

# The Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4.

VOL XXII, No. 8. } POONA—THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1939. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.  
FOREIGN 15s.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ... ..	97
ARTICLES :—	
A Prohibition Budget. ... ..	99
The Ferment in the States. ... ..	101
The Bengal Budget. ... ..	103
The U. P. Tenancy Bill— Provisions re. Sir Land. ... ..	104
REVIEWS :—	
Indian Civilization. By R. V. Oturkar. ... ..	105
The Spirit of India. By M. C. Rao. ... ..	105
MISCELLANEA :—	
India and the League. — Mr. N. M. Joshi's Speech. ... ..	106
CORRESPONDENCE :	
Small States and Responsible Government. By H. Mahtab. ... ..	108

## Topics of the Week.

### Baroda Reforms.

THE constitutional reforms in the Baroda State announced by the new Maharaja mark an advance over the present constitution of the Baroda Legislative Council. The Baroda State which is generally talked of as progressive among the major Indian States has been very backward in political matters. The present Dharasabha or Legislative Council of Baroda which has an area of 8,164 square miles and a population of 2,443,007 consists of 31 members, including the Diwan, who is the President. Five others, high officials of the State, are ex-officio members of the Council. Besides these, there are 15 nominated members, of whom one comes from the Ruling Family, six are officials and eight non-officials. Thus there are only ten members who are elected. Their election also is indirect, the franchise being confined to the members of the Prant Panchayats or District Boards which themselves have one-third of their members nominated. Thus the theoretical non-official—not elected—majority of 18 in a House of 31 is far from being real. Even a House so constituted had not the right to discuss the budget of the State. The members "enjoy" the right of interpellation and of moving resolutions on matters of "general public interest."

EARLY in 1938, the Baroda State appointed a Committee consisting of officials and non-officials to consider the question of constitutional reforms.

In December last this committee made a unanimous report. The Maharaja has now announced his willingness to implement what he calls "the main recommendations of the Committee". Under "the new constitution" of Baroda the Legislative Council will consist of 55 members. Of these 37 will be elected, 9 will be Government servants and not more than 9 will be nominated non-officials. The Dewan will continue to be the President, but the Deputy-President will be selected by the Maharaja from the non-official (not necessarily elected) members of the Council. A non-official member of the Council "with a record of public work such as would make him acceptable generally to the Dharasabha" will be appointed by the Maharaja to his Executive Council and he will be responsible to him. All or any of the departments of education, development, commerce, industry and labour, local self-government, public health, rural reconstruction and co-operation may be placed under the councillor so appointed. Two Parliamentary Secretaries "from among the members of the Dharasabha" will also be appointed by the Maharaja to assist members of the Executive Council. The new Council will have power to discuss the State budget "in accordance with rules to be framed".

IT was very unfortunate that the Committee upon whose unanimous recommendations these reforms are based did not mention in its report responsible government even as the ultimate goal of political reforms. It refers to "the ultimate goal of the policy of His Highness' Government" as being "the full association of his subjects with his administration". The Committee is satisfied with only an elected majority in the Legislative Council. It does not recommend the abolition of nomination. It does not insist upon having the new Minister from amongst the *elected* members of the Council. He may be a non-official but should be "acceptable to the majority of the members of the Dharasabha". Nor is he to be responsible to the legislature. Thus in most respects the recommendations of the Committee are very halting and timid.

CONSIDERING the announcement of the Maharaja of Baroda as a whole, we cannot but observe that the forthcoming reforms in the Baroda State are very far from satisfactory even for a temporary period of time. We are afraid they will be far from enthusiastically received by the people of the State as they are not in the least likely to meet even half way their very legitimate political aspirations. Giving careful thought to the spirit of the times generally and the recent happenings in Baroda in particular, the Maharaja would have done well to have made a grant of a full responsible

government to his people. That would have been for him personally an excellent augury of his newly begun regime. The only consideration that is in his favour is the unfortunate fact that the Committee appointed by the late Maharaja itself does not ask for more. We do not know what the composition of the Committee was, which may in all probability supply the clue to the reactionary nature of its recommendations. But there was nothing to prevent the Maharaja from being more generous than this Committee in the matter of transferring his powers to the people to whom they should rightfully belong. We shall not be surprised if in Baroda there will be widespread dissatisfaction about these reforms. Consequent agitation for their betterment and transformation into full responsible government will be completely justifiable.

#### Press Repression by the Bombay Government.

A WARD Congress Committee in Poona passed a resolution on Sunday last protesting against the recent demand of securities from four newspapers. The resolution was in the following terms:

The Congress Ministry in Bombay has made an assault on the freedom of the press by demanding securities from four newspapers and printing presses in the Presidency, and this assault, being directly contrary to the ideals and policies insistently put forward and loudly proclaimed by the Congress, is deserving of condemnation in every possible way. This meeting, therefore, urges that the Congress Ministry should, without stading on official prestige, forthwith cancel the order for these securities and return the securities so far taken and should further give an unequivocal assurance for the future that no man who is not adjudged guilty by a judicial tribunal shall be made to suffer by such executive action, and that, in default of this, the Tripuri Congress should call for relinquishment of its office by the Ministry.

In vindicating the adoption of such a resolution by the Congress Committee, the speakers suggested that this arbitrary action was taken by the Ministry in order to placate the Governor who had presumably asked for the application of the Princes' Protection Act in the presidency and that the Ministry, not being quite willing to follow such an infamous policy, offered indirectly to bring about the same result in a somewhat round-about manner.

THE *Indian Social Reformer* has also severely criticised the Kher Government for adopting "Star Chamber methods in the twentieth century". It says:

In a similar case the Madras Government prosecuted the *Viduthalai* under the provisions of the ordinary law. The Bombay Government owes an explanation to the public for its preference of the emergency law. We trust it will not be the hackneyed one of publicity attending prosecutions. If the use of such emergency powers by a bureaucratic Government was tyrannical, it is not less so when used by a popular Government. When a popular Government borrows from the armoury of its bureaucratic predecessors, it becomes itself a bureaucracy. The personalities of the members of Government, the proofs which they have given of their self-sacrifice and patriotism by some of them having courted imprisonment by breaking the law (also an emergency law!) are irrelevant in assessing the character of their measures on well-established political principles. The demand of securities under the emergency law, instead of

prosecuting the papers under the ordinary law, is an invasion of the freedom of the press by a Government professing to value civil liberty.

#### Exclusion of Joint Stock Banks.

A CIRCULAR has been recently issued by the Reserve Bank of India to all Local Governments exempting joint stock banks from the provisions of legislation dealing with money-lenders and rural indebtedness. According to the Reserve Bank,

The business of joint stock banks is already regulated by law. Their accounts have to be regularly maintained and audited. The activities of the scheduled banks are further watched and guided by them. There does not seem to be any justification for subjecting their activities to restrictions which are primarily devised to regulate the practice of money-lenders... Such restrictions will have the effect of frightening them (banks) away from taking any part in agricultural finance, a field in which they already find it precarious to venture.

Protection of and relief to agriculturist debtors may be classified under four heads: (a) grant of moratorium and schemes of liquidation of debts, (b) regulation of accounts and prevention of certain abuses by declaring them offences in law, (c) regulation of suits against agriculturists by providing for grant of instalments, by exempting a minimum holding and produce necessary for the subsistence of the judgment-debtor and his family, by fixing fair price for land in public sales, by prescribing fair rates of interest, and by controlling usurious transactions through courts, and (d) licensing and registration of money-lenders.

WE do not see how it is possible to permit joint stock banks only to recover their debts, while other creditors are not allowed to do so under the stay orders or debt settlements made by conciliation boards. We may exclude joint stock banks from the provisions referred to in (b) above, as these banks have to maintain certain books under the company law, and as they can be punished for certain offences under the provisions of the Indian Penal Code. As regards the provisions regulating suits against agriculturists, they are based on principles adapted to the existing agricultural economy, of protecting the small holder from being unduly exploited in the satisfaction of his debt and from being dispossessed of his land, which is his only insurance against unemployment. Any credit organisation should regulate its credit to agriculturists in such a manner as to conform to these principles. And it will do no good either to joint stock banks or co-operative societies, if a court has to violate them in their case in suits against agriculturists. For it will be giving them a special kind of monopoly to lend at usurious rates of interest and to bring the lands of agriculturists to sale in execution of decrees. Banking law requires to be amended, empowering Local Governments to exercise some control over banks. Until this is done, the only indirect method of regulating agricultural credit lies in the provisions in the Money-lenders' Acts in suits against agriculturists. As regards licensing and registration of moneylenders, there is no reason to include joint stock banks under these provisions.

#### Dr. Kunzru and the *Straits Echo*.

THE *Straits Echo* of Penang, commenting on the lecture delivered by the Hon'ble Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzru at Penang, had said: "As one listened to Pandit Kunzru developing his

arguments, one felt sorry and even angry that a man so able and so sincere should have been so grievously misinformed and misled as the Pandit has been on so many points." Actually it mentioned only three points in its criticism, and *The Indian* of Kuala Lumpur in its issue of 8th February has shown how Mr. Kunzru's statements were correct on all of them. The paper says:

It (the *Straits Echo*) challenges anyone to say that "the standard wage of 50 cents for male and 40 cents for female labourers is too low." When the ostrich raises its head it will realise that (1) there is no "standard wage" but only a standard "rate," (2) that the standard rate is not now 50 cents and 40, (3) that its challenge was long ago answered by all interested in the question, and (4) that such wages are insufficient. The next point that our contemporary strives to make is as regards discrimination in the admission to educational institutions. Except reporting an interesting tete-a-tete that it had with "a local-born Singapore Medical College graduate in Ipoh yesterday," and grandiloquently exclaiming that it is gross libel to say that there is discrimination,

it does not attempt to answer the charge—a charge made not only by Dr. Kunzru but by many other Indians experienced in the conditions prevalent in the country. The third and last point on which our Penang contemporary waxed eloquent was that both Dr. Kunzru and Mr. Raghavan (President of the Indian Association) were wrong—entirely wrong—in their allegation that Indians nowadays did not enjoy the privilege that they once had in being members of the M. C. S. and were not given their due share in the municipal and Government services in this country. The *Straits Echo* at first took up the position that "there has been no case of an Indian with the requisite qualifications being passed over," and challenged anyone to have the temerity to cite instances. When a specific case of an Indian youth so passed over was cited by Mr. Raghavan, our contemporary tried to wriggle out by saying that the candidate in question, though a domiciled Indian, was a Hongkong graduate while the candidate appointed was one holding a Raffles diploma! What particular disqualification attaches to a Hongkong degree to consider it of less efficiency even to a Raffles diploma remains unanswered.

## A PROHIBITION BUDGET.

THE budget presented by the Hon'ble Mr. Latthe to the Bombay Legislative Assembly last week may well be called a Prohibition Budget. For, out of the Rs. 169 lakhs to be raised by new taxation in the budget year, Rs. 125 lakhs are due to the prohibition experiment. The Finance Minister also promises to push on rapidly in the same direction in 1940-41 and complete the prohibition programme. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that the implications, financial and otherwise, of this policy on which the Government of Bombay seems to have embarked should be examined in some detail.

The Finance Minister at the outset of his speech states that while the announcement of the determination of Government to root out the drink evil was hailed with almost universal joy the critics thought that the pace of the experiment would be slow. This statement of the Finance Minister needs amplification in one regard. It may be justly said that, together with the critics, the well-wishers of the Government had also hoped that the progress would not be too rapid. Unfortunately these hopes have been proved false, and we have to face the consequences of the Government's determination to bring about prohibition immediately. This is a matter on which strong feelings are so easily roused and on which prejudices are so strong that we feel it necessary to examine the nature and consequences of this prohibition programme at some length.

The problem that faces an Indian Finance Minister to-day is one of the most complex. The avenues of useful expenditure are so many and the possible resources so few. Hence a most careful formulation of the immediate and urgent national needs is the *sine qua non* in

the definition of financial policy. The problem raised by this prohibition budget is as to whether the rooting out of the drink evil is *the most* urgent and pressing need in India to-day and whether the way of total prohibition is the proper way of attaining that end. We deliberately say *the most* urgent need, for, that is how the Bombay Government evidently treats it. Last year Rs. 31.5 lakhs were proposed to be spent on prohibition, whereas only Rs. 4.5 lakhs were voted for all other measures of constructive effort. It was presumed that last year Government had too little time to prepare large schemes of constructive nation-building effort. This year the same excuse does not hold good. We are all aware that counsel has been widely taken and that the official and non-official advisers of Government have been working overtime to prepare schemes, large and small. But all this has been reflected in the budget by only Rs. 69 lakhs of expenditure as against the Rs. 125 lakhs of prohibition expenditure. The value the Bombay Government attaches to this end of rooting out the drink evil is, therefore, to be judged by comparing the Rs. 156.5 lakhs of prohibition expenditure as against the Rs. 113.5 lakhs on all other items during these two years.

We repeat, therefore, that the one end of rooting out the drink evil is treated as of enormously higher importance by the Bombay Government than *all the other ends put together*. And we have no hesitation in this matter in registering a frank and full difference of opinion. The drink evil is undoubtedly a very serious one, and some effort to check and regulate it must be put forth by each Government along with other efforts. But to give it the place that the Bombay Government does is not only to over-estimate its im-

portance, but seriously to under-estimate the urgent need of efforts in other directions. In this connection it is necessary to notice one specious but popular argument. The priority given to prohibition is often justified by saying that it is immoral for a Government to derive any revenue from a vice. The source taints the revenue, and, therefore, the sooner it is given up (and given up at whatever sacrifice) the better. The argument is no doubt plausible but has in reality no substance. For it can equally well be argued that there are other sources of revenue which are tantamount to robbing the poorest of the poor. The land revenue and the octroi are two such taxes. Their incidence is highly regressive, and in levying them no attention whatever is paid to capacity. A large part of our peasantry and urban population are by common consent but half-fed. The bulk of them, however, pay the land revenue and the octroi. What then is worse for the State to do—to share in the profits of the drink traffic or to take a morsel away from the starving? The truth of the matter is that such arguments take us nowhere. We have frankly to realise that the present tax system is so built up that the incidence or the source of many a tax is of a dubious character. It is incumbent on us to try and slowly weed out the undesirable elements; but “to hustle oneself into rash action” in one direction alone shows, to put it mildly, a lopsided sense of values.

Not only do we believe that the Government is pursuing the end of abolishing drink with a callous disregard to other crying needs, but also that the method adopted in attaining the end is not wholly appropriate. We often hear direct legal prohibition advocated on the ground that immediate action by the direct route is urgently called for as the evil is great. Would you wait, we are asked, if your house is on fire or if your child is on the brink of a precipice? If we must argue by analogies we would in this case apply an entirely different sort of analogy. The drink evil is not to be likened to an immediate or impending catastrophe which can and has to be averted by immediate direct intervention; it is rather more like a complex organic disorder of a very long standing due to a variety of reasons, a disorder which is not likely to yield to a short intensive treatment, however costly, but can only be tackled successfully by a slow persistent treatment over a series of years. Men drink because of a large variety of reasons; because perhaps of tradition, or habit. But there is very general agreement that at least among the masses the main reasons why people drink are to be found in the conditions under which they are brought up and under which they live. Fatiguing work, inadequate housing, unwholesome surroundings added to ignorance and a sense of despair, play a major part in driving the people of our cities to the liquor shop. And ultimately the only satisfactory way of combating the drink problem is the way that deals with the fundamental predisposing conditions. The experience of other

countries all the world over points to the same moral. It is well-known that the incidence of drunkenness in England has very largely decreased during the last few decades without any measure of direct prohibition, and this has been due to the provision of better living, better sanitation, more parks, more libraries, more wholesome and cheap entertainment, less strenuous work, pleasant working surroundings and a better education. No doubt all this works hand in hand with a gradually stricter regulation of the liquor traffic. Shorter hours, a smaller number of shops, the closing of shops on pay days or local option are measures whose spread should be welcomed by everybody. These, when coupled with a positive programme for bettering living and working conditions, are the only effective means of *really* fighting drink. The Government way of direct, immediate, wholesale prohibition may satisfy those who have been brought up in a belief in negative commandments, in a belief in a list of don'ts; to us, however, it appears to be an entirely wrong approach. As long as the fundamental conditions remain what they are, legal, wholesale prohibition is bound to be ineffective. It is too early to say in what way the reaction will come, whether in the way of an illicit liquor traffic and a wholesale corruption of the administrative machine as in U. S. A. or whether in some other manner. It is in any case too optimistic to believe that there will be no such reactions as long as the other conditions remain what they are.

And Government by this very programme of prohibition is making it impossible for itself to tackle the other conditions. We are no doubt told that the money people save by abstaining from liquor will fructify in their hands; but it is too naive a supposition that, the rest of the social milieu being what it is, the drink addict of to-day will turn overnight into a model paterfamilias. [Parenthetically we may note that the present programme may, if it benefits anybody at all, benefit only the family of the drinker; it certainly does nothing for the family of the abstainer.] Further, the effect of a little money accruing separately to a large number of people will be very different from large sums expended by the State. This is a consideration whose importance the Finance Minister fully admits in another context. It is indeed easy, as the following extracts will show, to make out a case against the prohibition policy of Government from this very budget speech of the Finance Minister. The Finance Minister admits that the rural situation to-day is such that “the slightest burden of taxation, be it the Land Tax or even the Local Cess”, becomes for the peasant “too heavy to bear.” Yet he proposes no reductions in the revenue burden, because, as he rightly argues, “the adoption of a policy of economic development of the villages would pay the ryot far more than the gift to him of a small relief by way of reduction in Land Revenue... While recognising

the need of doing our best to alleviate these burdens as far as possible, Government think that remedial measures on as large a scale as possible against the root-causes of poverty and helplessness of our masses to-day are a vital necessity, and a policy of treating symptoms without dealing with those deeper causes would be a blunder. We have to attack the foe from all sides. Over-emphasis on one side would be fatal to progress." The whole burden of our objection to this prohibition budget could not be put better than in these wise words of the Finance Minister.

We have already pointed out the enormous extent of over-emphasis on the drink evil in this budget. The over-emphasis is all the more unjustifiable as the beneficiaries, if any, will be mostly the population of the biggest cities. And

this over-emphasis is undoubtedly going to be fatal to progress. We all recognise the justice of asking the landlord on the Malabar Hill to pay for the good of the labourer at Worli or Parel. But let the good be a concrete and a positive good. Let it mean better housing at Delisle Road or more parks in the Parel area or, even better, let it mean more funds for ambitious schemes of rural development. As it is, the prohibition programme of Government uses up all the available resources of the State in a purely one-sided and negative effort and makes it impossible for Government to undertake a constructive programme within any reasonable time in the future. It is a blunder. We desire to enter our emphatic protest against this short-sighted policy of treating symptoms without dealing with the deeper causes.

## THE FERMENT IN THE STATES.

**T**HE people in the Indian States are in ferment, and the heaving discontent is leading everywhere to an assault upon the feudal system prevailing in the States. British India for a long while held its hand, what with a feeling of weakness and what with a want of will; but the will of its statesmen is being rushed and their feeling of weakness dissipated by the stormy flood of events. Indeed, the States problem bids fair to solve itself by bursting the shell of neglect in which British India has allowed it to fester. The Princes are at the cross-roads. If they take timely action and confer self-government upon their people they can still save their States, but if they do not the States are doomed. In any case let not the Princes place too much reliance either on the powerlessness of their people or on the guarantee of the British Government to maintain them. In mighty upheavals the people, apparently powerless, become strangely powerful and the wielders of great power become utterly helpless. This may take time, but the end is certain. The Princes must determine now in what direction they desire that their political destiny should progress. If they do not want the States to come to an inglorious end, they must make up their minds to allow the people to come into their own—and that quickly. A declaration of good intentions or the appointment of a committee to shelve actual introduction of popular government will not serve their purpose. A syrup of empty promises will not still the people's thirst for a better and freer existence. Their thirst will be allayed only by solid achievement of freedom.

Nothing short of "a liquidation of the States system" is being demanded by them, but they are willing to put a less awesome interpretation upon these words, provided the Princes awake betimes to their responsibilities and fulfil them in an adequate measure. "Responsible govern-

ment in the States or their total abolition" is the clear message of the All-India States' People's Conference to the Princes. The resolution passed by this organisation at Ludhiana is meant to be persuasive but at the same time it contains a distinct warning. It runs as follows:

This Conference feels that the Indian States system is completely out of date, semi-feudal and an obstruction to the progress and advancement of the people. Autocracy as embodied in the system has long ceased to exist in every part of the world, and the progress made by the rest of India demands the liquidation of the Indian States system. The close association of this system with British Imperialism involves a danger to all people of India, and in the interest of the whole of India it is urgently necessary to put an end to this association and to make vital changes in the system. These changes must necessarily be in the form of responsible government. This Conference desires to point out to all the Rulers of the States that the establishment of responsible government in the States is not only in keeping with the spirit of the times and the natural aspirations of their people, but also provides for them a position of influence and dignity above contention and strife. It is, therefore, to their interest to issue unequivocal declarations of their decision to establish full responsible government and immediately to bring up the system of the administration to a level with that prevailing in the provinces. Attempts to delay this inevitable development are likely to lead to grave and disastrous consequences, and the Conference appeals to the Princes to avoid these perils by lining themselves with their people.

The resolution purports to say that the States system will be considered to be liquidated if autocracy is removed from the States, but it also gives a warning that if this is not promptly done more drastic plans for liquidating the system will have to be framed. That is why we say that the Princes are at the cross-roads. It is for them to choose whether their States shall remain or cease.

The usual argument founded upon the treaties is so exhaustively considered by the All-India

States' People's Conference, and for the first time, that it would be worth while to quote here the resolution adopted by the Conference on the subject *in extenso* :

Whereas great stress has been laid on old treaties between the British Power and the Indian States and attempts have been made to use these treaties to perpetuate the autocracy and semi-feudal order which has so long prevailed in the States and to obstruct the progress of the people, it is necessary to point out the real character of these treaties, the manner and circumstances under which they were made, the persons who made them and the interpretations placed on them in later years. Out of 562 States in India only 40 have such treaties, and these were usually made after the conflict between officers or Agents of the East India Company and persons who had no status of independence, but who had come to exercise authority over parts of the country after the collapse of the central authority in India which resulted from the fall of the Moghul Empire. Treaties were made without any reference to or regard for the people. They ceased to have any importance and many of them were ignored or even completely abrogated long ago by the practice of the Political Department of the Government of India, which varied and developed with the changing policy of the Paramount Power. Many clauses of the treaties made over a century ago cannot be considered binding on the people of the States at a time when conditions have entirely changed. These treaties are now used by the Paramount Power to intervene in the struggle for freedom in the States in favour of the Rulers, and the obligation of the Power to protect the people from misrule and oppression is ignored. This Conference is strongly of opinion that these treaties should be forthwith ended as being completely out of date and inapplicable to the present conditions, and it calls upon the Paramount Power to refuse help or protection to those Rulers who decline to put an end to misrule and who attempt to crush the movement for freedom in these States.

The resolution merely blames the Paramount Power for ignoring its obligation "to protect the people from misrule and oppression", while carrying out its obligation of protecting the Princes. Being apparently convinced that the Paramount Power will never discharge its duty towards the States' people, it does not expressly ask the Power to do so. But the Working Committee's draft resolution in Delhi called for the British Government's intervention on the side of the States' people in specific terms. It said :

And whereas, each treaty obliging the Paramount Power to protect the Princes necessarily carries with it the corresponding obligation to protect the people from misrule and oppression and to secure good government for them, and whereas the obligation of the Paramount Power to secure good government, which is the same thing as self-government for the people, is admitted independently of the treaties, this Conference demands that *the Paramount Power must discharge its obligation and enforce measures for a change in the form of government, without eliminating the Princes, in those States whose people's demand for that change is proved to be widespread and popular*, and calls upon the Paramount Power that it should refuse protection to those Princes who decline to accept and carry out the suggestion and leave the people of the States concerned to enforce their demands without let or hindrance by peaceful and non-violent means.

The Working Committee asked that the Paramount Power should not only stand aside when the States' people were carrying on a struggle for constitutional freedom in a peaceful manner, but should give them active assistance and even impose upon the rulers a constitution desired by the people. The same instruments that give the Paramount Power the right to protect the rulers against the people give it the right to protect the people against the rulers. But in these days there is not over-much anxiety on any body's part to invoke the Paramount Power's intervention on behalf of the people; all one can wish for is that the Paramount Power did not intervene on the other side when circumstances did not justify it.

The Conference broke entirely new ground when it suggested how small States should be dealt with. Its resolution on this subject reads as follows :

It is the considered opinion of this Conference that only those States which have a population exceeding 20 lakhs or revenue exceeding Rs. 50 lakhs can maintain the standard of administration necessary and suitable for being workable units for the purposes of uniting with the provinces in a scheme of free and federal India, and, therefore, all States not coming within the above category should be amalgamated, either singly or by groups, with neighbouring provinces for purposes of administration, with suitable provisions for safeguarding the reasonable rights and privileges of Rulers concerned, and the Conference requests the National Congress to appoint a committee of enquiry for the purpose of finding ways and means to facilitate such an amalgamation.

When even the *Statesman* raised a sort of Cromwellian voice in favour of virtual abolition of the small States, it is not to be wondered at that a body which speaks in the name of the States' people should adopt such a resolution. Let us see what will be the result of giving effect to this resolution. Only eight States will be considered viable by the application of the population test, viz., Hyderabad, Mysore, Kashmir, Gwalior, Baroda, Travancore, Jaipur and Jodhpur; and fifteen more States will be entitled to a separate political existence on the ground of their annual revenue, viz., Patiala (with a revenue of 150 lakhs), Indore (136 lakhs), Kolhapur (127 lakhs), Bikaner (121 lakhs), Nawanagar (112 lakhs), Bhavnagar (105 lakhs), Cochin (85 lakhs), Junagadh (83 lakhs), Bhopal (62 lakhs), Rewa (60 lakhs), and Alwar, Udaipur (Mewar), Kotah, Gondal and Bahawalpur with a revenue round about 50 lakhs. Excepting these 23 States all the other States numbering about 550 cannot maintain an independent existence. However, the Conference does not seek their abolition; but only amalgamation with the neighbouring provinces, "with suitable provisions for safeguarding the reasonable rights and privileges of the rulers concerned." Since the grant of responsible government is asked for as an alternative to abolition, "suitable provision for rulers" can only mean their recognition as constitutional rulers. They need not be pensioned off as would be the case if the States themselves

were to be put out of existence. One only hopes that this question of the small States, so prominently raised, will be settled satisfactorily before federation, even if the federation is otherwise of a desirable type. After federation it will become insoluble. The Conference this year did

a glorious piece of work. It made several constructive suggestions, but, more important, it brought into focus the numerous high-hearted endeavours being carried on by the States' people with marvellous heroism. It is to be hoped that the Princes will read the writing on the wall.

## THE BENGAL BUDGET.

THERE is no correspondence between professions and practice in the Bengal Budget estimates for 1939-40, presented to the Bengal Legislature by the Hon'ble Mr. Nalini Ranjan Sarkar. Mr. Sarkar's budget speech is a splendid document both in its conception and manner of presentation. In it, he refers to the menacing evils of unemployment, to the necessity of transferring money from the rich to the poor and to the desirability of rapidly increasing the activities of the State. His survey of the inadequacy of provincial revenues to meet the growing needs of the population leaves nothing to be desired. But when one looks to the budget estimates prepared by the Finance Minister, one is surprised to find that there is no attempt at all to put the foregoing ideas into practice. The budget, in fact, is a routine one concerned mainly with the maintenance of the *status quo*, with a little increased provision for expenditure on the nation-building departments. No attempts have been made to relieve to whatever extent possible the increasing miseries of unemployment, nor have any steps been taken to tax the rich so that the proceeds might be utilised for providing greater services to the poor. In fact, there is nothing new in the budget to suggest a departure from the old policy of the Bengal Government. To come to the figures, the estimated expenditure for 1939-40, amounts to 14.65 crores, 1.72 crores more than the expenditure of the current year. Of this 93 lakhs represent an expenditure which was already there, spent by the local bodies which used to get this amount by the cess, fines and penalties levied by the courts under the local laws. Under the new constitution these fines etc., cannot accrue directly to the local bodies but will accrue to the province in the first instance, which will make a grant of the same amount to the local bodies. Thus, it will be seen that the 93 lakhs of new expenditure provided in the budget for 1939-40 is new expenditure only in name. The real new expenditure is only 79 lakhs which has been divided under the following heads, viz., (1) Civil Works, (2) Education, (3) Public Health, (4) Irrigation and (5) Agriculture. Most of the expenditure on civil works is due to an extensive programme of building projects for various Government departments in which one can have little reason to be interested. The complaint is often heard that our Governments follow a brick and mortar policy; by which more attention is paid to the construction of

imposing buildings than to the welfare of the needy populace. The Bengal Government has done nothing to remove this complaint. On the other hand, it is providing a new expenditure of 24 lakhs on new buildings, which could have been better utilised in many other ways. On education, the Bengal Government has provided for a new expenditure of Rs. 11,73,000, and some 8 lakhs of this has been provided for Muslim institutions. In the year 1939-40, an additional sum of one lakh is being provided for stipends to be given to needy and deserving students. Out of this amount 60 thousand will be earmarked for Muslim students; 20 thousand for the students of the scheduled classes and 20 thousands for others. In the current year's budget again, the lion's share of the stipends has been reserved for Muslim students.

The estimated revenue is 13.78 crores, and the estimated expenditure being 14.65 crores, the result is a deficit of 87 lakhs. This deficit is covered by the opening balance, which is 78 lakhs, but the Finance Minister wants to conserve the balance and therefore provides for a loan of one crore to meet the deficit. The reasons advanced for floating a loan to cover the deficit are convincing enough, for nearly 76 lakhs of the deficit is due to loans given to the flood-stricken peasantry of the province which is recoverable with interest and therefore should reasonably be met out of a loan incurred for the purpose. Secondly, the Finance Minister intends to impose two new taxes expected to yield about 12 lakhs of income. One of them is a betting tax on dog-racing and the other an ungraduated tax of Rs. 30 a year on professions, trades and callings, exempting those who do not pay the income-tax. We have no objection to a tax being levied on dog-racing, but we doubt seriously the equity of an ungraduated tax levied on all professional men. As matters stand at present, the glaring inequality of taxation on the business men and landlords of Bengal is too striking to escape attention. It can be said with pardonable exaggeration that the landlords of Bengal evade tax-payment altogether, the land-revenue they are required to pay under the Permanent Settlement being a very small fraction of their taxable capacity. The same state of things was prevalent in Behar. But the Congress Government of Behar has now imposed a tax on agricultural income and thus has redressed to a great extent the disparity of taxation on the businessmen and the landlords of the province, Bengal, being a wholly permanently-settled area, is an ideal

province for the imposition of agricultural income-tax, and we have no doubt that it will add a good bit to the revenues of the province. But instead of imposing agricultural income-tax, the Bengal Ministry has taken the absolutely unjustified step of taxing further the businessmen. It may be argued by the Ministry that as the Floud Commission is enquiring into the whole question of Permanent Settlement it would be premature for the Ministry to impose an agricultural income-tax without waiting for the recommendations of the Commission. But this can be no reason for not imposing an agricultural income-tax, for this tax is justified not only in zamindari areas nor only in permanently settled areas, but in rayatwari and temporarily settled areas also. In any case, we would like to emphasize that the proposal of a new profession tax is iniquitous in the extreme and should be given up for that reason by the Bengal Government.

In every province, the question of retrenchment occupies very great attention and there is a belief in the public mind that the present scale of expenditure can be considerably curtailed if proper retrenchment is effected in the various departments. Mr. N. R. Sarkar has done well to demolish this popular belief. He argues and rightly, that under a democratic form of government, State activities would increase and not decrease and therefore no economies can be expected from the reduction of departments. As regards salary-cut he points out that out of the total salary bill of the Bengal Government which is about 6'02 crores, 98 lakhs and 88 thousand are charged and therefore no reductions can be effected in the same. Of the rest, 3 crores, 57 lakhs and 85 thousand are drawn by people whose pay is not above Rs. 200 a month. Obviously, no cuts can be made in these salaries. There remains, therefore, a balance of about 1 crore and 45 lakhs which can be subjected to salary reduction. Everyone will admit that much economy cannot be expected from this small amount. Therefore, no great hopes can be placed on possible savings by salary reduction. It is best that this is realised at once, for it will lead people not only to demand new activities to be undertaken by the State, but also to raise the necessary revenue for the purpose. But the Bengal Government is not doing nearly enough in either direction.

#### U. P. TENANCY BILL. PROVISION *re. Sir* LAND.

ONE of the most important questions with which the United Provinces Tenancy Bill deals is the question of *sir* land. In the U. P., as elsewhere, certain special privileges attach to *sir* land and so the Land Revenue Acts as well as Tenancy Acts have carefully to define what is legally *sir* and what is not and also what are exactly the privileges of the owner of *sir*. As the law stands, when tenant-right is

allowed in *rayati* land, it does not extend to *sir* land; when land is assessed, *sir* land is allowed a certain reduced rate below the full proportion of the rental value; and if a man loses his proprietary right in *sir* he is entitled to retain possession of it as an occupancy tenant.

*Sir* originally signified a home-farm. According to the Mainpuri Settlement Report of 1840, it meant the same thing as *khudkasht* (i.e., land under the personal cultivation of the landlords). Gradually, however, it came to acquire wider significance with the growth of tenancy legislation. As the various tenancy measures sought to restrict the landlords' unlimited rights of ejection and enhancement of rent, as a reaction against them the landlords caught hold of this institution of *sir* and used it to retain these rights over as large an area of their property as possible. What was originally a home-farm has of late become only a name given to the area of land over which tenants can acquire no rights whatsoever. Thus *sir* land in the possession of landlords went on increasing in its area out of all proportion, so much so that it lost its original significance altogether. As the Select Committee on the U. P. Tenancy Bill observes in its Report, "the greater the *sir* area, the greater the area in which tenants are deprived of hereditary rights".

In view of these considerations the U. P. Congress Agrarian Enquiry Committee, which reported in November 1936, recommended that "no area not under the actual cultivation of the zamindar should be classed as *sir*, and tenants' rights should accrue to all cultivators on the *sir* in the same way as on other lands". The Congress Government in the U. P. do not choose to abide by this just, though radical, recommendation of the Committee. They, however, do not want the law regarding *sir* to remain as it is. They would like to modify it to some extent. The first proposals for such modification were formulated in April 1938 and presented to the U. P. Legislative Assembly in chapter II of the Tenancy Bill. The Select Committee which was subsequently appointed toned down even these mild proposals still further, so that the provisions regarding *sir* that have now passed the Assembly leave large numbers of tenants of *sir* land unprotected against the two chief ills of their life, insecurity of tenure and arbitrary enhancement of rent.

In the original Bill it was provided that tenants of *sir* who had cultivated it continuously for five years or more would be granted hereditary occupancy rights. An exception was, however, made in the case of tenants of the *sir* of what were called smaller landlords, which term was interpreted to mean landlords who are assessed to land revenue not exceeding Rs. 100 or to a local rate not exceeding Rs. 10 or those who are not assessed to income-tax. In the case of these small landlords it was assumed that land in their possession would be necessary for their own cultivation, and so no tenant right was allowed to accrue on *sir*



belonging to them. With regard to the other bigger landlords the assumption was that they were all rent-receivers, and so it was provided that all *sir* lands belonging to them barring the areas which were actually under their cultivation would cease to be *sir* and that tenants of these lands would be on a par with the tenants of other ordinary lands in regard to occupancy rights.

The Bill as it emerged from the Select Committee and even passed the U. P. Assembly has relaxed these provisions of the original Bill in favour of the landlords in two respects. In the first place the original definition of the smaller landlords has been widened so as to include in it landlords who are assessed to a land revenue of Rs. 250 or to a local rate of Rs 25. Thus the number of landlords who need not give any protection to the tenants has been very considerably increased, and consequently an enormous mass of tenantry who are engaged on their *sir* have been left unprotected as to the security of their tenure and the stability of their rent. This mass of tenantry are further augmented by another clause in the Bill which allows a bigger landlord coming under the restrictions as to *sir* to retain as much as 50 acres of his land as *sir* and will in regard to this land be in no way affected by the Bill. The original proposal was to deprive the landlords of their *sir* rights in all land except that part of it which was under their own personal cultivation. Far from doing that, the clause as it is passed allows even bigger landlords not only to retain 50 acres of their land as *sir* but also to acquire new *sir* if they do not happen to possess 50 acres. So even if a landlord does not cultivate himself a single acre of land, he can have as many as 50 acres as *sir* with all the unlimited rights over its tenants.

---

## Reviews.

---

### INDIAN CIVILIZATION.

**A CIVILIZATION AT BAY. INDIA—PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE.** By K. KUNHI-KANNAN. (Natesan, Madras.) 20cm. 504p. Rs. 3.

FEW writers have dealt with a problem so vast in magnitude and varied in character. The author states how India has been studied by Western writers and how their writings have largely suffered on account of the limitations with which they necessarily had to work. The tourists describe India as a land of worship of animals, a land of palaces and tombs, of towers and fortresses and wild elephants and tigers. The Britisher is interested in the government and exploitation of the country. There are a few others who would describe the quaint and the queer of the Indian life to feed the vanity and self sufficiency of the West. The author "views with grave misgivings the effects of the writings of the West in regard to India," and comes to the conclusion that "Indians have therefore to interpret India for themselves and for the world." (page 15).

With this landable object, the author proceeds to deal with the subject stating the back-ground and then deals with such Indian institutions as village community, joint family, caste, marriage, religious charity and domestic hospitality. He also deals with Indian art and literature, which he largely identifies with Indian philosophy. Having made a sweeping survey of the Indian political evolution and economic exploitation, he turns to a statement of the present-day problems. In explaining the phrase "civilisation at bay" the writer gives in a nutshell the diagnosis of the Indian problem. He thinks that "the ascendancy of the static priestly class and the disappearance of the dynamic fighting class made India a prey to successive invaders and the conquerors added additional racial elements to the population, which refused to fit into the scheme of Indian culture and polity", (page 500). To make matters worse the Britishers introduced their ideas of individualism and a centralised system of administration which acted as a centrifuge on the communities disuniting the people in all matters. "Under these circumstances, the people are deprived of every independent activity, unable to exercise virtues dear to them and prevented from the exploitation of new ones. The whole civilisation is thus brought to bay" (ibid). The views of the author regarding reconstruction of Society sharply differ from the general trend of opinion in the country. He is in favour of liberty first and democracy afterwards. "What the country needs," in the opinion of the author, "is a national government which will serve national interests and which, with a true measure and mastery of the forces at work, will utilise them to the best advantage of the people" (501). Howsoever we may differ from conclusions such as these, the reading of the earlier pages of this book that describe Indian institutions, will surely create an Indian outlook of these institutions in the minds of readers and certainly would save them from the tainted views of those that do not belong to this country. It is no use joining issues regarding his conclusion for, alas, the author met his death at the young age of 47 before he could see his book released to his readers.

R. V. OTURKAR.

### THE SPIRIT OF INDIA.

**THE SPIRIT OF INDIA.** BY W. J. GRANT. (Batsford.) 1938 23cm. 120p. 10/6.

THIS book contains 141 attractive and interesting illustrations which combined with the text, have as their general object "giving as much general knowledge of India as possible." The book can roughly be divided into three sections. The first chapters describe scenes and cities. Some of the descriptions are quite lyrical.

The next chapters give in some detail the main ideas embodied in the various religions in India and the influence these religions have on the outlook and daily life of the people.

The remainder of the book considers the social aspects of Indian life. In this field the author takes what might be termed an orthodox rather than the social reformer's point of view. He urges India to retain her age-old ways and only make such minor changes as can be made without changing the main streams of life. Just how India alone can hold back the march of time the author does not explain.

The book is altogether highly personalized view of what India is and what she should strive to be. It will be interesting to those Indians who might enjoy seeing themselves as some one else has seen them. It would perhaps be more interesting to the people who have visited India and would like to compare their impressions with those of the author.

M. C. RAO.

## Miscellaneous.

### INDIA AND THE LEAGUE.

#### MR. N. M. JOSHI'S SPEECH.

*To the resolution, proposed by Mr. Avinashalingam Chettiar, urging India's withdrawal from the League of Nations, Mr. N. M. Joshi moved an amendment substituting the following for the original resolution: "This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to convey to the League of Nations India's dissatisfaction that in major political issues it has so far failed to achieve its purpose of bringing about international peace and protecting the interests of smaller nations, to put forward before the League proposals for making it a better and more effective instrument for accomplishing its aims and objects by strengthening the Covenant of the League and otherwise and for India's more effective participation in its work and also recommends to the Government of India to take such steps, as are necessary to secure the acceptance of its proposals by the League." In moving this amendment Mr. Joshi made a speech as follows in the Legislative Assembly on 4th February:*

SIR, I share the dissatisfaction which my friend Mr. Avinashalingam Chettiar has expressed with the constitution of the League of Nations and with the work done by that organization. But, Sir, because I am dissatisfied with the work of the League of Nations, I am not prepared to ask the country to leave that organization. I feel, Sir, the remedy to secure the removal of dissatisfaction is not to walk away, but I feel that there are other remedies for securing the removal of our dissatisfaction. It is with that intention that I move my amendment.

There are two points of view from which this subject can be discussed and should be discussed. The first is the general utility of the League, its constitution, and the work done by it in order to achieve its object of establishing international co-operation and international peace. Secondly, we must also consider India's position and India's relation with the League of Nations and India's participation in the work of that organisation. Taking the first point, I would deal very briefly with the constitution of the League of Nations and then I shall deal with the work done by it. I agree again with my Hon. friend, Mr. Avinashalingam Chettiar that the constitution of the League of Nations is defective. In the first place, the constitution of the League is unnecessarily connected with the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. There should have been really no connection between the two, and I am glad to find that this question has been taken up by the League itself. Proposals are being framed in order that the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations may be separated altogether. I also agree with the view which was read by my Hon. friend, Mr. Chettiar, that the League does not

provide effective sanctions. If the decisions of the League are to be enforced, it is necessary for the League to be provided with an armed force especially an armed air force in order that it should have the power to coerce recalcitrant members. I have no doubt that in course of time the League will be given that power. I admit that there are other defects in the constitution of the League. The members of the League do not bind themselves to accept arbitration in political issues. This question has been discussed also in the League of Nations. It was Mr. Arthur Henderson, on behalf of the Labour Party in Great Britain, who tried his very best to get the members of the League to bind themselves to accept arbitration in all political issues. Sir, the nations of the world are not still willing to part with even a little of their sovereignty, that is the stumbling block in the way of the success of the League. I feel that a time will come when the nations of the world will be willing to part with at least some of their sovereignty in order that international co-operation can be established and there may be universal peace in the world. As the constitution of the League is defective, it is our duty to make efforts to change that constitution.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Who are you?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: My Hon. friend Mr. Satyamurti, says, who are you? I say, who are you to withdraw from the League of Nations? Unfortunately, the efforts that are made at present to secure changes in the constitution are in the contrary direction. Great Britain and several other countries are trying to weaken the League of Nations by taking away from that organisation some of the sanctions which that organisation possesses. I again share the views of my Hon. friend, Mr. Chettiar, that the record of the League of Nations in big political issues is very poor. We must admit that in spite of the League Japan has been able to swallow Manchuria, Italy has swallowed Abyssinia and the League only made half-hearted attempts to prevent that being done. Austria has been swallowed and part of Czecho-Slovakia has been swallowed. The League has not been able to help Spain, it could not render much help to China. I admit that these are great failures of the League. We naturally mark the failures of the League; but even in political sphere, in small matters may be, it has rendered great service to the world. The League, I have no doubt, in solving those smaller matters, has avoided at least smaller wars and our thanks are due to that organisation for that work. I again admit that the League of Nations has failed to secure disarmament in the world.

When we speak of the work of the League of Nations, it is not the political work alone which we should consider. Mr. Chettiar has admitted that besides political work the League does work in both economic and social spheres. The League has as a subsidiary body the International Labour Office. There is also an organisation for intellectual co-operation and a big organisation which has done very good work so far as regards public health. The League has done something to bring about better international communications. It has done some work for ameliorating the conditions of women and children. It has done great work in relieving the sufferings of refugees. Besides these, the League of Nations has done very useful work in collecting information on economic, social and even political matters. The mere collection of this information is of great use. Besides that, the existence of the League of Nations

for a fairly long period has brought into existence a body of international public servants. It is not an easy thing for individuals to feel internationally and to act internationally. The League of Nations and the bodies working with it, like the International Labour Organisation, the Intellectual Co-operation and other organisations, have brought into existence a body of persons who feel internationally and who act internationally. I feel that this is a very useful thing which the League of Nations has done, if the League of Nations has failed in political matters—and I do not admit that it has failed in all political matters but still it is admitted on all hands that it has done very useful work in both the economic and social spheres. Why should we withdraw from the League of Nations? Do we not want that Indian labour should benefit from the International Labour Organisation? Do we not want that the public health organisation of our country should benefit from the experience of the League of Nations? If we want economic benefits from the League, if we want social benefits from the League, why should we not co-operate with the League, why should we withdraw from it? My Hon. friend, Mr. Chettiar, has pointed out several objections to our remaining in the League of Nations. It is true that Abyssinia has suffered. It is true that China has not been helped. It is true that Spain has not been helped. But has Spain withdrawn from the League of Nations, or has China withdrawn from the League of Nations? China and Spain still cling to the League of Nations and try to get out of it whatever little help it could render. And why should we leave the League of Nations? Moreover, if the League of Nations is not successful, is it the fault of that organisation, or is it the fault of the members of that organisation? We, as a member of the League of Nations, are equally responsible for the failure of the League of Nations.

*An Honourable Member* : Not at all.

*Mr. N. M. Joshi* : I shall come to that point. It is not, therefore, that the organisation is a bad organisation. There are some members of the League who are apathetic to its work, who are not sufficiently sympathetic and the failure of the League of Nations is due to that fact and not to the idea underlying that organisation. If, therefore, the League of Nations is to be successful it can be made successful by all the members of the League trying towards its success including India. What have we done? India is a member of the League of Nations. My friend, Mr. Chettiar and the great Party which he represents have been in this Legislature for more than three years. May I ask what they have done to improve the League of Nations? I could have understood my Honourable friend and his Party if they had brought forward a Resolution pointing out to the Government of India what changes should be made in the constitution of the League of Nations. (Interruptions.) If these gentlemen will obstruct me and not allow me to speak, that only shows that their arguments are weak and the course they are following is wrong. I ask again what have they done? Instead of pointing out to the Government of India what should be done to make the League successful, they bring forward a Resolution saying that we must walk away from the League. It may be said that these gentlemen are engaged in the national struggle and therefore they are apathetic towards the League, except to say that we should walk out of the League. Our very membership of the League is a recognition of the

fact that India is a self-governing nation. If at any time India ceases to be a self-governing nation that question will be a question of international interest. Moreover, our membership of the League of Nations enables us to discuss foreign questions. Why don't the members of the Congress Party insist upon the Government of India placing the report of its delegation before the House for open and free discussion? May I ask if the League of Nations is unsatisfactory, are there not other organisations, which are unsatisfactory and which we are still using? May I ask the Congress Party whether they consider the constitution of the Legislative Assembly to be satisfactory and if it is not, why do they work in this organisation?

*An Honourable Member* : Wait and see.

*Mr. N. M. Joshi* : I have waited and seen for a long time. Longer perhaps than most of the members of this House. So, if we are not leaving the Legislative Assembly, why should we leave the League of Nations? The Government of India can do many things to see that its participation in the League of Nations is more effective. It can place the report of the delegation before the Legislature for discussion. Then the Secretary of State must cease to interfere in the relationship between India and the League. Whatever relations we may have to maintain should be through the High Commissioner for India. Then the Government of India are themselves lowering the status of India by refusing to allow the Commerce Member to sign treaties with other countries of the world. The delegation of the Government of India headed by Sir Muhammad Habibullah had made certain recommendations. The first recommendation was that the Government of India should set up a committee of the Legislature to consider the attitude of India towards the work of the League of Nations. The Government of India should immediately set up a committee and allow that committee to consider what India's attitude should be towards the questions included in the agenda of the League and the brief given to the delegates should be the brief prepared by this committee. Then, Sir, India must secure membership of the Council of the League. Then again I agree with my Honourable friend that there are very few Indians on the staff of the League—hardly any one in a high position. The Government of India should insist that there should be a sufficient number of Indians on the staff of the League of Nations and some of them in high positions. It is our right to insist that the whole of the Indian delegation to the League should consist of Indians and there should not be even one Britisher in the delegation. India's position in the international world is misunderstood on account of the fact that several Britishers find a place in the Indian delegation,

There is only one point more which I wish to mention before I sit down. The Government of India, in order to secure changes in the constitution of the League and to secure that its work is successful should take immediate steps to set up a committee and that committee should make a report as to what changes should be made in the constitution of the League and the proposal made by that committee should be sent to the League of Nations. Then, there is the amendment put forward by Sir Syed Reza Ali that the contribution should be reduced. If the League of Nations does not accept our proposals, let us then make the proposal that in the eyes of the Indian nation the usefulness of the League

of Nations is much reduced and therefore, the contribution made by India should also be reduced. The Congress Party is no doubt very fortunate in bringing forward this motion at this moment when the League is in a very bad way. Those of us who believe in the brotherhood of man and the citizenship of the world expected and thought that with the establishment of the League of Nations a new era would begin. But, unfortunately, disappointments have come to us. But simply because there are disappointments we must not get into despair. If we have faith that universal brotherhood can be achieved and that citizenship of the world can be established, then in spite of disappointment, we must redouble our efforts to bring about international co-operation with the help of the League of Nations. I hope the House will not accept the Resolution moved by the Congress Party but will accept the amendment moved by me.

## Correspondence.

### SMALL STATES AND RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—Many thanks for your comments on my letter at page 79 of your issue of the 9th February, 1939. I am sorry I could not appreciate the way in which you understood my point of view. When I say that the sanads should be cancelled I mean that the States should be treated as British Indian territories. The history of the Orissa States clearly proves my contention. In many cases the sanads have been cancelled and the States have been treated as British territories as for instance Angul and Banki. In many other cases such as Kanika, Kujang and some other States, in spite of the retention of the sanads, they are treated as British Indian territories and are now parts of British Orissa. These States hold exactly the same sanads as the so-called Indian States of Orissa hold. Even now if the Paramount Power so wishes, it can cancel the sanads and treat the States as within the British territory. These States used to be treated as British territories up till the year 1894 when, as the result of the decision of the Calcutta High Court, the Secretary of State declared the States as Indian States.

Apart from the above facts, I am sorry to note that you have been accusing me for carrying on a propaganda against introduction of responsible government in the States. This is a grossly inaccurate piece of information, and I can well see from which source it emanates. You will please excuse me if I do not join the controversy any longer. — Yours, etc.

H. MAHTAB.

Cuttack, February 17.

[ Mr. Mahtab says that, in advocating cancellation of sanads of the Orissa States, he is advocating their being joined to the British territory in Orissa. That would indeed be the natural

interpretation, but some words used by him in his letter published in the issue of 9th February of our paper precluded us from placing this interpretation on his advocacy of cancellation of the sanads. He says in this letter, "In view of the above (restrictive) terms in the sanads, I have been agitating for cancellation of sanads and pressing the Political Department to come out for responsible government in the Orissa States." If, by cancellation of sanads, the States are to form part of British Orissa, they will cease to be under the Political Department, and Mr. Mahtab need not press that Department "to come out for responsible government." They will then be part of British territory and will automatically be in enjoyment of responsible government. And one would expect a publicist of the eminence of Mr. Hare Krishna Mahtab, if he wants the Orissa States to be abolished, to say so clearly, rather than use an equivocal expression like cancellation of sanads. We too have no desire to carry on a controversy with him, but for the sake of enlightenment, not only of ourselves, but of the people in the Orissa States and other States, we would ask him whether in fact the agitation he is carrying on is for the purpose of abolishing the States.]

JUST OUT!

JUST OUT!!

### Primary Education In India

From the Poor Man's Point of View

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

Member, Servants of India Society

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

Price Re. 1/4 net.

Can be had of:—

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

### BHULABHAI DESAI'S SPEECHES

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

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

Price:

Rs. 3/8/- India

Sh. 7/6/- Foreign

Postage extra.

Can be had of all leading booksellers,

**WHEELERS BOOK STALLS,**

or please write to:

**G. A. NATESAN & COMPANY,**

Publishers, MADRAS.