

The

Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XVIII, No. 20. }

POONA—THURSDAY, MAY 16, 1935.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	257
ARTICLES :—	
Your Fetters Will Fall Of Themselves. ...	259
Sparks From The Commons' Anvil. ...	260
The Franco—Russian Pact. By Madame L. Morin.	266
OUR LONDON LETTER.	267
REVIEW :—	
Realities (?) Of Indian Problem. By Prof. D. G. Karve, M. A.	267
SHORT NOTICE	268

Topics of the Week.

Avoiding Reality.

MRS. KAMALADEVI CHATTOPADHYAYA, who was Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Karnatak Provincial Conference held under the Congress auspices at Mangalore, criticised the Congress sharply for neglecting the subjects of Indian States. On her observations in this part of her speech, the *Bombay Sentinel* comments as follows under the above caption :

Mrs. Kamaladevi's reference to the States and the States' peoples were very timely. It is obvious that there cannot be a free India, as long as there are over seven crores of peoples in the States under a discredited feudal system.

The pity of it is that Congress leaders are willing to accept such a system, without any demur. Whether the Congress attitude is one of indifference or toleration, it is equally reprehensible, and the country will not accept such a proposition willingly.

Mrs. Kamaladevi was right in saying that the Congress attitude "betrays on our part a lack of coherence, of vision and a desire to avoid coming to grips with reality."

What is more, is its sheer pusillanimity to run away from the real situation and tolerate a state of things out of personal regard for certain Princes. As she says, left to herself, India would have gone the way of China and Turkey, for "Indian States have no place in India to-day, and minus the British patronage and protection, no reality." These words will find a ready echo in the hearts of most Indians.

We quite realise that there is no sense in appealing to these Princes to throw in their lot with the Indian struggle for freedom, and it certainly "shows a want of historical sense and understanding of human nature."

"The simplicity of the appeal," says Mrs. Kamaladevi, "is too naive to be convincing". The Congress is injuring

the entire cause of India and her struggle for freedom by such an insincere and even hypocritical attitude towards the Indian Princes and their States.

* * *

Postal Employees' Pension Grievance.

THERE are three grades of service in the Postal Department: (1) superior, (2) subordinate and (3) inferior. The members of the last grade seem to be treated with gross injustice in regard to their pension as compared to the other two grades. While in the case of the first class the pension has been fixed at £1,000 and in that of the second at half the salary, in the case of the inferior grade the princely sum of Rs. 4 a month has been laid down as the maximum! Their pension rules seem to have undergone no revision since 1860, when they were originally drawn up and when owing to the cheapness of living their salaries might perhaps not have exceeded Rs. 7 or Rs. 8 a month. But things have changed beyond recognition since and it is a wonder to us how their pension grievance did not come under Government's notice earlier in the usual course of official routine, while the position of the superior services continued constantly to engage their attention all these years. It is a case of the voiceless having no friend in the Councils of Government with the result that while more and more is thrust on those who are already overfed, the hungry and the half-starved have to go without food.

Mr. N. M. JOSHI is among those who have espoused the cause of these unfortunate employees of Government. He has been pressing their case on the attention of Government at every available opportunity, but it was only this year that his pertinacity has been rewarded. In connection with the consideration of the budget by the Assembly this year he moved a cut in the grant for the Postal Department for the purpose of drawing pointed attention to the pension grievance of the inferior service. Financial stringency used to be cited so far as a plausible excuse for delaying action in the desired direction. With a surplus budget this year that excuse could no longer be used for resisting Mr. Joshi's relentless pressure on behalf of this much ill-used class of Government servants. And Sir James Grigg had no alternative but to promise his sympathetic consideration of the grievance. He made it clear that the question would be taken up by Government "with every desire to do something to meet the grievance which has been admitted for sometime." May it be hoped that the assurances will be translated into action without available loss of time?

* * *

I. M. S.

WE have no doubt the demand recently put forward in the Council of State for the replacement of the present method of recruitment to the I. M. S. by the selection board by an open competitive examination

held in this country has the solid backing of public opinion. Admission to the I. M. S. used to be by an examination held in England. This method held the field for sixty years—till 1915 when owing to the exigencies of the war it was substituted by the present unsatisfactory method of selection by a board.

* * *

AS can be easily seen, this is attended by many disadvantages. In the first place, the selective method does not always ensure the selection of the best available material in the same way as the results of an open competitive examination may be trusted to do. In the second place, a selection board is likely to be amenable to personal influences with the result that its decisions may oftentimes be influenced by considerations other than those of sheer merit of the persons selected by it. Looking to the personnel of the board the fear may legitimately be entertained that the tendency to prefer an inferior Britisher to a superior Indian cannot be altogether absent. While under the Medical Council Act a degree of an Indian University is regarded as a sufficient qualification for admission to the I. M. S. and though the Director-General himself has borne testimony to the excellence and efficiency of aspirants to the I. M. S., the numbers actually selected by the board show that the prejudice against Indian degrees has not completely died out in official quarters. It is found that in 1931 only three doctors with Indian qualifications were admitted, while in the following two years only one each was found worthy of selection. We have no desire to underrate foreign qualifications; but we insist that this should involve no unfairness to India-trained graduates.

* * *

THE complaint voiced by the mover of the above motion that the insistence upon the maintenance of a ratio of 2 Britishers to 1 Indian in recruitment to the I. M. S. is invidious is well-founded. If even in the Indian Civil Service an equal number of Indians and Britishers is agreed to by Government without any danger to the security of British rule, it is difficult to see how the maintenance of this ratio in the I. M. S. can be justified. Even the necessity to provide for the medical needs of the European members of the services and their families cannot be regarded as a sufficient ground for the maintenance of the present excessive British element in the I. M. S. In this connection the opinion expressed by the Commander-in-Chief that "I personally think that they overdo that a bit and I think before very long they will find that the Indian medical officer is as good as their own" is significant. Sir Philip Chetwode tried to make it appear that the maintenance of the ratio of 2 British to 1 Indian was unintentional. Whatever that be, it is noteworthy that he made no attempt to doubt the correctness of the racial proportions of which the I. M. S. is composed. If the ratio is not consciously aimed at, why not take active steps to reduce the British element so as to establish the bona fides of Government with the people?

* * *

Travancore in 1933-34.

ONE point about the administration of Travancore State can never be given too much prominence, viz. that the proportion of the ruler's civil list to the State revenue, which has never been very high, instead of rising, is steadily going down. About 50 years ago it was 8.76 per cent.; while it is now even less than a half of that figure. To be exact, it stood at 4.22 in 1933-34, its administration report for which year has recently fallen into our hands. In this respect Travancore must indeed be said to occupy a unique position. To our knowledge there is no

other State where this praiseworthy phenomenon is observable.

* * *

COMMENTING on the Cochin State's expenses in connection with the Viceregal visit, we had occasion to regret that our curiosity in regard to their total had to remain unsatisfied, the State accounts failing to give the figure separately. We have the same fault to find in connection with the Travancore accounts where too, as in the case of Cochin, the expenditure due to the Viceregal visit is included under Miscellaneous Political Expenditure. It must however be acknowledged that the Travancore report gives us a correct idea as to the State expenditure on this account, which came to Rs. 3.34 lakhs. Even so, it would, we think, be better to show such expenses under a separate head in stead of their being included under miscellaneous. Both their purpose and amount are surely dignified enough to deserve a separate heading.

* * *

IN educational matters the State, as is well-known, occupies a front rank. During the year under report the number of educational institutions grew less by 61, thanks to the State's policy of closing down inefficient schools. This has however not told adversely upon the number of pupils studying in them. As a matter of fact, despite the smaller number of schools, the strength of pupils went up by nearly 22,000, which is a matter for satisfaction. It may be noted that nearly 10,000 of these were girl pupils. It is gratifying to learn that the education of the depressed classes is receiving the special attention of the State authorities. The total number of pupils belonging to these classes was 25,273, nearly 8,000 of them being girls. Private schools making special efforts to attract depressed classes students are given special grants—a feature which, if widely copied, would go far to promote the spread of education among these suppressed classes.

* * *

White Labour Policy in South Africa.

THE enforcement of the white labour policy in South Africa has added greatly to the difficulties from which our countrymen there are suffering by increasing unemployment among them. About ten years ago the number of Indians employed on the railways was 1,800 which has now dwindled to about 500. In other Government departments too the number of Indians employed is likewise fast declining. It was 955 in 1925 but only about 200 in 1933! Nor is the tale less sad in the case of municipalities which, in pursuance of the white labour policy, are being openly urged by responsible Government officials to substitute Indian by European labour. The effect is to be seen in the dismissal by the Durban municipality four years ago of nearly 50 of its Indian employees, whose places must apparently have been filled by Europeans. Further in giving out contracts for Government buildings, it is made a condition that all the labour employed must be white, which automatically shuts the door against Indian employment. The pursuit of such a rigorous official policy has not been without its effect on private employment too. The South African Indian Congress mentions an instance of a private match factory in Durban, which in 1924 employed as many as 400 Indians, having reduced the number by 300 in a period of seven years.

* * *

THE situation being so serious, the South African Indian Congress recently organised a deputation to the Minister of Commerce and Labour in order to

represent to him the injustice and inequity involved to the Indian community by the pursuit of the white labour policy. The principle of equal pay for equal work which had secured the adherence of the Union Government under the Cape Town agreement, had been accepted by the Indian community in the belief that equal opportunities would not be denied to it. As a matter of fact, the acceptance of that principle by the Union Government in the absence of such opportunities would be nothing short of farcical. If Indians are to be systematically thrown out of employment, it will not be very long before the last Indian is squeezed out. And then it may legitimately be asked, of what practical good is the enunciation of such an unexceptionable principle as equal pay for equal work to them?

* * *

THE Congress maintains that the white labour

policy is in conflict with the ideal set forth in the Cape Town agreement, viz. that of maintenance of western standards of life and to the spirit of the "upliftment clause" contained in it. It therefore asked that though the white labour policy has inflicted much hardship on Indians, "in fairness to Indians themselves Indian workers be employed in increased measure in Government Departments as has been done hitherto, and in the pursuance of any civilised labour policy Indians be given a fair share of employment. Moreover any direction which influenced pressure being brought to bear upon private enterprise in the employment of Indians should be withdrawn. This, in our view, would be in accordance with the declaration made that the so-called white labour policy does not affect the employment of Indians."

YOUR FETTERS WILL FALL OF THEMSELVES.

THE President of the National Congress would have done better if he had left out the Indian States from his itinerary. He and other Congress leaders are already being plagued—not by the States' people but by British Indians themselves—on the States' question. They are saying: "We enlist these poor States' people in our army of freedom and send them to the battle-front. This would be all right if the battle-front extended to the States as well as British India, and we fought their battles and they ours. But it is not so. They are asked to fight for our freedom, but when it comes to our fighting for their freedom we hang back. This is unjust. Let us declare here and now that, if all the oppressed peoples of the world are not one, at least all the oppressed people of India are. Let us be communists so far. Freedom's battle in India is the same all over, to be joined in indiscriminately by British Indians and the States' people. We have already recognised this principle but choose to follow it one-sidedly. We receive help, but do not give it. This will not do. If we receive help, we must give it too. Let us say in the name of fair dealing that freedom of the States' people is our concern just as much as that of British Indians. We have entailed sufferings on others; now let us suffer a bit for them. We had no prickings of conscience when we sent the States' people to the gaol's door and exposed them to lathi charges. Why should we call the hair-splitting lawyers to our aid when it is our turn to go to gaol and encounter lathi charges for the States' people? These people have meted out to us a full measure of co-operation; we cannot mete out to them a shorter measure, for any reason whatever. As it is, those who need help most sorely have been urged to give it, and those who can give help have withheld it. This topsy-turveydom must come to an end at once."

British Indians were already saying this to the Congress leaders purely out of a sense of chivalry and out of a desire to give a fair deal to the States' people. But now Babu Rajendra Prasad in his Presidential tour visited some States and met leading Congressmen in them face to face, showing by this very act that the Congress drew no nice dis-

tinctions of jurisdiction between British India and Indian India, but that for this national body all India was one and indivisible. The question raised in British India about the British Indians' duty towards the States' people was naturally certain to take an even more acute form in the States. In clumsy hands it might even have taken a more unpleasant turn. But in Mysore State, where Rajen Babu happened to go, the unpleasantness was happily avoided, thanks to the urbanity and suavity of the Congressmen there. They made no reference at all to the very substantial help which the Congress had derived from the States' people as a whole in its satyagrah movements in British India. They did not ask for help, as others might crudely have done, as repayment of a debt outstanding. They rather did so on the ground of an identity of interests between British Indians and the States' people. Nor did they ask for any actual help immediately. They only asked for a clear repudiation of the very convenient plea, set up by men holding positions of authority in the Congress hierarchy, that the States were to the Congress foreign territory where any active political work was concerned, and they asked for a pledge that such political work would receive active support from British Indian Congressmen when suitable opportunities would offer. It was a modest request modestly made, but still it caused embarrassment to the Congress President. The embarrassment is in the Congress position itself. It can only be avoided if the Congress constitution is changed once again and the States' people are ejected out of its fold.

Moral sympathy Rajen Babu gave in plenty to the States' people. Active participation in their struggle for freedom he could not promise even in more favourable conditions. "You are quite right," he said in effect, "to think that freedom's battle in India is one, and must be fought by British Indians and the States' people together. I very much appreciate the splendid help you gave to the Congress in its satyagraha campaigns. Strict justice would seem to require our giving help in return to you. But there can be no giving and returning when we are all one. We concentrate the fight in British India.

only because British India offers the most strategic position. You must leave it to the general to choose his field of battle. We cannot have a little war in every province because every province has contributed to the army. The enemy is in British India. Let us give him battle there. He is just as much your enemy as ours. When the grand finale of British Indian freedom is reached, that very act will have won your freedom. Once we succeed in breaking our fetters, your fetters will fall of themselves. Nothing need be done in your territory. Leave it alone and come along into British India. Strike a blow there as soon as the Congress gives the signal, and you will find that if the blow is at all effective the Princes will go down as a result of it just the same as the British rulers. You are therefore fighting your own battle when you join us in our satyagraha. Do not enter upon the fight in a bargaining spirit, but remember that your interests and ours are common. If we appear to carry on the fight on one front to the exclusion of others, it is only because that promises the best results."

Rajen Babu of course did not actually say all this. He from politeness left a good deal of this to be inferred just as the people in Mysore State from a sense of the graceful had left a large part of their case to be inferred. But the exchange of views was to be interpreted in this way. Babu Rajendra Prasad's audience however did not seem too pleased with the reply they received and could not be expected to. Granting for the sake of argument that when British Indians obtain their freedom the States' people will automatically obtain theirs, without any further exertion on anybody's part, this may possibly hold good when the final blow in freedom's cause is struck. But what of the innumerable intervening stages through which the Indian people have to pass? When salt satyagraha for instance was embarked upon, no one thought that if it proved successful all the last vestige of British rule would disappear from India. It was only, even in the Congress eyes, one of the many small things which might help forward to a certain extent India's emancipation. But even in this preparatory stage British India took the help of the States' people. Similarly in the States also a good deal of agitation has to be carried on before the people in them can win constitutional liberty. If the States' people are to be expected to co-operate in the

preliminary stages of the fight in British India, why should not British Indians respond by active participation in the preliminary stages of the fight in the States? The States' people have every right to say: "Let the ground be prepared everywhere; we shall have to do a lot before our preparations are complete; and then let the final engagement take place where it may. But in the preparatory stages you can't leave us to our own devices while taking active help from us."

One may take the example of the Village Industries Revival movement on which Mahatma Gandhi has started. Is it not true that village industries will revive, and can only revive, when we get self-government? It is far more true to say this than that when British Indians secure freedom the States' people will automatically do so. Yet Rajen Babu does not say to the Mahatma: "Leave village industries alone for the present. The best way to solve the problem is to obtain political freedom. Therefore give up that bauble and come into politics once more. Political freedom attained, village industries will resuscitate almost necessarily. In its absence, they are bound to languish. You have thus got hold of the wrong end of the stick". It would be just as reasonable for Rajen Babu to say this to the Mahatma as to say to the States' people: "You don't know really the source of your trouble. It does not lie in the States, but in British India. You are thus helping yourselves when you help us in British India. You need do nothing in the States." Probably Rajen Babu, when pressed, will admit that the States' people must carry on an agitation in the States even while they go into British India and assist British Indians in their satyagraha movement. But if he admits that work in the States themselves is necessary, does not this admission necessarily lead to the further admission that in this preliminary work the States' people are entitled to receive help from British India as they were asked to give help in the preliminary work of British Indians? It was just as well that the Congressmen in Mysore who met Rajen Babu did not put the question so sharply, but the question at bottom is nothing less than this, and the Congress will continue to be in a dilemma unless either British Indian Congressmen bear their part in the States' people's struggles or cease to involve them in their own struggles.

SPARKS FROM THE COMMONS' ANVIL.

29th and 30th April.

IMMUNITY FROM PROSECUTIONS.

THE House of Commons resumed consideration of the India Bill in Committee, after the Easter recess, on 29th April, when the first matter to be brought forward for consideration was a new Clause, moved by the Solicitor-General, providing that no Bill could be moved in the Indian legislature without the previous sanction of the Governor-General acting in his discretion which sought to reduce the

protection given to public servants under Section 197 of the Cr. P. C. or Sections 80-82 of the C. P. C. The Clause was attacked on two grounds. The first ground was that public servants should not be immune from criminal proceedings in India as they are not immune, for example, in England. Mr. Linton Thorp argued that if a public servant in England did a criminal act, he was liable to prosecution just like any other private person; that he

enjoyed no special privileges at all; and that there was no reason at all therefore why in India they should follow a different procedure and shield public servants. Mr. Thorp said:

A person might have a legitimate cause to institute a criminal prosecution against an official who had done something in the course of his official duties which was a criminal act, and if the prevailing authority that had jurisdiction over him chose to protect him, then they could undoubtedly do so by withholding consent. I do not suggest that they would wilfully withhold consent or withhold it unreasonably, but there might be very considerable pressure brought to bear upon them to withhold consent if the act happened to be one which suited the taste for the moment of the political forces in power. I do not think that this is a matter which ought to be lightly parted with by this House.

To this criticism the Solicitor-General had no answer at all, except that the Government were not introducing a new principle, but were merely adapting "an existing safeguard to the new conditions which will be established" after the Act comes into force. He also tried to make out that the protection was meant "in particular for Indian members of the civil service" and led the Committee to believe that for that reason the Clause had or would have the support of the Indian public. The fact of the matter, however, is that Indians have not been consulted on the question at all and, if consulted, would certainly knock off this protection. If the Government carry Indian opinion with them on this matter, why do they not leave it to the decision of the Indian legislature? Why do they impose a restriction upon its will?

The other ground of attack was in the contrary direction. Mr. Herbert Williams contended that a Bill taking away the protection now enjoyed by Indian public servants should not be entertained at all by the Indian legislature, even after receiving the previous sanction of the Governor-General or Governor, but such a change, if to be introduced, should be introduced by Parliament alone. It is true, he argued, that the Governor-General or the Governor, in giving or withholding his sanction, is to act in his discretion; that is, he decides "of his own free will, without his Ministers having the right to tender advice."

Nevertheless (he said) that will not prevent Ministers from bringing pressure to bear upon the Governor-General or the Governor, and I can see the possibility of a long period of propaganda being directed against the Governor-General or Governor with regard to an issue of this kind, so that ultimately a weak Governor-General or Governor—and we must from time to time anticipate the possibility of either in the future—might give in to this pressure and consent to a Bill being introduced. Having regard to all the declarations that have been made in this country about the protection to be afforded to civil servants in India, and having regard to the obvious grave fears of the civil servants in India, it seems to me that no legislation affecting this protection ought to be introduced except in a Bill of this Parliament. In other words, this seems to be a matter in respect of which we should not let go control, but should retain it in our own hands.

The Solicitor-General in his reply said that there was no reason to fear any undue pressure on the part of the Ministers.

Though there might be reason to anticipate pressure of certain kinds, I do not think that there is any reason to anticipate pressure by Ministers on the Government to remove perfectly proper protection from the officials who will be carrying out the orders of the Ministers themselves. Ministers are in charge of their various departments and the civil servants are carrying out their duties under the Ministers; therefore, it is hardly likely that Ministers will act in the way suggested and try to get this protection removed.

If the Ministers can be trusted so far, why cannot they be trusted to such an extent as to make the previous sanction of the Governor-General or the Governor unnecessary? And, it must be remembered, the Bill provides that the Ministers be entirely left out when the Governor-General or the Governor considers this matter.

CORPORATION TAX IN THE STATES.

A CLAUSE was moved by the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Mr. Davidson, to give effect to the two conditions which, he said, "it was always assumed would be made by the States in regard to the inclusion of a corporation tax in the Federal Budget." The two conditions were (1) that such a tax would not be levied in any State within the first ten years after the commencement of the federation, and (2) that if any State objected to the tax, it should be open to it to pay the equivalent of the proceeds of the tax to the federal Government. The Clause was opposed with great vehemence by the die-hard members of the Conservative party. Lord Wolmer visualised the working of the Clause as follows:

The federal Government will propose a corporation tax which will be debated in the federal Assemblies. The representatives of any State will have every opportunity to speak against it, to vote against it, to lobby against it, and to use all the influence they can, publicly and privately, against the proposal being carried into law. The representatives of that State may be defeated in both Chambers at every turn, but after this law has passed, through all the constitutional stages, it is, under this new proposal, to be open to the ruler of the State to take this unprecedented action."

It is a most extraordinary proposal (he said), and it appears to me to set a most important precedent. I should like to see this precedent applied to our English Parliament. We might have an Act saying that there shall be no increase of super-tax for the next 10 years, and that if any increase is proposed after 10 years' time, any Member of Parliament may elect to pay, not super-tax but some other tax instead. Can my right hon. Friend point to a single precedent in any Constitution in the world for a provision of this sort, where one member of a Federation is entitled to say that he does not propose to pay such and such a tax, even though it has been imposed by the Federal Parliament.

The objection to such a provision enabling a State to hand over to the federation the estimated yield of the corporation tax within its borders out of its other revenues is not merely that it would run counter to precedents—an objection of which the British Government makes very light—but that it would result in placing the industries of British India at a serious disadvantage in competition with the industries in the States, the former being subject to a tax from which the latter may secure immunity. On the point of the unprecedented character of the provi-

sion Mr. Davidson merely said: "There is no precedent, and anyone who sat on the Joint Select Committee or the other bodies which have investigated this problem would not look for any precedent from foreign constitutions in connection with this new constitution for India." Everything about India, he meant, is unprecedented; this would be only one more novel feature in an entirely novel constitution. He is right too. Why worry about this trifle when almost everything of far greater import in the constitution is without a precedent?

But Mr. Wise emphasised this objection and also the other in a closely reasoned speech as follows:

In this Clause there seems to be an extraordinary departure from any known principle of federal government. This is a remarkable provision unduly limiting the powers of the Federal Government. I do not think that under the constitution of any existing Federation a tax can be levied by a Federal Government on some of the component parts of the Federation but not on certain other component parts. I do not think, for example, that it would be possible for the Commonwealth of Australia to levy a tax and specifically exempt from that tax, say, Tasmania and South Australia. But if we go further into the possible results of this procedure we see that its effect will be to drive industry from British India into the native States. This corporation tax is, definitely, a tax on industry and if it can be established, as we presumably are establishing it now, that industries will be subject to extra taxation in British India to which they would not be subject if they were operating in native States, there must inevitably be a tendency for industry to leave British India and migrate to areas where it will be less heavily taxed.

The second part of the new Clause provides that even after the 10 year period an industry in a native State may still be exempt from the tax which is levied on it in British India. A ruler has only to find some alternative system of raising the money. He can, let us say, squeeze a little more out of the ryot. It has been done before in the native States. In one way or another he can avoid this particular tax on industry and I should say it is extremely possible that a ruler who wanted to see industrial development in his State would not, whatever happened, allow this tax to be levied in his State. Therefore, I suggest that the proposal is unfair to industry in British India, and I hope that the Government will seriously consider that point. Those who speak on the same side as I do on these questions cannot be accused of any undue affection for the Indian manufacturer. Some of us regard him as the source of three-fourths of our trouble. But, at least, I think he is entitled to the same consideration as the potential manufacturer in a native State. It is true that this Clause may go a long way towards conciliating some of the opposition which the Princes apparently have shown in the past towards the Federal Clauses of the Bill. It meets, I think, one of the objections which they have raised, but I suggest that the objection which it is meeting is not one which we ought to consider or to tolerate and that they are claiming something to which they have no right and to which no other component part of a Federation anywhere else in the world has any claim. I trust that this matter will be given the most serious consideration, and that between now and the Report stage something will be done to balance conditions more evenly in this respect between British India and the native States.

Mr. Davidson's only answer to this was: "If the existing conditions have not led to great alterations in the States, is it likely or reasonable to expect that any tremendous movement (of industries from Bri-

tish India into the States) will take place which is not taking place at the present time?" Viscount Wolmer, however, immediately took him up for this much too casual and easy-going defence. He said:

My right hon. Friend cannot get away with the arguments as easily as that. We are setting up a constitution which is, presumably, intended by the Government to last a certain amount of time. The whole industrial movement in India is a very short-lived one; it has only just started; and if the Indian Nationalist movement has its way, as undoubtedly it will, the industrial movement in India will be a big and long drawn-out affair. We are here setting channels into which the industries of India will have to fit themselves, and to a certain extent digging the channels into which they will flow. The point made by my hon. Friend the Member for Smethwick (Mr. Wise) is a sound one. I would remind hon. Members representing the Labour Party—I am sorry that on a matter of this industrial importance there are only two present—that the States may have a very much lower standard of factory legislation than the rest of India. This Clause will enable a State not to have the corporation tax, but to levy a tax in some other way which, as the hon. Member for Smethwick pointed out, may be oppressive to the ryot. It may take the burden off the shoulders of the wealthy capitalist and put it on the poor under-dog. There may be an inducement in this new Clause to give industries set up in a State an unfair advantage over industries in British India or in other States. That, of course, is in addition to the gross inequity of putting a provision of this sort in a constitution, and my right hon. Friend has not in the least got rid of the argument that a proposal of this sort cannot work equitably.

Further he observed:

It passes my comprehension how they think that an arrangement like this can last and be accepted by public opinion on India and by representatives of British India. It is one of those concessions which have been made on the backstairs or at a round table conference—I do not care what article of furniture my right hon. Friend has chosen to assist him in his negotiations. A proposal of this sort is incapable of standing the test of impartial examination in framing a constitution. It has not been put in as a workable or an equitable proposal. It has been put in as a bargaining counter in order to get a certain section of the Princes to come in. I do not know whether my right hon. Friend can tell the Committee which States he hopes this Clause will square, but, to my mind, it is only another example of erecting a constitution which you call a Federation, but which is not really a Federation at all. It lacks many of the essential characteristics of a Federation, and must produce a state of affairs which I cannot believe public opinion in India will regard for long as equitable.

It may be urged that, if no federation is formed and the States are left in isolation, there would be no control over labour legislation and no control over industrial taxation, but that would only prove that the Indian federation afforded no help whatever in bringing about a uniformity of legislation and administration in matters of national significance, to secure which a federation is usually brought about. On this point Lord Wolmer said:

(This shows that) we are not in a position to form a Federation at the present moment, because we have not the constituents out of which a real Federation can be formed. I would much rather wait a generation until we have the constituents out of which we can form a real Federation than make myself responsible for a make-believe sham which is going to perpetuate a great many scandals under the aegis and the authority of this Parliament.

It is hardly necessary to say that the Clause was carried.

TRANSITIONAL PERIOD.

THE Bill provides in Part III for the transitional period required for the federal part of the new constitution to come into full effect. In addition to this the Bill as originally drafted contained two Clauses—Clauses 287 and 288—intended to remove certain difficulties which could now be foreseen. But it is held that there may be other difficulties not now foreseeable, and to remove which the Government must take power of a general character under the Bill. In order to do this a new Clause has been added to the Bill which provides in general terms that for a limited period His Majesty may by Order in Council take such steps as he considers necessary for the purpose of facilitating the bringing into operation of the federal provisions of the Act. The diehard members asked what would be the kind of transitional period that the Government envisaged. If it was a long period—say, ten or twenty years—the Clause would obviously be a source of great danger, for the new constitution, would in effect be a plan to govern India by Order in Council for a long time. "It appears to me," said Sir Alfred Knox, "you can do (under the Clause) anything either in the air, on the earth or under the earth. It really is not the very slight and unimportant Clause which the learned Attorney-General has made us believe." Or is there going to be, he asked, a short interval, say, of three months? In which case the Clause would be reasonable. The Attorney-General replied that the interval "might well be 12 months or some period of that kind." And he further said, "If there is any anxiety on the part of the Committee on this point, I shall be perfectly prepared to consider whether 12 months, or at the outside two years, as limiting the periods of these Orders in Council could not be put into the Bill, so as to make it quite plain that there shall be no attempt by the Minister to govern India by Order in Council."

RESERVATION OF C. I. D.

SIR REGINALD CRADDOCK moved a new Clause proposing in effect the reservation of the Provincial C. I. D. The Clause ran as follows: "The functions of the Governor in relation to the Provincial Intelligence Bureau and all matters connected therewith shall be exercised by him in his discretion under the general superintendence and control of the Governor-General exercised by him in his discretion." The Under-Secretary of State, Mr. Butler, opposed it on the ground that there is no such department in the Provinces at all; "some have a special branch (with regard to secret intelligence), some have a portion of the C. I. D. set off apart to control intelligence, others have rather looser arrangements," and that in any case "it is impossible to isolate the department in a water-tight compartment." But the main ground of attack was that the Government have provided in the Bill a more effective means of combating terrorism than the reservation of

a particular branch of police can be. The means is that of giving special powers to the Governor, including the power of taking over in his hands any department that he considers necessary. "Instead of merely saying," Mr. Butler explained, "that he can isolate the special branch, we have said that in cases of necessity the Governor can take over such departments of government as he may deem necessary to combat terrorism or crimes intended to overthrow the Government." "I think," he added, "that these (special powers), combined with the general provision that the Governor-General will be able to communicate with the Governor, obtain information from him and give him instructions, are therefore satisfactory for the purposes we have in view." This is only about the Provincial Bureau; as for the Central Intelligence Bureau, "it would be reserved in the discretion of the Governor-General and would almost certainly be attached to the Department of Defence."

PENAL TARIFFS.

A NEW Clause was then moved by Mr. Thorp substituting for the existing Tariff Board in India another whose members were to be appointed, not by the Governor-General as head of the Indian Government as at present, but "by the Governor-General in his discretion after consultation with the Secretary of State." Under this clause the Governor-General was to be under a statutory obligation to submit to this new Tariff Board all proposals varying the existing rates of import or export duty, and he would be under an obligation further to transmit the Board's report to the Secretary of State who would be under an obligation to lay it before Parliament if any proposal was found by the Board to result in decrease in revenue, that is if, in the Board's opinion, the proposal was calculated to have a protective effect.

The obvious criticism suggested by the Clause was that it would go clean against the Fiscal Autonomy Convention. But we all know already that practically an end has been put to the convention by the fact that before a proposal is submitted to the Indian Legislature, the Government of India refers it to the Secretary of State who then gives his own view of the question, and the Government of India is thereafter obliged to adopt that view as its own. There is thus no opportunity for the Indian view to prevail even when it really coincides with that of the Government of India, for before the Indian view is expressed in the Assembly, the Government of India may have already abandoned it as a result of the Secretary of State's instructions or representations. The Duchess of Atholl referred to the debates in the Legislative Assembly in 1930-31, in which it became clear that previous correspondence had taken place between the Government of India and the Secretary of State. It is obvious that in such correspondence the Secretary of State has ample opportunities of influencing and indeed coercing the Government of India's opinion. The Duchess of Atholl also quoted from the Simon Commission's

report, which indicated limitations on the operation of the Fiscal Autonomy Convention. These limitations the Government admits will continue to be in force. For the Attorney-General observed: "It was always intended, as the Noble Lady the Member for Perth and Kinross (Duchess of Atholl) pointed out, that in certain circumstances there should be power to prevent full freedom of fiscal policy, that is to say, if some measure agreed upon between the Governor-General and the Legislative Assembly cut across some international system or some imperial interest." As to the correspondence between the Secretary of State and the Government of India, Mr. Butler said: "It is well-known that there are perpetual exchanges of view between the Government at home and the Government of India. It must be clear to everybody that if we have a Government in India and a Government in England they will exchange views, and that it is the duty of the Secretary of State to represent his point of view to India, but that does not mean that it is the policy of the Government to go behind the spirit of the Fiscal Autonomy Convention." If the Secretary of State can and does press his view on the Government of India, which is under his control, we all know that it means a virtual setting aside of the Convention.

The Clause in its original rigidity was supported by hardly anyone, but a variant of it was that whenever duties proposed to be levied were suspected to be penal against the United Kingdom either in intention or effect, the proposal should be submitted to a Tariff Board contemplated in the Clause and that an appeal be allowed from the Board to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. On this the Government's answer was that the provision in the Bill for the Governor-General's intervention in case of penal tariffs would be far more effective than to submit the question either to the Tariff Board or to the Privy Council or the Federal Court. Lord Eustace Percy said, in defending the provision in the Bill,

Let me point out to the hon. Member that the recommendation of the Joint Select Committee that the Governor-General should have a special responsibility for deciding in his discretion whether the intention of a particular proposal was political or economic, is the whole essence of what the Governor-General will have to decide in deciding whether a proposal is penal. That is a proposition which a man of common sense, in close touch with the political situation, can always decide. It is like the question whether a man is a gentleman or not, a thing which is not provable in a court of law but is perfectly well-known to everyone. But to whom are you to submit this question of whether a duty is penal or not? My hon. Friend suggests that it could be submitted to the Federal Court. How are you to prove before a court that the motive of a proposed duty is penal? The only thing you could do would be to submit the question, not to a court of lawyers but to a court of economists, to decide whether there was any economic reason for the proposed duty, and if there was no economic reason you would say that it was merely political. . . . The result of asking any tribunal, whether of economists or lawyers, to decide whether there was or was not any economic argument in favour of a proposed duty, would always be to find that it was possible to adduce economic arguments in favour of that particular duty. I never heard of a duty proposed by the most log-rolling Congress politician in America,

for which apparently weighty economic arguments, though quite fallacious economic arguments, could not be adduced.

So Lord Eustace Percy's advice to die-hards was: "Don't risk a reference to the Tariff Board, even such as you desire. In a fit of impartiality they may find an economic reason for a duty which you consider penal. It is much better to trust the Governor-General's discretion. He is in a position of advantage as he need not adduce any reason. He can just say that the duty is penal and be done with it. He will give you better service than any Board."

The Attorney-General too advised the die-hards not to ask for an impartial Tariff Board, but frankly for a machinery which would confer the hoped-for advantages upon the languishing trade of Lancashire. Give up all talk of fairness and then perhaps you can justify your attitude, the Attorney-General said in effect to the die-hards. The latter based their claim for preference also on Great Britain's partnership with India. Sir William Wayland stressed this point in his speech:

I certainly consider that as we have given so much to India it is not unfair to ask India to give us something in return, and that something should not be less than a 50 per cent. preference in any tariff which India may raise. India must have tariffs for revenue purposes, but if we had a 50 per cent. preference it would not interfere with the total revenue which India would obtain because we should export more goods to India and therefore more revenue would be raised. In my opinion, we made a great mistake during the last 70 years. When we gave self-government to the Dominions we could have made a business bargain with them, and I believe they would have been prepared to have accepted Dominion Status and given the goods of this country a big preference.

It is indeed a pity that when self-government was conferred upon other colonies this principle of partnership was not made full use of. For the present India's partnership with England is like, as Major Attlee said, the partnership "between an admiral and a stoker, in which the admiral gives the orders and the stoker does the work."

SPECIAL ADVISERS FOR THE GOVERNOR.

A GAP discovered in the system of safeguards was proposed to be filled up by a new Clause moved by Sir Reginald Craddock empowering the Governors of Provinces to appoint three officers each to assist them in matters involving the use of their safeguard powers. Sir Reginald argued that in the Government of India there were Councillors not responsible to the Legislature who would be in a position to give the Governor-General advice in matters connected with the discharge of his special responsibilities. In the Provinces, however, there were to be no such members in the Cabinet, and there would thus be no one who could give them the necessary advice and assistance. He therefore pleaded for the appointment, as it were, of extra official members to the Provincial Cabinets, in addition to non-official responsible Ministers. Sir Edward Grigg appreciated the difficult position of the Governors under the new regime, for he thought that

"the provincial part of the Bill was going to be harder to work than the federal part," presumably because there was not in the Provinces a thoroughly dependable bloc like that of the Princes in the federation, and admitted that some special arrangement was necessary. But he could not stomach Sir Reginald's proposal for "creating advisers of Ministerial rank or even superior in some respects to Ministers, with no definite responsibilities of their own except of offering advice to the Governor." Such an adviser would be, he said, "a kind of the mayor of the palace." Mr. Butler too said: "It would be impossible, ... if one had three or four such Ministers, to have side by side with them three or four official watchdogs of the Governor all watching what the Ministers did." This would be going back, in effect, to the Simon Commission's recommendation in favour of an official member of the Cabinet. Major Attlee went further. He said, the real object of Sir Reginald Craddock in moving the clause is "to get back to the old pre-reform days."

Mr. Butler however was prepared to meet Sir Reginald half way. The Governor of a Presidency ought to have, and the Governor of a Province which is not a Presidency might have, by his side—in addition to a Private Secretary "to conduct social affairs"—a Secretary, a man of 20 or 25 years' service, perhaps of the rank of a Commissioner who could help him in matters involving the exercise of the Governor's discretion. He should also have assistant secretaries on his staff, the salaries of both the Secretary and the assistant secretaries being non-votable. The Governor-General too, although he has his official Councillors, will have a personal secretarial staff like the one proposed for the Governors. The diehards in fact got more than they had bargained for.

LIMITING THE SCOPE OF SAFEGUARDS!

FOR a wonder there was a proposal made in Committee not for extending but for limiting the scope of the safeguards against commercial discrimination. The proposal was that if the Governor-General felt that the interests of good government in India required a limitation of the safeguards, he might communicate this view to the Secretary of State, and if the Secretary of the State also held the same view he might advise His Majesty suitably to limit the operation of the safeguards by Order in Council. The object of the Clause was to introduce some amount of flexibility or elasticity in an otherwise cast-iron constitution. Diehard members of Parliament were alarmed at the threatened relaxation of the safeguards, but the member who moved the new Clause, Mr. Molson, made it clear that limitation of the safeguards was being proposed only because a limitation would in certain circumstances be in the interests of the British merchants themselves. He said:

It is not inconceivable that what would be interpreted by the courts as being discriminatory against Europeans would really be in the interests of the European community, but because these safeguards were absolutely rigid and were being interpreted by the courts it would be possible for a single disgruntled and unreason-

able man to impugn in the courts the validity of legislation of this kind, and it would then be impossible for that legislation to be brought into effect in India without an Act of the Imperial Parliament.

It is to prevent such a calamity happening to the British community that Mr. Molson was good enough to put forward a proposal making it possible to lessen the safeguards!

WESTERN EDUCATION.

A GENERAL discussion on the value of western education to orientals took place on a new Clause moved by Mr. Godfrey Nicholson. Major Ormsby-Gore, First Commissioner of Works, speaking on the Clause on behalf of Government, let himself go in his speech against western education and in favour of indigenous or national education. He said harsh things about Macaulay who, according to him, held that "the whole object of education should be to impose western ideas and methods of education upon the Indian people." But latterly, he rejoiced to think, "there has been an element of re-nationalisation in Indian education", and that an effort is being made "to prevent the denationalisation of education, to preserve the vernaculars, to use the mother tongue of the children as the main medium of instruction everywhere, and to introduce European subjects after the traditions of the life and environment of the child have formed the basis of education." This would have met with a measure of support, but his last sentence spoilt the whole effect. "I cannot help thinking," he said, "that if that had been the policy in India, India would not present us with such political, administrative, and, above all, with such sad problems and difficulties as we have to face in the minds and hearts and very souls of some of the people."

Mr. Isaac Foot reproved him severely for attacking Macaulay. He said:

I feel myself in general agreement with the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works but I wish he would get away from Macaulay. I thought his reference to Macaulay, in the Second Reading Debate, was one which would not be approved of in India. Probably there would be much stronger approval of Macaulay in India than the right hon. Gentleman is prepared to give. Macaulay's famous note is one of the most remarkable contributions that has been made to the study of Indian history. It was based on considerable study and was not a decision arrived at casually. Although the right hon. Gentleman spoke of being saved from political difficulties, there we had the Tory speaking rather than the educationist. Macaulay thought that the teaching of our Western ideas and our Western literature would inspire the love of liberty. He said in this House that if we gave Indians education the time might come when as a result of it they would demand Western institutions, and, if they did so, it would be the proudest day in our history. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman, in referring to the political difficulties upon which we have entered, wished that the Indian people had never made that demand.

While I thank the right hon. Gentleman for the statement he made just now, I hope he will not refer to Macaulay again or, if he does, that he will pay the tribute which ought to be paid to a man who, perhaps next to Burke, would be recognised in India to-day as a sort of intellectual bridge between India and ourselves. If the educated Indian has that regard for Macaulay, I do not think that this House is the place where Macaulay ought to be disparaged.

THE FRANCO-RUSSIAN PACT.

ON the evening of the 2nd inst. at the Quai d'Orsay the Franco-Russian Pact has at last been signed by M. Laval and M. Potemkine, after a span of prolonged negotiations. To international opinion, it will appear as a definite seal of solidarity between the two signatory powers.

According to the information available at present the pact implies :

1. The engagement by the signatories to consult each other immediately in case of aggression, threat or danger of aggression.

2. Precise obligations as regards the applications of articles 15 and 16 of the Covenant.

Article 15 of the Covenant envisages the case when the Council of Geneva, on examining a conflict, should prove unable to come to a unanimous decision, and stipulates that, in such a case, the states would be free to act in the best way they can devise in defence of their respective rights. It is in view of an eventual case of this kind that the Franco-Russian Pact establishes for both parties the obligation of immediate mutual assistance, under certain given conditions.

Article 16 foresees the case of a flagrant aggression, without coming to very definite conclusions on the matter. The Franco-Russian Pact stipulates that, in such a case, mutual assistance will come into play immediately after (but only after) the recommendation of the Council of the League, or also in case this Council should not have formulated any recommendation.

The text of the pact also specifies that its engagements will be valid only as far as conflicts inside Europe are concerned.

Moreover the duty of mutual assistance will exist only if the aggressor is aiming at the territory of one of the signatory powers.

Finally, the fact is underlined that the obligations undertaken can in no manner come into contradiction either with the Covenant, or with other agreements previously signed by the two countries, especially with the Locarno agreements.

The Franco-Russian Pact thus finds its place strictly within the framework of the League of Nations, so that it can neither be taken as a pretext by other countries, such as England, for denouncing previous mutual agreements, nor considered by Germany in any way as a hostile gesture. As *L'Oeuvre* very appositely expresses it : "A door has been opened yesterday between France and Russia. But no door has been closed on the face of anybody—except war". And in fact the Franco-Russian Pact has received on the whole a good welcome, at Geneva, as well as in the foreign press. Even Berlin remarks that "Locarno is safe, which is essential to Germany". The Little Entente proclaims that the signatures exchanged yesterday constitute the greatest event in Europe since the signature of the peace treaty after the great war.

In France, however, unfavourable criticisms or at least very sceptical comments are offered by

a number of papers. The *Quotidien* considers that the signature of 2nd May marks the decadence of French politics leading to communism. M. V. d'Ormesson writes in the *Figaro* :

What are all these pacts worth? Will they prove to be real obstacles in the way of those who wish to create trouble?... Nevertheless, the policy of pacts follows as best it can the evolution of life, and is nothing but a reflexion of the preoccupations of the day. A pact is applied to a dangerous point, just as a poultice is applied to some congested region of the body. Disease migrates to some other spot: pacts also. That is why we should not consider as successful results things which are nothing but processes.

Two tendencies are observable again and again in the comments and controversies published in the press. On the one hand, French opinion seems particularly desirous that new agreements should in no way endanger her present concord with Great Britain and Italy, unity of action with these two countries being viewed as an essential guarantee of peace in Europe. On the other hand, great stress is laid on the idea that the pact should remain open so as not to appear as a threat to Germany; at most could it be taken as a warning, coupled with an open invitation to collaborate in the great task of establishing international peace and security.

M. Harmel in the *Peuple* regrets that the pact should be merely bi-lateral, and hopes to see other nations entering it.

The most important point, (says he), is that the present pact fits into the pact of the League of Nations. It is not aiming against anybody. It leaves the door open to a wider Eastern Pact. It is not another military alliance such as the old Franco-Russian alliance. Yet its novel character has to be developed and rendered more precise. This can be done by strengthening the Pact of the League of Nations.

A pertinent mixture of appreciation and criticism is offered by M. Pierre Dominique in the *Republique* :

As a matter of fact, the eventuality envisaged in the Franco-Russian Pact—namely direct aggression on France or U. S. S. R.—appears at present as rather unlikely. If ever the Reich should rashly step into action, France would probably not be directly attacked: the price of victory is too high on that front. On the other hand... Russia has no common frontier with Germany. To violate the Soviet frontiers, Germany would require either to invade Poland, or to act in agreement with that country. The first solution entails so many risks that Berlin would think twice over it. The second, in spite of the rumours that have been complacently put about, is very little in keeping with the ardent desire of Poland not to be led by anybody into a battle-field.

It is therefore most likely that the pact so minutely elaborated by French and Sovietic diplomacy will never be made use of. And that is so much the better.

Nevertheless is it devoid of any real significance? On the contrary. But its true significance is not in the dead letter; it lies in the demonstration of Franco-Russian collaboration in the defence of peace... In this resides the historical importance of yesterday's event.

If ever the two Governments thought of using this pact as a support or a screen for military agreements such as those which, in the beginning of this century, drove us to war, the Franco-Russian rapprochement, far from preventing conflicts, would rather

favour them. If, on the contrary, Franco-Russian solidarity come into play firmly and loyally to help in the organisation of peace, to undertake once more the great task of the controlled limitation of armaments, then it can have a decisive influence on the conflicts threatening Europe at present.

The point can be argued that the Franco-Russian Pact does not add much to the League of Nations Pact. Why then should it have been so laboriously and carefully negotiated, and does it really deserve the solemn consideration that is greeting it today? This apparent paradox in the facts simply proves that many famous texts of the League of Nations have come to be considered as merely theoretical and academic. To emphasise them by further pacts means giving them a renewed life and strength, in the light of present events, especially when these new pacts are within the framework of the League.

Practically speaking, the Franco-Russian Pact is a compromise between two contradictory points of view, and its real significance will only be revealed by time, and the further developments of the European situation. Even at present this agreement is attracting special attention because it is viewed in the light of the important international events which have succeeded one another during the last three weeks or so, and the reactions that have ensued: the Stresa and Geneva Conferences following upon the declarations of Germany regarding re-armament, the various diplomatic journeys and consultations, even Mr. MacDonald's articles and declarations in the Commons, etc., as well as the prospect of the coming Danubian Conference in Rome.

According to the growth and reactions of the various factors of international life preponderance will be given either to the French or to the Russian elements that have been somewhat laboriously amalgamated in the pact. This seems to be the view of M. Jeune, in *Paris Midi*, when he writes:

If Germany shows aggressiveness and England hesitation, the pact will become the important diplomatic instrument, which the Little Entente already considers it to be. It will then play the part of a first-rate force. It will, on the contrary, remain in the background as a reserve force, if the political co-operation of England, France and Italy continues to form the basis of peace.

On the whole, M. Laval, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, deserves praise for the way he has steered the ship of state through very stormy waters. As M. Fabre-Luce remarks in *L'Europe Nouvelle*:

Franco-British unity has been consolidated and the London Cabinet has begun to commit itself in continental affairs. A pacific solution of the Saar problem has been arrived at. A double conciliation has been brought about, on the one hand between Great Britain and Russia, on the other hand between Italy and the Little Entente. The rearmament of Germany has been viewed not so much in the light of its opposition to the "Diktat" of Versailles, as by comparison with a plan of limitation of armaments coupled with equality of rights; it is in that spirit that it could be unanimously condemned in Geneva.

The Franco-Russian Pact signed yesterday can thus be considered as a potential reality which will develop more or less extensively, one way or the other, according to the evolution of the present international situation.

Paris, May 3.

L. MORIN.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

London, 3rd May.

INDIA BILL.

PARLIAMENT resumed on Monday last after the Easter holiday and is devoting this week three days of the remaining nine to the Committee stage of the India Bill. It is expected that the Special Committee that laid down the thirty days' programme of the Committee stage will continue its good work for the Report stage, so that that and the third reading may be dealt with by the House by Whitsun holiday, which opens at the end of the first week of June. The best opinion is that the Bill will have gone through the Lords and be placed upon the Statute Book by the end of July or the beginning of August, when Parliament rises for the Summer Vacation. If, however, the more cautious forecasts are verified, it is probable that an early Autumn Session will be called in order to complete the consideration of the Bill and make it law. Every effort will be made to prevent undue delay, in view of the consequential matters that will arise immediately the new Constitution is brought upon the Statute Book. There is another consideration that the Government will have before them in wishing to expedite the Bill. There is bound to be a reconstruction of the Cabinet before long, and it may well be that, with the concentration of public attention upon foreign affairs to the relative exclusion of domestic interests, the reconstituted Cabinet will think it more desirable to make an appeal to the country this Autumn rather than wait until 1936.

Sir Samuel Hoare's illness, which will prevent his return to Parliament for at least another fortnight has imposed an additional burden upon the Under-Secretary. The Attorney-General, the Solicitor-General, Mr. W. Ormsby-Gore and Mr. Davidson, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, who have all acted as the Government spokesmen in the Secretary of State's absence.

INDIAN LEADERSHIP.

Wednesday's *Times* contained a very interesting estimate by the Delhi correspondent of possible developments under the forthcoming constitution and an analysis of leadership or its absence in India. After paying a tribute to Mahatma Gandhi's personality, the correspondent considers that he is always a portentous figure in the background and that he remains there as a victor and not as a discredited leader so far as the Congress Party is concerned. Among the Mohammedans Mr. Jinnah is described as a leader who cannot depend upon his somewhat heterogeneous following, whilst the Aga Khan, who has the makings of a National leader in him, is not to be depended upon for consistency of activity.

Review.

REALITIES (?) OF INDIAN PROBLEM.

INDIA. WHAT NOW? By N. GANGULEE. (Allen and Unwin.) 1933. 21cm. 280p. 7/6.

THE sub-title of this book is 'A Study of the Realities of Indian Problems.' The appositeness of this description may be judged in the light of the following views expressed by the author: Indian opposition to

he Simon Commission was due to the falling off of British investments in India; there was no violent opposition to the recommendations of the Simon Commission from the political minorities; success of the boycott movement was due to the magic influence of Gandhi's personality and not to any convictions on the part of the people; Indian unrest is so weak that Government need have no fears from its onslaught; revolt of Indian youth is against social and not against political restrictions; Liberals support the agitators with a view to making an advantageous bargain with Government.

At first sight one is surprised at the fact that any writer professing to be a student of Indian public life should purvey such a jumble of inaccuracies and half-truths. When, however, it is remembered that this book is addressed principally to the British electors in support of the policy outlined in the Simon Commission's Report this feeling of surprise is replaced by another. How is it possible to get cultured Indians to say that the needs of their country are not political but are economic and social? Has it not been sufficiently proved that for this very social and economic progress to be brought about in a reasonably short time an Indianisation of political control is a necessary preliminary. Mr. Gangulee knows that seven years ago the Agricultural Commission recommended that the rural problem should be tackled as a whole and that the state should play a leading part in this process. What has the Government done to implement this wise suggestion? They have spared a crore of rupees in the last budget for village work. This step has been taken as a counterblast to the Village Industries Organisation of the Mahatma. In an indirect but very real way political pressure alone has evoked this tardy action from Government.

That the people have no interest in politics but only in their social and economic amelioration is a remark that applies to all countries. In fact Lord Bryce came to this very conclusion after an elaborate survey of modern democracies. The unavoidable integration of human life, however, demands that unless a common national will is enthroned in the place of social power no kind of progress, either economic or cultural, is possible. The details of the

constitution such as the position of provinces and states, extent of franchise, powers of the legislature might indeed be discussed from several standpoints. But there is hardly any reality about the views of a writer who does not realise that for social and economic progress of the people themselves it is essential to make them ultimately responsible for the management of their own affairs. Mr. Gangulee "regards it as axiomatic that reparation of all national, social, and economic maladjustments must precede the task of creating a new political edifice in the federal sphere." Surely even the bewildered, but by no means inexperienced, British voter knows better than that. It is a pity that highly cultured and intelligent Indians should do such political pamphleteering in support of reactionary anti-national programmes.

D. G. KARVE.

SHORT NOTICE.

THE TANTRIK DOCTRINE OF IMMACULATE CONCEPTION. By ELIZABETH SHARPE. (Rider.) 1933. 19cm. 87p. 4/6.

EXTRACTS from the Lalita Sahasranama and Bhaskararaya's commentary on it, the Devi sutras attributed to Gaudapada, and the Ananda Stotra of the Kularchana Dipika—all done into English are pressed into service to support the somewhat sensational announcement that the Tantra includes the doctrine of immaculate conception. The author claims that "all meanings given by the writer are those within the range of her own mystical experience;" we may not therefore argue about the mystery only partly unfolded in this booklet. But so far as common human judgment can be applied to such things, there seems to be no evidence whatever for the main thesis of the author. The extracts presented here, like other Tantrik works, are full of sex symbolism, but of immaculate conception, there is in them no trace whatever.

K. A. N.

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.