thinnest wafer”

Available Everywhere.

**GOVERNMENT SOAP FACTORY,
BANGALORE.**