

Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4.

Vol. XX, No. 15. }

POONA—THURSDAY, APRIL 15, 1937.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ...	157
ARTICLES :—	
The Real Issue. ...	159
Stop the Federation! ...	161
The Jamnadas Blue-Print. ...	163
Coastal Traffic Bills. ...	164
Bombay Industries. By Neelkanth Joshi. ...	165
REVIEWS :—	
Local Self-Government. By Prof. S. V. Ayyar. ..	166
Zoning. R. S. Deshpande, B. E., A. M. I. E. ...	167
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
Suspension of Federation—Demand By The States' People's Conference. ...	168
CORRESPONDENCE :	
The Rani of Jhansi—An Apology. ...	168
BOOKS RECEIVED ...	168

Topics of the Week.

Motor Vehicles Insurance.

THE report of the Committee appointed by the Government of India to consider the question of enforcing compulsory insurance of motor vehicles against passenger and third party risks was published last week. As was generally expected, the Committee has definitely found in favour of insurance being made compulsory for both private and public vehicles. The Committee base their case on the number of road accidents in India, the low standard of care and responsibility on the part of drivers and the difficulty experienced by injured parties in obtaining compensation. In chapter IV the Committee analyse the statistics of motor vehicle accidents in India. One glance at Table A given in this chapter will show how utterly inadequate accident statistics in India are. It may be conceded that the number of fatalities resulting from motor vehicle accidents may be fairly correctly recorded, but the ratio of fatal accidents to non-fatal accidents is so incredibly low in all provinces, with the possible exception of the Bombay Presidency, that it is clear that in all provinces a large number of accidents which do not result in death do not find their way at all to the police records. It should be noted as reflecting on the efficiency of official statistical service in India that some provincial authorities were unable to give figures even of the total number of vehicles running within their area.

THE Committee have done the best they could while examining the question of accidents per

public and private vehicle and the analysis of the causes of accidents. The statistical data for all these questions is, however, so defective that not much can be deduced from the Committee's discussion on these matters. The figure—that of the number of deaths per 10,000 vehicles—on which the Committee rely for proving the large proportion of accidents in India is, however, fairly reliable. It is clear that this proportion is much greater in India than in any other country for which similar statistics are available. Another point which deserves close attention is, as the Committee point out, the large difference in the incidence of accidents as between the various provinces.

EVEN though the causes of accidents or the amount of compensation obtained by injured parties cannot be statistically investigated with any certainty a sound prima facie case can be made out for the Committee's contentions in this behalf. The need for compulsory insurance is also on public evidence fairly clear. We are glad that in considering the question of the cost of insurance the Committee have not gone into the complicated question of the effect of compulsion on taxable capacity. They have contented themselves with pointing out that the cost would not be too onerous but have perhaps not emphasized sufficiently that, whatever the cost, the measure of compulsion is akin to an essential safety measure. With regard to insurance companies the Committee have, in view of the pending insurance legislation, not gone into any detail and contented themselves with recommending that the deposit for motor insurance should be separately required and the accounts of this business shown separately. We specially commend two parts of the Committee's report—one in which they recommend that co-operative insurance societies of bus-owners should be allowed to operate subject to such reasonable conditions as they lay down and the other in which they draw attention to the fundamental issue of road traffic economics and conditions being rendered reasonable by such state regulation as route licensing.

Racialism in the Army.

THE Indian army has two forms of officer reserve. The first is known as the regular reserve and is intended, as in the case of the British army, for pensioned or retired military officers. The other is the Army in India Reserve to which people who do not take to military service as a regular career are admissible. As pointed out by Mr. Tottenham, the Defence Secretary, the officers of these reserves will form a sort of reinforcement for the Indianised army. But the Indian Army Act failed to provide for either class of reserve officer and its amendment recently passed by the Assembly is designed to fill this gap. It is obvious that enlist-

ment in the reserve involves the performance of military service when called up. It equally stands to reason that a reserve officer, when not engaged in such service, need not be subject to military discipline. If the Army Act had not been amended, the reserve officers would have continued under military discipline at all times, whether they were actually serving or not. The effect of the amendment would be to exempt them from military service when they are not called up to the colours.

THE amendment was, however, strenuously opposed by non officials, being carried by 47 votes to 46. Their ground of opposition was the principle of racial discrimination of officers which seemed to them to vitiate the whole scheme of Indianisation from top to bottom. Mr. Satyamurti put the non-official case against the amendment in a nutshell when he said :

Of course I am saying nothing about the merits of the Bill. So long as there are officers, whether they are British or Indian, I want them to be placed on the same footing, so far as liability to military discipline is concerned, and is being confined only to the time when they are called to military duty. That is perfectly all right. What we want is one Act governing all officers, British and Indian, in the Army. . . . If I am right, I submit that this House is now being asked to recognise statutorily, what it has always refused to recognise when it came to a vote of the House on the Army demand, that the British Army Act should govern British officers serving in this country, and we should supplement that legislation by Indian legislation governing only Indian officers.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir said the same thing :

The difference between us (Government and non-officials) is one of wide principle, of having two Acts, one for the British officers of the Indian Army and another for the Indian Commissioned officers of the Indian Army.

Non-Indians on Committees.

MR. RAMDAS PANTULU brought before the Council of State a resolution which sought to taboo the appointment of non-Indians to Committees which the Government of India might appoint. As Mr. Pantulu himself admitted, he was provoked into making this somewhat sweeping proposal by the constitution of the Wedgwood Committee. From its personnel Indians were rigorously excluded. As if this was not enough humiliation, an Englishman from South Africa, which is leaving nothing undone to squeeze Indians out of the Union, was added to it as an expert. If the exclusion of Indians from the Committee's personnel constituted an insult to Indian intelligence, the importation of a Britisher from South Africa of all countries was in the nature of an outrage on Indian self-respect, which evoked universal resentment. To avoid the recurrence of a similar contingency in future the mover wanted the appointment of non-Indians to future committees to be forbidden. The wording of his motion left the door open for the appointment of non-Indians in Indian services, but non-Indians from other countries were to be expressly debarred.

THAT India was unfairly treated in respect of the Wedgwood Committee hardly admitted of doubt. But opinion was not equally unanimous about the wisdom of the solution suggested by the mover. It was felt that to deny ourselves the services of foreign experts when Indian experts of requisite authority were not available would be suicidal to national interests. The idea was also suggested that when expert knowledge was needed Indians themselves might be given the required training. In some quarters the suggestion was ridiculed

as fantastic and would have been laughed out of court if Mr. Kunzru had not tried to rescue it by pointing to similar practice followed in other countries.

THE influence of foreign experts was sought to be counteracted by an amendment providing for the appointment of non-officials in a majority on all committees. This would be an obvious handicap in the case of committees which were called upon to grapple with scientific or technical subjects. How could any value be attached to the opinion of a majority which admittedly knew nothing of the problem in hand? As neither the resolution nor the amendment gave precise expression to the wishes of the Legislature both were rejected. But the lesson of the debate is there for the Government to learn. It is that from no committees should Indians be kept out and that foreign experts should be engaged only when no other course is open.

Rejection of Compulsion in Cochin.

A BILL to provide for free and compulsory primary education framed by a private member has been rejected by the Cochin Legislative Council. It was the bugbear of additional taxation that was responsible for the hostile attitude that non-official members adopted. Not that they were opposed to further taxation for all time, but they wanted this to follow the exploration of all avenues of retrenchment and to be resorted to only in the last resort. It was the over-emphasis laid by the Dewan in his pronouncements at different times on the need for further burdens on the tax-payer that had the effect of turning the majority of non-official members against the bill. If this aspect of the matter had not been so aggressively thrust on public attention, it is possible that the fate of the bill would have been different.

Highhandedness in Dhar.

HOW completely the liberties of the people in Indian States are at the mercy of the State authorities is forcefully illustrated by recent events in Dhar State. The Principal of the local College, by name Mr. Dwivedi, recently brought out a book dealing with the life and work of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. For this heinous crime he was summarily deported from the State! The notice given to him to remove himself from the State must obviously have been too short to enable him to arrange for his family to accompany him. Whatever the cause, they were left behind. The Principal subsequently prayed to be allowed to enter the State for taking away his wife and children. But, strangely enough, his request was turned down with the result that the family and its bread-winner continue to be separated. The A. G. G. is being moved by Mr. Dwivedi to interest himself in the matter. Should the case excite his sympathy and should he be pleased to give suitable advice to the ruler, there is some chance of the restoration of the family to its head. Else the separation may continue.

FROM all accounts the deported head of the College seems to have been uncommonly popular with his students. Naturally the high-handedness of the authorities touched them to the quick, so much so that they openly declared their intention to go on a strike by way of protest. If the authorities could summarily dispose of the principal, were they going to be cowed down by the prospects of a strike of his students? The students are being subjected to all

kinds of harassment by the police, some being administered sound beating. Is it any wonder that less and less should be heard of the contemplated strike day by day? It is good in one way that the Civil Liberties Union confines its attention to British India. If its activities are to be extended to the States, it will have very little time to give to the suppression of civil liberties in British India.

Indianisation of High Courts.

THE claims of larger and speedier Indianisation of the high courts were urged on Government by means of a resolution moved in the Council of State on a recent date. The general complaint was not that the number of Indian judges was either stationary or was not on the increase, but that the increase was annoyingly slow. In 1910 non-European judges formed 26 per cent. of the total number of high court judges. This percentage was officially stated to have gone up to 51 per cent. in the present year. In other words, a rise of 25 per cent. had taken very nearly a whole generation to materialise. Can there be any question that the pace needs to be considerably accelerated if public opinion is at all to be met?

IN this as in other matters the Government will be found to be far behind the demands even of moderate opinion in the country. It was over fifteen years ago that Sir Phiroze Sethna pleaded by means of a

resolution brought before the same body for the proportion of Indian judges being at least 50 per cent. What he asked for in 1922 has come to pass only in 1937! The demand embodied in the present resolution sponsored by Mr. Husain was for the same proportion being increased to at least 66 per cent., which meant an advance of not more than 15 per cent. in the present position. The demand might have struck many as being too modest but failed to be acceptable to Government.

Bombay Ministerial Programme: A Deficiency.

THERE is a noticeable deficiency in the programme of work prepared by the interim Ministry of the Bombay Presidency. The programme makes no mention of the problem of the treatment of political prisoners, which has agitated public opinion for years past. The programme may not be exhaustive, as the public has been assured it is not. But surely the treatment of political prisoners should have been considered important and pressing enough to deserve to be a prominent plank in the Ministerial platform. While most of the reforms which are going to engage the attention of the Ministry cannot be carried out without a large outlay of funds, it is obvious that an improvement in the treatment of political prisoners in jails is a comparatively inexpensive reform. It is strange that the item should have escaped the attention of the Ministry.

THE REAL ISSUE.

THE debate in the Lords has only served to aggravate the political situation and to embitter the Congress. Lord Lothian who raised the debate failed to place the real issue before the Secretary of State. He seemed to think that all that was needed to resolve the deadlock that has arisen was a gesture of sympathy and good-will. He thinks that the constitution is as liberal as it could be in the circumstances; that Congressmen without any further ado should work the constitution in a loyal spirit; that if only they could persuade themselves to do so they would find that a reality of power was placed in their hands; that the crux of the difficulty consisted in persuading them to take this course; and that this difficulty, almost wholly psychological, could be got over if the Marquess of Zetland would utter a soft word or two to assuage the feeling of irritation under which Congressmen were labouring. The solution that he himself had in mind was not any substantial concession to the Congress demand for a broader constitution, but a certain amount of sob-stuff which costs nothing. Lord Zetland, however, did not even utter the soft word which was expected of him. He rubbed in the correctness of the legal position of the Government, cast aspersions on Mahatma Gandhi and asked him to have a talk with the Viceroy only if he was convinced of his having led the Congress into a demand for assurances under a misapprehension of the real constitutional position.

If Lord Lothian proceeded on the basis that no great augmentation of political power was desired by the Congress as a condition precedent to its acceptance of office, prominent Congressmen themselves contributed not a little to this false issue being

raised. Mahatma Gandhi himself in his statement of 30th March had his share in this. For his statement was self-contradictory, asking in one part for the sweeping away of all the special powers of the Governors and in another for the use of these powers in moderation. The passage in his statement which refers to Sir Samuel Hoare's belief that ordinarily no occasion would arise for the exercise of the Governors' reserve powers clearly reduces the demand for an assurance to a superfluity, and we cannot understand why Lord Zetland should have boggled at repeating what the former Secretary of State is supposed to have stated. It was wholly non-committal in character, and the Governors of the various provinces, the Viceroy and Lord Zetland himself said as much in the very act of denying the possibility of an assurance being given. Lord Lothian referred to a suggestion made by the *Tribune* of Lahore, which appeared to him to show a way out. But the suggestion amounts to nothing at all, as we showed last week, and would satisfy nobody. Let the Governors, our contemporary said, undertake not to interfere with the Ministers' constitutional activities, reserving to themselves the power of deciding finally what were constitutional activities. The *Tribune* itself pointed out as the chief merit of its suggestion that when the Governors felt it necessary to bring their special powers into use they would only be required to say that the Ministers' activities in question were not constitutional within the meaning of the terms of the assurance given by them!

This kind of make-believe is entirely worthless. Political difficulties are not solved by evading them by the use of a clumsy device. The statements issued by Congress leaders also partake somewhat of this

character. Mr. Rajagopalachari, e. g., admits that the Governors are under the control of the higher authorities in the matter of the exercise of their discretionary powers. What is the solution that he suggests for overcoming this difficulty, the force of which he recognises? Let the Governor-General and the Secretary of State override the Ministers if they are so inclined, he says, but there must be no over-riding on the part of the Governors, who should always use the discretion allowed to them in favour of the Ministers and leave the unpleasant task of interference to the higher authorities. Apart from the unreasonableness of this demand, how would it help the Congress? What will the Congress gain if it resists interference from A only to submit to interference from B? Let us similarly examine the position of Babu Rajendra Prasad in this matter. He is quite willing to believe that situations will arise in which the Governors will be required by the constitution to use their special powers. And as a solution he suggests that the Governors should on such occasions, instead of interfering with the Ministers, ask them to resign office. Will it, we ask in the name of common sense, make any real difference to the position of Ministers if, instead of themselves tendering their resignation when the Governors begin to interfere, they are called upon by the Governors to do so as a substitute for direct interference? What is it that the Congress wants to secure? We thought it was complete abstention from interference of any kind on the part of the Governors, with the necessary corollary that the Ministers should be left free to give effect to their policies. If at any point the Governors are at liberty under the assurance asked for to cut short the Ministry's tenure of power even when the Ministry commands the support of the legislature and the electorate, what is the value of the assurance even if received? The Ministry would be submitting to interference, by whatever process the interference is brought into practice.

What Mahatma Gandhi says in reply to Lord Zetland's objection that if minorities are ill-treated the Governors would be justified in exercising and would exercise their special powers also shows that he is not opposed in principle to these powers. For his reply is that the Congress Ministers would not be so foolish as to ill-treat the minorities, but the reply lends itself to the rejoinder that if the Ministers would not be so foolish the Governors would have no occasion to interfere and that therefore no harm would result in allowing the power of interference to remain. If the Governors are to trust the Ministers not to abuse their powers, why should not the Ministers trust the Governors not to abuse theirs? If an assurance is still required from the Governors a corresponding assurance will have to be taken from the Ministers that their policy in regard to the minorities will not depart from the policy which the Governors think is required for the protection of minority interests. Mahatma Gandhi cannot lay a claim to non-interference by the Governors unless he takes the stand that, whatever the Congress policy on the minorities question may be, the Governors should throw the responsibility for it on the Ministers and disinterest

themselves completely in the matter. He ought to say that in practice the Congress Cabinets would never tyrannise over the minorities, but they must nevertheless have the right to tyrannise, the remedy for any possible tyranny being sought not in the Governors exercising their special powers but the Congress members suffering a defeat in the legislature and the electorate. So long as Mahatma Gandhi does not take his stand on this, he is advancing a claim not to the complete non-use of special powers but to a very sparing and wise use of them. In their desire to appear moderate, Mahatma Gandhi, Rajaji, Babu Rajendra Prasad and the *Tribune* make non-sense of the demand which they put forward.

The difference in the opinions which legal experts have given as to the possibility of the Governors giving the required assurance within the limits of the constitution arises mainly because of the different interpretations they place on the nature and scope of the assurance. And since Mahatma Gandhi asks for a binding decision on this question from an arbitration tribunal it is necessary for the Congress to define the assurance more precisely than is done in the A. I. C. C. resolution. Would the assurance, if given, mean

(1) that while the Governors would have a right to bring their special powers into force in the event of a movement of direct action being started, they would have no such right in practice, though they have been endowed with it in theory, so long as the Ministers confine themselves to parliamentary activities, whatever their policy may be and in whatever degree in the opinion of the Governors it may conflict with the requirements, as the Governors see them, of the preservation of peace and tranquillity, protection of minorities, prevention of discrimination, the safeguarding of the interests of the services and other duties placed upon the Governors by the constitution?

(2) and that the Governor-General and the Secretary of State and Parliament too would give up any control they may have over the Governors and would not force the latter to use their reserve powers when the Governors refrain from using them?

(3) or merely that the Governors would not ordinarily use their special powers but would use them in emergencies and even then reasonably?

(4) or that the Governors should never use them, but the Governor-General and the Secretary of State would be free, not only in theory but in practice, to compel the Governors to use them?

These points must be cleared up; no tribunal would be able to decide the question at issue without knowing what is the kind of assurance that is contemplated by the A. I. C. C. resolution. The vagueness of a formula may be useful in politics; it is a fatal obstacle to a legal decision. Does the Congress want to achieve full provincial self-government within a constitution which purports to give only partial self-government, or does it want only to prevent a vexatious, wanton and irresponsible use, as the *Hindu* said, of the wide arbitrary powers vested in the

Governors? When the question is so put, the need of lawyers to answer it is eliminated. Even laymen can answer it: in the former case the assurance is impossible and in the latter unnecessary.

It is not a legal question at all. It is a political one, first and last. Lawyers have no place in this business. Mahatma Gandhi by bringing them in is only complicating matters. Perhaps that is his object. One cannot help being reminded, in considering this aspect of the question, of Mr. de Valera's demand for referring the Land Annuities controversy to an independent tribunal of extra-imperial judges. The British Government had a very good case in that controversy; but Mr. de Valera only wanted by taking the stand that he did to keep up the ferment among the Irish people, and he succeeded in his object. Similarly, the British Government may have a good

case against the assurance asked for by the Congress. Safeguards may be, and indeed are, as Lord Zetland says, an integral part of the constitution now being brought into force, and their elimination may need an amendment of the constitution. Mahatma Gandhi may be wrong in seeking for their elimination without constitutional amendment, but other Congress leaders who do not think of the question in legalistic terms like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru would say: Amend the constitution, if that is necessary, in order to remove these and other safeguards even if the amendment amounts to a complete scrapping of this constitution and replacing it by another constitution of full self-government. It is this question which the British Government is up against, and not merely the legal conundrums which Mahatma Gandhi at the moment chooses to place before it.

STOP THE FEDERATION!

WHILE the political crisis remains in all its intractability in the six provinces where the Congress has obtained a majority and the situation there threatens to be explosive, the federation is still in the offing; and when one considers the ominous possibilities of an additional menace to peace and order that the establishment of an unwanted federation has in it, one's heart cannot but sink. The dangers that are inherent in forcing this federation into being it is almost impossible to exaggerate. The British Government could at least rely upon the support of the Muslim community in giving effect to the constitution in the provincial sphere. In five provinces the constitution has been set going in normal fashion. But this support of the Muslim community will not be available in the central sphere; for the Muslims are if anything even more antagonistic to federation than the Hindus. Again, by common consent the federal constitution is by far the worse part of the constitution. The British Government might have expected non-Congress parties to pull a little weight in favour of the restricted provincial autonomy which it has brought into operation, though this expectation has not been realised to any appreciable extent. But non-Congressmen are no whit less hostile to the federal structure than Congressmen. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in his message on Spain says: "The drift towards fascism continues in India, and the new constitution, with all its democratic facade in the provinces, is essentially fascist in conception and probably in action, especially in the federal sphere." Everyone in this country, to whichever school of thought he may belong, agrees with Pandit Jawaharlal in holding that if the whole constitution is abominable, the federal part is much more so than the provincial; for in the former there is not even a facade of democracy as in the latter. The federal constitution is frankly autocratic or oligarchic. Prof. Berriedale Keith puts it forcibly in his recent letter to the *Scotsman* when he says that the clear intention of the British Government in setting up federation is that "of stereotyping autocracy and absence of the

rule of law in the States in return for the aid of the Princes in defeating Indian strivings for self-government." The British Government must therefore be prepared for a united effort on the part of the whole Indian population, without distinction of party or community, to frustrate the functioning of the federal government. It must not pretend when trouble comes that it was not warned in good time.

But what are the Princes going to do? Sir Kailas Nath Haksar writes in the special Constitution Number of the *Times of India* that the first batch of Princes have already signified their willingness to join federation to the British Government, and that others will follow soon enough to make it possible for the inauguration of the federal government within a year from now. Have they considered the terrific discontent that will be created in the country when federation will be brought into operation against the wishes of the whole of British India? This discontent will not be directed against the British Government either; it will be directed against the Princes themselves. For it is within the power of the Princes to give a quietus to federation; and if, in spite of the unanimous opposition of all British Indians, the Princes will enter federation and by doing so make themselves instrumental in forcing it upon British India, it is obvious that the anti-federation agitation that will arise hereafter will be aimed at least as much against the Princes as against the British Government. The British Government is foreign and may be excused if it is heedless to Indian opinion. But the Princes claim to be Indian, and if they will do nothing to rescue their own subjects and the British Indian people from the horrors of this federal constitution but will take upon themselves the responsibility of inflicting these horrors upon the whole country, they will necessarily make themselves the principal targets of attack. This is a truth which must be brought home to the rulers of Indian States and if only they come to realise it in all its grimness it is possible that they may yet draw back from a step which, being irrevocable, may be fatal to the interest of all parties, including themselves. We are glad to

see that the All-India States' People's Conference, through its Working Committee, has made a very timely attempt, a last attempt as it says, to make the Princes alive to this danger. In the resolution passed by this Committee (which is published *in extenso* elsewhere) it has performed this duty with commendable frankness. It reminds them that, central responsibility being denied to all intents and purposes by the constitution, they ought not to join federation in default of the imperative condition on which they had made their entry contingent, for they cannot gainsay the truth of Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya's statement in picturesque language that in the federation they would "get in effect the casket without the jewel", the shadow without the substance. The resolution also tells them that the States' people consider federation to be "inimical to their (the people's) interests," and that therefore, as claiming to be trustees for their people, the Princes should decline to accede to federation.

But neither of these pleas will have any weight with the Princes, who look at most things from a self-regarding point of view, and, recognising this, the Working Committee of the States' People's Conference goes on to argue that the Princes ought to stay away from federation in mere self-interest, and to this aspect of the question they may perhaps give some attention. The resolution says: "It would be against the best interest of the Governments of the States themselves to enter a federation... to which dominant sections of opinion in British India are implacably opposed as by so doing the rulers of States would unnecessarily draw upon themselves the hostility of British Indians who are engaged in a political struggle directed primarily against British imperialism and in which at the moment the Governments of the States are not involved." The Committee hits it off very well in this resolution. British India as a whole is content to leave the Princes alone, unhampered in their autocracy in the States. It does not show itself too ready to take up cudgels on behalf of the States' people. It considers itself to have enough work on hand to fight British imperialism. Even for following this policy of "hands off the States," the political bodies in British India and particularly the Congress have been strongly condemned by the States' people. Speaking of the Congress, Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya says in the statement that he issued after his recent tour in Kathiawad States: "Time has come for the Congress to pursue a vigorous and virile policy in regard to the problem of the States instead of merely marking time or adopting temporising methods." But if, instead of confining their autocracy to the States, the Princes will force it upon British India in the federal legislature, British India cannot obviously ignore them as people with whom it has no concern. It will have to widen the range of its attack so that Indian autocracy as well as British imperialism will feel the full force of its democratic movement. How terrible this force can be the Princes have surely seen for themselves from recent happenings. At present happily the storm passes by

them: is it advisable that they should place themselves wantonly in its centre?

The answer which the Working Committee of the States' People's Conference gives to this question is the only answer that it is possible for all well-wishers of the Princes to give. The resolution says, the hostility of British India which the Princes will draw upon themselves "will lead inevitably to constant friction between British India and the States which it is in the power of the rulers of the States to avoid and which it would certainly be in their interest to avoid." Another argument which the Working Committee addresses to the Princes is very shrewd and cogent. It says in effect: "You don't like the federation to be perpetually binding. You did your best to persuade the British Government to make it terminable. You have failed. The result of it is that you will have to endure in perpetuity the disadvantages that in your own opinion flow from federation. You cannot be relieved of them at any time in future. Similarly British India too will be subjected to what it considers to be grave evils of federation for all time without any hope of its being free from them, and British India's wrath against you as the co-authors of federation with the British Government will be all the more fierce because the evils will be permanent. One may hesitatingly participate in an arrangement which is not of decided benefit if a retreat therefrom is possible when it is found necessary. But one must not sign a contract which is not only of doubtful advantage to oneself and which is forced upon the other party but which cannot be cancelled on either side subsequently, however bitter may prove to be the fruits of it." The words of the resolution are: "As the federation, once established, is intended to be indissoluble at any time in future and is recognised by the rulers of States themselves to be indissoluble, the mischief that will result from it will be wholly irremediable, and the least that the Government of the States should do in self-interest, even if they are to ignore the opposition of the people in the States, is to delay their accession to federation till British India finds itself in a position to work the federal constitution in a spirit of co-operation."

But the Committee does not stop here. It makes an appeal to the Working Committee of the Congress to "advise the Princes not to join the federation". What response the Congress will make to this appeal is not known. If it does not tender this "advice" it will only be because, as Dr. Pattabhai Sitaramayya, himself a prominent Congress leader, says, the Congress will not deem it consistent with its dignity to approach the Princes. "The Congress would not treat with the rulers of States," he says, "unless as a minimum measure of reform they agree to occupy the position of constitutional heads of their States in a recognised scheme of responsible government." But what advice the Congress would give if it deemed it worth while to do so is known to the Princes, for the Congress is pledged to oppose the introduction of federation. Not so very long ago the Princes pretended to be willing to come into the federation only on the invitation upon bended knees of British India. Now the "advice"

of the Congress and other political organisations to them is to stay out of federation. Will they follow this advice as they do that of the Political Officers of the Government of India, or by disregarding it incur the

ill-will and opposition of British India? Will they be so unwise as to take up their permanent abode in a house which is destined soon to fall in about their ears, if British India has any kick left in it?

THE JAMNADAS BLUE-PRINT.

THE Minority Ministry in the Bombay Presidency has not allowed grass to grow under its feet. It has published a comprehensive programme of reform and reconstruction which it will attempt to put into operation if allowed to remain in office for the requisite period of time. It is, however, exceedingly doubtful if the Congress will give more than six months at the outside to the Ministry to try its hand at government. The Ministry is fully conscious of the circumstances in which it rode into power; it is also conscious of the fact that it may be driven from its present position any day. It seems determined nevertheless to do what little it can within its brief span of life. The Ministry would have attracted no notice if it had not included Mr. Jamnadas Mehta who unites great ability and tremendous driving force to radicalism in social and political questions. This Ministry therefore stands out from all the rest as one which would provide a practical test of the amount of nation-building work that can be done within the limitations—admittedly grave limitations—of the new constitution.

The programme consists at present only of a bare list of heads under which the major activities of the Government will be grouped, with a mention of the ultimate aim and an indication of the direction in which the activities will be carried on. Their pace and their relative priority are not disclosed. It could not well be otherwise. Some of the items of reform require further investigation and most of them will require legislation. The Ministry does not seem afraid of facing the legislature and indeed appears anxious to do so, taking the verdict of the legislature coolly and calmly and being quite willing to pass on to its successor the tasks of government which it might be enabled to accomplish only in the most fragmentary fashion. But in the meantime it wants to do whatever it can by executive action and at any rate to lay the foundations for a well-conceived and far-reaching reform. The programme, now general, will have to be reduced later to concrete proposals, but even the outlines of the policy which are given show that the programme is such as a democracy will draw up for itself, with the whole emphasis on the betterment of the condition of the masses. Introduction of free and compulsory primary education, with a grant of special scholarships for the children of the scheduled, intermediate and backward classes and Muslims, remission of land revenue in proportion to the fall in the prices of agricultural produce, redemption of debt "making all just deductions," development of irrigation, road development, prohibition of liquor, improvement of public health, release of political prisoners, and measures in the interest of labour. Among these last are mentioned: "to consider and devise machinery for fixing a minimum

living wage and limitation of working hours; to secure wider recognition of trade unions within the Province; establishment of a machinery for facilitating the settlement of trade disputes; to investigate the whole question of unemployment and other social insurances; to find out what other ameliorative measures could be secured for the working classes," etc.

The programme is frankly tentative and cannot be properly assessed until it is translated into concrete measures of immediate application, but the presence in the Ministry of Mr. Jamnadas Mehta is a guarantee that the Cabinet will do its level best to evolve a plan which is both practicable and forward-looking. Even when the blue-print is ready, the scheme cannot be taken as it is and applied. A great deal of discussion will have to take place and experiments will have to be made, which will perhaps make many variations necessary. But the overmastering question is: Will the Congress, if it does not accept office itself, allow Mr. Jamnadas Mehta to carry into effect a programme which it had itself recommended to its members? Or will its first act, on the summoning of the legislature, be to vote Mr. Jamnadas out of office? It has certainly the power to pass a censure motion against the Ministry and drive it into the wilderness. It has also the power, subsequently by refusing to assume office, to compel resort to section 93 of the Constitution Act, thus bringing about a complete deadlock. If the Congress wishes that a stalemate should arise, giving no opportunities to anyone to do constructive work, then obviously nothing that any one can say will deflect it from its course. But if it wants to work the constitution, then surely it should give a chance to Mr. Jamnadas Mehta if it cannot itself accept office because the necessary assurance is not forthcoming from the Governors. Mr. Jamnadas Mehta is not a man to be so absorbed in working the new constitution as to give no thought to the remedying of its grave deficiencies. At the present juncture we want men who will turn the bad constitution to a good purpose but who will at the same time keep up an unceasing agitation against its defects so that we shall soon achieve a constitution of real self-government. Mr. Jamnadas Mehta is just such a man. The programme of reform which he has proposed for himself also approximates very closely to the Congress programme. The Council of the U. P. Provincial Congress Committee recently decided that, in the event of the Governor not summoning the Assembly, the Congress members returned to the legislature should meet as if in a meeting of the Assembly and pass a resolution sponsoring legislation for (a) agrarian reform, reduction of rent, securing tenancy rights, etc.; (b) relieving the peasantry and other labour classes

from the burden of indebtedness; (c) safeguarding the welfare of the wage-earners; (d) relieving the poor consumers from the burden of taxation; (e) the repeal of repressive laws and release of political prisoners; (f) the freedom of press, speech and assembly; (g) free primary education; and (h) greater expenditure on public sanitation and medical aid to the poor. If the Congress is anxious to carry out this programme and cannot for some reason do so itself, why should it not give a man of the calibre and tried patriotism of Mr. Jamnadas Mehta a chance?

There is a certain advantage in the Congress remaining in opposition and yet keeping a Government in office which will carry out the social policy it has itself framed. Mr. Jinnah and Dr. Ambedkar have seen this advantage. They have not allowed members of the Muslim League or Harijans to join the Cabinet, but they will get the Cooper Ministry to give effect to all the measures which they want, for they know that the Ministry cannot go on unless it receives their active support. Dr. Ambedkar is confident that, by keeping his followers ready to vote against the Government, he can get it to do all that is reasonable for Harijans without having to bear the burden of office. The Congress is in a very much better position than either of these groups because its numerical strength is very much greater. It will in fact hold the Government in pawn. The Congress may vote the Government out of existence the moment the latter adopts a wrong policy or shows weakness in following a right policy. Only let it not do so because of its quarrel with the British Government on account of the inadequacy of the constitution. Even this it would be entitled to do if it were wedded to a policy of continuous deadlocks. It would appear, however, that if an assurance of the kind it asked for had been given, it would have worked the provincial constitution in a constructive spirit, in spite of the utterly unsatisfactory character of the central constitution. It would therefore be doing no violence to its conscience if it allowed another group to do what it would itself have done in certain favourable circumstances. We are inclined to think that there would be a distinct advantage in the Congress trying out the constructive method at least in one province while it gives a trial to the other method in other provinces. In fact, the *Tribune*, which is in favour of the Congress deliberately producing constitutional deadlocks wherever it can, suggested that the Congress, while refusing office itself, should go out of its way to facilitate the assumption of office by other progressive groups, thus combining in one policy the advantages to be derived from following two contrary policies. Our contemporary's point was that the Congress would keep true to its policy of wrecking by being in the opposition and would yet secure for the country the benefits which can only come as a result of taking up the responsibilities of government. As a general policy we do not approve of this suggestion at all, but circumstances have conspired in producing a similar situation in Bombay. A policy of drastic reform can be brought into force here. Will the Congress let it go forward? It would be well if it did.

COASTAL TRAFFIC BILLS.

A BILL having for its aim the control of coastal traffic has been recently introduced in the Council of State by the Hon'ble Mr. P. N. Saprú. An identical measure of which Mr. Saprú himself was the author was pending consideration in the immediate predecessor of the present Council which had even ordered its circulation for the expression of public opinion on it. But its further progress was blocked by the dissolution of the Council itself with the result that Mr. Saprú was placed under the necessity of repeating the process once again. A like piece of legislation sponsored by Sir A. H. Ghuznavi is at present before the Lower House of the Indian Legislature.

Though the proposed legislation purports to bring coastal traffic under Government control, its real and eventual aim is to promote the growth and development of a Mercantile Marine in India. Why is not an indigenous Mercantile Marine developing in this country? The answer is obvious. The field is at present occupied mostly by well-established powerful foreign companies who never find it difficult to put a new venture out of action. This end is generally achieved by them by unfair means like rate-cutting, grant of rebates, etc. It is the fear of such unfair competition that deters Indian enterprise from turning its attention to the coastal trade. That is the lesson of experience. The proposed legislation, by empowering Government to put a stop to unfair competition, is expected to reduce the chance of such competition to the minimum.

To this end a system of licences will be introduced, none but those holding a licence from the Government being entitled to carry on business in coastal traffic. If the bill is enacted into law, Government would have the power of fixing the maximum and minimum rates of freight and passenger fares, of preventing the grant of rebates and of preventing such other practices as may be deemed to result in unfair competition. A penalty of Rs. 10,000 and exclusion from Indian ports are prescribed as punishments for any breaches of the law or rules under it.

It is necessary to state that the legislation largely follows the lines of the scheme proposed over a dozen years ago by the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee for the reservation of the coastal trade for Indians as a means of bringing into existence in course of time a well-developed Mercantile Marine. About the desirability of reserving coastal traffic the Committee was emphatic in its opinion. "The coasting trade of a country," it said, "is regarded universally as a domestic trade in which foreign flags cannot engage as of right but to which they may be admitted as a matter of grace. It is admitted that the policy of British Dominions or Possessions in regard to their own coasting trades must be determined by their local interests and we are of opinion that in the interests of the growth of an Indian Mercantile Marine it is necessary to close the coastal trade of this country to ships belonging to the subjects of foreign nations." But it was urged on the Committee that mere exclusion of foreign

shipping from the Indian coastal trade would not effectively serve the purpose of creating an Indian Mercantile Marine. What was generally considered necessary to this end was "action to reserve the coastal trade more or less exclusively for shipping companies, the controlling interests in which are predominantly Indian." This view found acceptance at the hands of the Committee which laid down three tests to determine the predominantly Indian character of an enterprise. (1) Is it registered in India? (2) Is it owned and managed by an Indian company or by a joint stock company registered in India with rupee capital and a majority of Indian Directors and share-holders? (3) Is the management predominantly in Indian hands? A licence to deal in coastal traffic was, according to the Committee's scheme, ordinarily to be issued to a company or concern which satisfied these tests. In view of the paucity of trained and experienced nautical officers the Committee naturally abstained from insisting on a wholly Indian staff being employed by coastal steamship companies. But it did envisage the enforcement of a condition making it obligatory on the licensee company to provide training facilities for at least two ex-Dufferin cadets on each one of its ships subject to a maximum of 60 apprentices all told for a company, and to employ at least 50 per cent. Indian officers and engineers when an adequate number of qualified Indians became available.

Both the Bills follow in the main the Committee's plan and when the details come to be worked out, they will, it may be assumed, embody some at least of the tests and conditions proposed by the Committee for prospective licensees. Is it at all likely that the authors of these bills would have any but companies which are predominantly Indian in character licensed to carry on coastal traffic? By establishing the training ship Dufferin in Bombay waters the Government have given effect only to one part of the Committee's scheme. In view of the existence of large British vested interests in the coastal trade, their reluctance to institute a licensing system in regard to the coastal trade as recommended by the Committee is quite intelligible. These Bills are obviously an attempt to compel them to move in a direction in which they have consistently refused to move. As an attempt to open out fresh channels of employment for Indian youths, the Bills are sure to receive widespread support in India.

BOMBAY INDUSTRIES.

THE Annual Report of the Department of Industries of the Bombay Presidency for 1935-36, like its predecessors, has almost the same sad story to tell about the general conditions of industries in this presidency and the activities undertaken by the Department to improve them. The report starts the account with a few general observations regarding the industrial outlook but totally lacks statistical material. The Cotton Textile Mill industry, for instance, is disposed of in a couple of pages without attempting a proper analysis of the situation. Again, mention is made of the factors that determined the seasonal character of mill-production. The report merely stops at giving a few broad statistics regarding the industries. One

fails to appreciate the idea behind the inclusion of such an imperfect study of the annual position of the premier large scale industry of the province. The review of other textile industries and the medium and small scale industries like sugar, glass, soap, gold thread, etc., is equally scrappy. A proper review of the annual position of these industries should have prominently brought to the notice of the interested public and the officials the exact lines on which the department can help these industries and should have suggested means of doing so.

A dispassionate reading of the brief account of the assistance rendered by the Department to small organised industries indicates that there is a considerable scope for some of the small organised industries. They require continuous assistance from the Department in many directions like technical advice, research, demonstration, marketing, etc. But what the Department has been doing is utterly inadequate. The Department seems to suffer from lack of a comprehensive idea about the general planning of its activities in this field. This state of affairs is almost entirely due to the chronic financial stringency from which the Department is suffering ever since its inception. A concrete instance of this would be the way in which the State Aid to Industries regulations were administered during the year. From among the applications for total loans to the extent of Rs. 50,000 under this head, the Department was satisfied with the financial position of only one applicant to whom a loan of Rs. 1,600 was granted for the manufacture of tin boxes! A statistical analysis which the report fails to give would have enabled one to arrive at some definite notions regarding the views of the Department about the possibilities of different industries and about the manner of application of the State Aid to Industries regulations. This major defect in the report can be removed if the Department gives some statistical information about the financial status and needs of the applicants, the character of the proposed manufactures or the lines of production on which the applicants propose to concentrate with the financial help from the State. The reasons for refusing help should also be clearly stated. That would be the real test of the good faith of the Department in respect of State aid to industries.

The report also gives an account of the departmental activities in the field of cottage industries (which we generally choose to style as handicrafts), by far the most important and widespread industrial activity of the province. It is impossible to deny the importance of handicrafts to this presidency. But it is most disappointing to see that the Department has not been able to put forth its best efforts and tackle the major problems of handicraft reconstruction. Beyond running a few demonstrations in weaving, sizing and dyeing and maintaining an insignificant number of under-financed weaving schools (seven in the whole province), the department has not been able to do any considerable work for the general improvement of the handloom industry. The fundamental problem of a reduction of production cost deserves the urgent attention of the Department. Such efforts are now being made in Madras, and the Bombay Department of Industries can certainly take a leaf from Madras and do some substantial work in this direction. The Department has no doubt recently organised a section for the marketing of handloom-products and has appointed two high-salaried officers to look after the technical and commercial difficulties of the handloom producers. This is done by organising Industrial Co-operative Associations on a district basis. Three such associations are formed in the presidency excluding Sind out of the grant received by the Department from the Government of India. The report gives a very

brief account of the work of these associations but lacks in important details such as the financial position of the associations, their operations during the year, the extent of improvement effected, etc. In this connection it must be noted that the associations are being conducted on a co-operative basis, a method which has miserably failed to achieve anything substantial in the direction of general amelioration of the weavers as a class. Co-operation as a method of tackling handicraft problems is no doubt sound and to a considerable extent meets the basic needs of the artisan industry. But the way in which the co-operative method has been applied to the artisan industries of this province has all along been extremely defective as the local history of handicraft co-operatives distinctly points out. If, therefore, the same old technique is adopted by the Industries Department in the organisation and operations of these associations one has to reserve one's judgment about the effectiveness of this new line of attack on handicraft problems.

The report winds up with a statement of the routine work done by the Department in the Fisheries section, weights and measures and technical education. A thing to be noted in the last section is the preparation of an apprentice scheme for certain vocations and is designed to give openings to educated youths. The scheme as adumbrated appears to be promising and if properly handled might give a lead to many youths. But like other ambitious schemes of the Department it should not founder on the hard rock of financial stringency. Another interesting activity of the Department is the participation in exhibitions by conducting demonstrations in several technical processes and by exhibiting new designs in textiles, etc. The Department certainly deserves credit for giving an educative value to exhibitions on this side of the country.

The expenditure of the Department during the year 1935-36 has gone up from Rs. 3.43 lakhs to Rs. 6.31 lakhs. But the items which show an increase are not indicated. The major portion of the rise must have been due to the addition of work in connection with the administration of the Weights and Measures Act. In the absence of a detailed analysis of revenue and expenditure any conclusion from the reading of the report about the trend of State policy towards industries becomes difficult.

A significant conclusion, however, from the report is that the general study of the different classes of industries which the report usually attempts, the methods of presentation of facts and figures regarding the departmental activities, etc. require considerable improvement before it can acquire any great importance in the eyes of the public.

NEELKANTH JOSHI.

Reviews.

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT.

RURAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IN BENGAL. By NARESH CHANDRA ROY. (University of Calcutta.) 1936. 24cm. 202p.

THIS is a thesis submitted by Professor Naresh Chandra Roy for the degree of Ph. D. at the University of Calcutta, and the book deals with an important but neglected aspect of local self-government in Bengal. Dr. Roy gives an account of the rural local bodies—the Union Boards, Local Boards, and District Boards—and their constitution, functions and finances. An important aspect of the author's method lies in his getting into touch with the men on the spot who were

really carrying on the work of these rural and semi-rural bodies and benefiting by that experience.

Dr. Roy does not give us merely a historical survey of the evolution of these agencies of local self-government, but has given us the benefit of his thoughts for the improvement of these institutions. Writing on the question of the Government control over District Boards, Dr. Roy seems to be of the opinion that while "certain definite powers to check and control the vagaries of the District Boards must continue to be placed in the Government, these powers should not be finally vested in, or even in practice be exercised by, the local administrative officers of the Government." On page 126, Dr. Roy says:

Not only all the statutory powers of control vested in the Commissioner should be transferred to the Government of Bengal, but what is more important still is that the Government should exercise these powers through other functionaries and not through these local administrative officers.

It is difficult to agree with this view both on theoretical and practical grounds and it is not surprising that the District and Sub-Divisional Officers consulted by the author did not encourage his view. The remedy suggested by the author of appointing experienced members of the Bengal Civil Service to do this kind of work would only add to the expenditure of a province already sufficiently borne down by the inelasticity of its income.

On pages 75-76 the author has something very interesting to say about the recruitment to the permanent staff of these Boards, but being sensible of the limitations—communal, local and otherwise—he is sceptical of the value of his own suggestions to have the permanent servants of the Boards recommended by a central staff selection board.

It is also difficult to agree with the author when he suggests that the Government should accept the principle that the motor tax collected in a particular district should be distributed among the District Boards and the Municipalities of the area. This is an extraordinary principle which might imply that the provincial Government should have no responsibility to ensure reasonably equitable treatment of all local bodies. If this doctrine is pushed to its logical conclusion, in many matters Dr. Roy himself would recoil from his own suggestion.

Dr. Roy deplors the fact that the sources of revenue to the District Boards are mostly inelastic, but his suggestion that "if only the Government grants are increased largely, the Boards can possibly be of greater use to the countryside of the province" indicates an attitude of mind that hopes for the impossible as the revenues of the province are also relatively inelastic. It is difficult to see how the Boards could be financed except by a policy of long term loans.

It is also difficult to follow the arguments of the author for the abolition of the local boards in Bengal. The abolition may or may not be justified on many grounds, but to suggest that the Government should abolish local boards because these may be narrow in outlook and action is to use an argument which cuts both ways. One cannot believe in local self-government and yet abuse the very persons whom you want to shape into self-respecting and self-reliant citizens.

Of far greater interest is the study of the author of the working of the Union Boards in Bengal. The author gives a historical survey of the growth of the Union Boards and the nature of their working. Evidently Dr. Roy is not satisfied with the Union Boards exercising any judicial authority and he therefore suggests that the boards should not have any judicial powers on the ground that the members are corrupt, and that they do not

have common sense! It is surprising that the author should consider that the Union Boards should be entrusted with such responsible duties as the improvement of sanitation, education, public health and so on, holding the view, as he does, that the members of the Union Boards do not have common sense. Possibilities of corruption are not the monopoly of Union Boards and may be met with on a larger scale in greater areas, but the remedy is to be found in the rising of the level of education in local areas and giving responsibility to the local people. The question of the devolution of powers to the subordinate local bodies requires more profound thinking than what the author has been able to give to the question.

The criticism of Dr. Roy of the system of dual control over the Chaukidars is perfectly justified, and from a review of the figures* collected by the author it appears that between 60 to 75% of the income of the Union Boards is spent on Chaukidars and establishment and only between 25 to 35% on health, education and roads! What a mockery of local self-government in the year of grace 1932-33! It is difficult to think of any alternative solution unless the Government are prepared to hand over the control of the village police to the Union Boards and trust them to manage the whole business. The crux of the whole question is finance and Dr. Roy's figures do not warrant the hope that any great activities are possible for these Unions as they are at present constituted in Bengal. Dr. Roy is aware that the Union Boards "would never be able to raise a large amount of money by taxation" and "if they are to be useful and efficient institutions the arrangement of annual Government grants must be liberalised." But Dr. Roy does not give us any reasoned estimate of how much could be made available by the province as a whole for the work of these institutions apart from what is being done now. Very probably much of the work done in rural areas by the Union Boards must rely on voluntary co-operation in service more than by assistance from above! But this requires a new spirit and a different outlook than one can expect from the Boards as they are now worked.

The author has done useful work in studying certain aspects of the great problem of rural self-government in Bengal, but his contribution would have been more valuable if he had been able to give his readers a comparative statistical appreciation of the income and expenditure of the District and Union Boards classifying them under different headings. If these figures had been assembled, say, for a decade or more, interesting conclusions would have been possible about the working of the machinery of local self-government district by district. A classification of the social status—educational and otherwise—of the persons who get elected to these bodies would

* The figures given are :

Year.	Total Income	Money spent on Chaukidars and Establishment	Money spent on Health, Education, Roads, etc.
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1927-28	1,863	1,164	665
1928-29	1,746	1,148	587
1929-30	1,985	1,368	573
1930-31	1,815	1,394	493
1932-33	1,878	1,425	453

also be of vital interest to students of the subject. We trust that the author would be able to add some of these details if and when he gets the book through a second edition!

S. V. AYYAR.

ZONING

ZONING. BY EDWARD M. BASSETT. (Russell Sage Foundation, New York.) 1936. 23cm. 275p. \$ 3-00.

EDWARD M. BASSETT is the leading authority on zoning. He was the member of the original two commissions appointed in New York, and has ever since then been closely connected with it these twenty-five years. In this book he discusses in a very comprehensive manner the origin, administration, development and the present status of zoning in U.S.A.

The average Indian reader may perhaps not be familiar with the word "zoning". It connotes the law regulating, by districts, under police power, the height, size and use of buildings, the use of land and density of population. The term "districting" was used for the purpose in the beginning, but in course of time the word "zoning" caught the popular fancy and has ever since been used in U.S.A.

Rapid growth of towns and cities produced chaotic conditions. Sky-scrapers of unrestricted height arose at random. They not only darkened the streets, and obstructed free breeze, but were open to the potential danger of fire, against which they could not be well protected. Again, coupled with the inevitable increase in density of population which they caused, they overtaxed the capacity of streets. With the congestion of residential quarters came in its train the increase in volume in litter, dust, fumes and noises. The erection of a building such as a department store, in the midst of residential quarters, interfered with the latter's privacy, or the advent of a theatre or a school near a hospital disturbed the peace of the latter. Similarly, certain trades such as slaughter houses, fertiliser works, oil refineries, tanneries, powder works, etc. were naturally looked upon as nuisance by the people living round about. In this way there arose a demand from all quarters for some sort of control for regulating this state of affairs.

New York City was the first to respond to this. In 1913 a commission was appointed for limiting the height and size of buildings, and as a result of their report published the following year another commission was appointed to explore the possibilities of the regulations, under police power, of the height, area and the use of buildings. New York City adopted the first zoning plan prepared by this commission in 1916. Enforcement of the zoning ordinances, under police power, was regarded as inconsistent with individual liberty and the ordinances themselves as discriminative and arbitrary by land-owners and others, who vehemently protested against them. These protestations came for hearing before a Board of Appeal, composed of experts who were in a position to use their discretion and grant impartial orders. Out of the decisions given by them gradually grew up a large body of precedent, and in this way the present status of zoning evolved.

The purpose of zoning as set forth in most of the State enabling acts is "to lessen congestion in streets, to secure safety from fire and other dangers, to promote health and general welfare of the community, to provide adequate light and air, to prevent overcrowding of land, to facilitate adequate provision of transportation, water, sewerage, schools, parks and other public requirements."

No municipality is compelled by law to enter into zoning, but if a municipality voluntarily decides to do so it must follow the procedure laid down in the State acts. Otherwise its ordinances will be null and void. At present nearly 1200 municipalities have adopted the zoning plan in the U. S.

In the concluding chapter all the types of buildings are listed and the regulations in various municipalities which restrict their use in residential and non-residential areas are described in detail. This chapter is the cream of the whole book and is sure to prove a very useful guide in framing zoning ordinances in future. A comprehensive bibliography and two indices—one of court decisions and the other of subjects—are given at the end.

R. S. DESHPANDE.

Miscellaneous.

SUSPENSION OF FEDERATION.

DEMAND BY THE STATES' PEOPLE'S CONFERENCE.

A meeting of the Working Committee of the All-India States' People's Conference was held at Bombay on April 6 with Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, President of the Conference, in the chair, when the following resolution among others was passed :

SINCE the time for the rulers of Indian States taking a final decision on the question of accession to federation is drawing near, the Working Committee of the All-India States' People's Conference takes this last occasion, as in its opinion is its bounden duty, to declare on behalf of the people of the Indian States that the proposed federation would be inimical to their interests, and to make a fervent appeal to the rulers of States to decline to accede to it.

The Committee is also convinced that it would be against the best interests of the Governments of the States themselves to enter a federation, which they agreed to join strictly on the condition that central responsibility would characterize it and to which dominant sections of opinion in British India are implacably opposed, as by so doing the rulers of States would unnecessarily draw upon themselves the hostility of British Indians who are engaged in a political struggle directed primarily against British imperialism, and in which at the moment the Governments of the States are not involved.

This will lead inevitably to constant friction between British India and the States, which it is in the power of the rulers of States to avoid and which it would certainly be in their interest to avoid.

As the federation, once established, is intended to be indissoluble at any time in future, and is recognised by the rulers of States themselves to be indissoluble, the mischief that will result from it will be wholly irretrievable, and the least that the Governments of the States should do in self-interest, even if they are to ignore the opposition of the people in the States, is to delay their accession to federation till British India finds itself in a position to work the federal constitution in a spirit of co-operation.

(b) This Committee appeals to the Working Committee of the Congress now that the constitution

has been wrecked in respect of provincial autonomy in six out of eleven provinces, to advise the Princes not to join the federation in the interests of the nation so that the new constitution may be deemed to have been wholly rejected.

Correspondence.

THE RANI OF JHANSI—AN APOLOGY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR, In its issue of 9th September, 1933, your esteemed journal was good enough to publish a review of a historical play entitled, "The Rani of Jhansi," a copy of which was sent you for criticism soon after publication.

As objection has now been taken to certain passages in the dialogue, and especially to the lines on p. 49—inserted purely for dramatic effect and for which there is not the least historical justification—with which the noble lady closes her appeal to Major Ellis, we the undersigned, being the author and publishers of the book, would be grateful for the opportunity to express our sincerest regrets for any pain which may have been caused to the brother and nephew of the Rani (of whose existence we have just heard for the first time) by the publication of the words in question. In making this submission of deep regret, however, we expressly repudiate any charge of having intentionally or knowingly or in fact defamed the noble lady, for whom we have the most genuine regard and esteem—as must be obvious to everyone who has read the book; and we would like to stress the fact that the work has been widely acclaimed as a praiseworthy vindication of the heroic Maratha Princess who died in tragic circumstances about eighty years ago.

To further emphasise how greatly we deplore any hurt that we might unintentionally have given by the use of the words complained against, we have decided not to issue any more copies of the book until the text has been suitably revised in keeping with the afore-mentioned objections, or to sell any translation or other rights in the work till such revision has been effected.

Thanking you for your kindness in giving publicity to this letter, Yours etc.

PHILIP COX.

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN, LTD.

London, March 18.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- HERBERT SPENCER'S THEORY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE. By E. ASIRVATHAM. (Upper India Publishing House, Lucknow.) 1936. 20cm. 306p. Rs.5.
- INTRODUCTION TO ECONOMICS. By G. B. JATHAR and S. G. BERL. (Oxford University Press.) 1936. 22cm. 595p. Rs. 4-8.
- THE INDUSTRY AND TRADE OF JAPAN. By S. UYEHARA. (King.) 1936. 22cm. 259p. 12/6.
- CO-OPERATIVE INSURANCE. By N. BAROU. (King.) 1936. 22cm. 391p. 15/-.
- DRAINAGE AND SANITATION. By E. H. BLAKE. (Batsford.) 1936. 22cm. 563p. 15/-.
- GREAT EARTHQUAKES. By CHARLES DAVISON. (Thomas Murby.) 1936. 22cm. 286p. 17/6.