

The Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4.

VOL. XVII, NO. 30. }

POONA—THURSDAY, AUGUST 2, 1934.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	349
ARTICLES :—	
The National Front Broken	352
Settlement of Industrial Disputes. By N. M. Joshi, M. L. A.	353
Zanzibar Indian Impasse. By An Unbiased Observer.	355
OUR LONDON LETTER	356
MISCELLANEA :—	
Congress Election Manifesto.	358
Working Committee's Resolutions.	359
Shipping Subsidy.	559
BOOKS RECEIVED.	360

Topics of the Week.

From Crumbs to Crumblets.

OUR London correspondent, who is exceptionally well-informed on Indian affairs, reiterates what he has said so often before, that the following changes in the White Paper proposals are very likely as concessions to the Tories: indirect election for the Assembly, second chambers in most Provinces, restrictions upon the transfer of the C. I. D. &c., &c.

It is no consolation to Indians that, as our correspondent says, the frame-work of the White Paper will be left intact, if it is to undergo such reactionary changes in detail. We shall say only this much about it on the present occasion that it brightens very much the prospect of a non-acceptance resolution being carried in the next Assembly.

If this is to be the outcome of the Joint Select Committee's Report, the Committee need not put itself out too much for India's sake in order to present the Report soon to Parliament. It may take its own time; Indians believe in postponing the evil day when they cannot avert it.

From crumbs we have come to crumblets.

Instructions to the Mahatma.

MR. MANILAL KOTHARI, the well-known worker in the Indian States' people's cause, says that "instructions were sent to Mahatmaji in England by a unanimous vote on the demands to be pressed before the Round Table Conference on behalf of the States' people". It is due not to the States' people alone, but to the country as a whole that the Congress should disclose what these demands were and whether, in its opinion, they were in fact pressed by the Mahatma as he was ordered to do. Is the principal satisfied with the agent's conduct? So far as

we see, there was a lot of ko-towing to the Princes, but no making of demands on them, not to speak of pressing the demands.

SAID the Mahatma to the Young Men's Hindu Association of Lahore: "The communal award is certainly anti-national and grossly unjust to the Hindu community, but the Congress cannot reject it unless the Mussulmans of India unanimously reject it." Similarly we believe that he will reject nomination by the Princes only when the Princes will unanimously reject it, and he will reject British rule only when the British rulers unanimously reject it. A good philosophy this!

Making Democracy Safe for the World!

THE Lancashire manufacturers may perhaps need over-persuasion; the rulers of the Indian States certainly do not. They have everything to gain and nothing to lose from the new constitution that is proposed for India. And they are most of them intelligent enough to understand where their interests lie. They can be bribed or coerced or cajoled into opposing federation as they can be bribed or coerced or cajoled into doing anything else by the paramount power; but as His Majesty's Government themselves desire federation there is no question of any State showing any hesitation in the matter. In fact they exhibit much enthusiasm, and we beg to inform the *Morning Post* that this time it is genuine enthusiasm. To think otherwise is to hold not only that the Princes are subservient to the British Government, which of course they are, but that they are foolish, which they are not. Federation they support and support with all their heart.

SIR MIRZA ISMAIL has done well to bring out this point in his letter to the *Morning Post*—we mean, the Princes' support of the White Paper and not their subservience to the British Government. But need he have given as one of the reasons for the support which the federation idea has received the alleged fact that "undoubtedly, world opinion as to the benefits of democracy as a system has greatly changed?" Latterly Sir Mirza has often let out on us a whiff of the dictatorship complex. It is true that dictators have installed themselves in many countries recently, but the result of this on world opinion is that it has become more insistent upon democracy than ever before and not that it is more indulgent towards what Albert Stickney has called "single-headed" administration, as Sir Mirza suggests.

AND what is the implication intended to be conveyed by adverting to this supposed preference by world opinion of authoritarian to democratic government? Obviously this: federation will establish in

India just that system of government which the world has now come to fancy. Responsible government of the western pattern unaccompanied by any element of autocracy would clearly be unsuitable. To give freedom to British India alone would thus be dangerous, since no autocratic elements could be discovered in British India. In a federal constitution, however, the States will supply just that element of personal rule which, blended with the democracy of British India, will make the resulting political system approximate to the golden mean on which the world has now set its heart. The States thus favour federation for their own sake of course, but also for the sake of British India and the world.

* * *

SIR MIRZA has threatened to be unresting in his endeavour to secure abolition of the tribute that is being paid by Mysore. This tribute is objectionable to him more because it is "a stigma of inferiority" than because it is a monetary drain. How happy he is that, in the case of his State, considerations of material welfare coincide with dictates of honour! That Mysore's representatives in the federal legislature will not all be elected on the same basis of franchise as those of even the least advanced of British Indian provinces or perhaps will not be elected at all does not appear to him to be a mark of inferiority. Here too self-interest coincides so wonderfully with altruistic motives. It is given to Mysore and to other States to contribute just that element which will make democracy safe for India and the world. In what an enviable position are the Indian States! They can make a solid contribution to human welfare!!

* * *

Quite a Different Tune now ?

Mr. M. C. CHAGLA was the most vehement critic of the All-Parties Conference when one was proposed to be held by the Liberal leaders of Bombay. His objection was that it was suggested at the time that the communal award, by which unfortunately a large section of our people swore, should not be made a ground for national opposition to the White Paper. The promoters of the Conference did not ask for approval of the award. They could not possibly do so, as they themselves were wholly opposed to it. But they recognised that no agreement could be reached on the political issue unless the communal question was excluded from the scope of the Conference, and therefore they proposed, much to their own regret, that every one would be left free to hold his own opinion on the question of minority representation and that a sort of Patriotic Front would be attempted only on the broad political questions, on which all communities were agreed.

* * *

Weak-kneed! Pusillanimous! cried Mr. Chagla. What is a political settlement worth unless it is based upon a communal settlement? Political liberty will not be worth a day's purchase if it is to be based upon communal electorates. We must fight the communal award first and only then the White Paper. And so on, and so forth. Sir Chimanlal Setalvad and others, who took a leading part in commending an All-Parties Conference to the country, very much appreciated this exuberant support of general electorates on the part of a young Muslim leader, but thought that he was ill-advised in pressing upon the Conference a question which would merely serve to wreck the Conference, with the certain result that the White Paper as well as the communal award would remain unmodified. But this reasoning left Mr. Chagla cold. He kept on exclaiming, Weak-kneed! Pusillanimous!

* * *

NOW the Congress says just what the Liberals said a few months ago, and Mr. Chagla is instantly and completely persuaded. He tries now to beat up support for the Congress in nationalist circles as against Pandit Malaviya and Mr. Aney in a statement which, it need hardly be said, has received wide publicity in the Congress press. Mr. Chagla says, after exposing the defects of the communal award: "But it is argued,"—and he forgot at the moment that he himself was unwearied in arguing in that way—"that the Congress should categorically and unequivocally reject the award. What is there in it, it is asked, which should find favour in the eyes of a nationalist organisation?" To such questioners Mr. Chagla's reply is, as Sir Chimanlal's was to Mr. Chagla himself: "But rightly or wrongly (Sir Chimanlal did not even make this qualification; he said definitely "wrongly"), the bulk of the Muslims have taken their stand by the award," and therefore even a nationalist organisation like the Congress has to accept a compromise. (Sir Chimanlal, be it remembered, did not suggest a compromise; he merely suggested that the Conference should for the time being side-step the communal issue.) To clinch the matter, as it were, Mr. Chagla adds: "Idealists in both the communities have cause to quarrel with this (Congress) decision. But idealism is as difficult to achieve in politics as a vacuum in nature." Whether it is so difficult or not to achieve idealism may be open to question, but it is certainly more difficult than—swimming with the current.

* * *

A Gift of Two Crores.

PROFESSOR K. V. RANGASWAMI IYENGAR in his fifth Sir William Meyer Endowment lecture in Madras on Saturday last observed as follows on the proposal for an all-India federation—

There is a feeling that responsible government in the Centre, and in the units, will be quickened only under a federal system. But there are also obvious disadvantages in Federalism, especially in its emphasis of local and political barriers, and a possible weakening of rationalisation schemes. Especially dangerous is the parochialism of the people in the various units which would place the Central Government in a position of helplessness. In India, Federalism, far from being a natural progression of political institutionalism, is an imposition, and it will be in the initial years at least an unstable association of peoples and personal rule. The inequalities within an Indian State will be perpetuated by the constitutional guarantees to the federating units, and monarchy and personal rule in the States may be stabilised.

It might therefore appear to be better to have a British Indian Central Government and autonomous provinces instead of a federal India. Again, fiscally speaking, the argument against federalisation is that while there is some kind of uniformity and equality among the provincial financial systems, between British India and the States, or among the States inter se there is none now. The inclusion of Rulers in the Federal governing bodies may, with exceptions, strengthen the forces of conservatism and reaction, as the number of progressive-minded princes is still not large. Therefore, it may become necessary to enforce standards of economic and administrative sufficiency on the States, a feature repugnant to the federal conception. It is also true that the terms demanded by the States rather suggest a confederation than a federation.

On the financial aspect of the federation, Prof. Rangaswami Iyengar remarked, "The Davidson Committee's recommendations come to this that the States will have a gift of nearly two crores from British India," and he added, "Opinion in British

India seems to be opposed to this heavy subsidising of the States."

The Detenus' Detention Bill.

IN the name of fighting terrorism, the Assembly was asked last week to agree to the following three things greatly restrictive of personal liberty: (1) detention of Bengali detenus without trial (2) outside their province and (3) their deprivation of the much valued right of habeas corpus. It is not as if such a highly objectionable demand made on the Assembly was dutifully satisfied by it for the first time. Action on these lines had indeed been approved by it two years ago though the approval held good only for three years. All that it was now requested to do was just to extend its help in perpetuating what it had sanctioned as a temporary measure. The procedure followed does great credit to the Government's ingenuity but none to the Assembly's reputation as the custodian of popular liberties.

There can of course be no difference of opinion among responsible people about terrorism being an evil which deserves to be banished from the land lock, stock and barrel. It is however the methods proposed to that end, about which official and non-official opinion will continue to hold widely differing views. It is obvious to a dispassionate observer that the policy of repression relentlessly pursued by Government towards the terrorist cult for nearly 30 years has not succeeded in stamping it out. Is it seriously believed that the permanent arming of the executive for an unlimited period with such arbitrary powers as are proposed in the new bill will work the miracle? But that is the view of the Government for which they have generally found too ready a supporter in the present Assembly. That however does not mean that the view is correct. It is time they realised the utter inutility of such coercive methods for the purpose they in common with the public have in view and saw the wisdom of adopting a policy of liberal and far-reaching political reform as a means of alienating public support from the revolutionaries.

THE existing law has still nine months' life left to it. Why should the Government, it may be asked, have rushed the Assembly into passing the new law in such a hurry? They might as well have waited till the new Assembly was constituted and was in working order, which would have been about the end of January. There would have been time enough even then to get the law passed if only the Government could be sure of their ability to convince it of the reasonableness of their demand. It cannot be doubted that no serious harm would have accrued if this course had been followed. Such a measure if passed by the new Assembly, which would be decidedly more representative, would doubtless have commanded a greater measure of public confidence. But the decisive consideration, from the Government's standpoint, perhaps is that it cannot be so easily induced into passing the new measure as the present docile one.

Disqualification of Congress Candidates.

UNDER the existing electoral rules nobody who has been convicted of an offence punishable with imprisonment of six months and more can offer himself for election until five years have elapsed from the date of the expiration of the sentence. Most of the Congressmen intending to enter the Assembly at the forthcoming election are labouring under this disqualification, which is an initial difficulty in their way. It is however open to the Government to

clear their path of this obstacle if they so choose. Will they exercise the discretion vested in them under the rules for the purpose of facilitating the entry of Congress men into the Assembly?

INFORMATION on the point was sought to be elicited by means of a question in the Assembly on a recent date; but the reply of the Government was as unenlightening as it could be. Beyond explaining the procedure for getting the disqualification removed, it gave no inkling as to their general attitude towards requests for such removal. It is easy enough to understand that the initiative in the matter of the removal of the ban must come from the candidates themselves. With the Congress pendulum now swinging towards unalloyed co-operation as seen from Mahatma Gandhi's recent utterance at Benares, the submission of such applications by Congressmen to their local Governments is not a difficult matter. Congressmen have by now pocketed their former pride so far as not to regard such a proceeding unthinkable. But the point is whether the Government is prepared to deal with such applications as if it was a mere formality or whether they will insist upon picking and choosing from such applicants.

IT is a pity that Government have been so long in defining their attitude in a clear-cut fashion. That correspondence with provincial Governments should still be in progress, as stated in the course of the reply, shows how painfully slowly the wheels of Government move even in important matters. What the upshot of all this epistolary consultation between the Central and Provincial Governments will be it is difficult to say. In any case we should be sorry if it led to the formulation of a policy which rendered any invidious distinctions between individuals and individuals possible. Congressmen as a class are either dangerous and must anyhow be kept out of the legislatures or they are not. In the latter case, which seems to be the present view of the Government, a policy of individual discrimination would be highly impolitic and unwise.

Floods in Assam.

ASSAM is at present in the grip of devastating floods, caused by unusually heavy rainfall. Owing to the interruption of communication at several places, it has not yet become possible to ascertain the extent of the damage caused by the floods. But the area affected apparently extends to hundreds of miles and the loss of cattle is said to be appallingly severe, the damage to property being not inconsiderable. The rise in the water was so sudden that the utmost that was possible was the saving of human life. Even so, some loss of life could not have been avoided. According to information supplied to the Assembly, about 15,000 families have been rendered homeless and are deprived of their means of livelihood. These will have to be provided with gratuitous relief for at least two months, help for a longer period being needed in worse affected cases. The situation, heart-rending as it is, is being grappled with indefatigably both by Government and the people. Apart from the provision of immediate relief, efforts are being directed towards procuring cattle and seed so as to enable re-sowing being undertaken at the earliest opportunity. Agricultural loans are also being arranged for and the suspension and remission of Government dues are under the serious consideration of the authorities. Facilities for the reconstruction of houses by allowing the free use of timber from Government forests are being afforded. In fact everything that is possible is already done or will be

done to set the affected areas on their feet again. But the task is too stupendous to be satisfactorily discharged by Assam single-handedly without liberal assistance, financial and otherwise, from outside. May it be hoped that charitably-disposed people from other provinces will rise to the occasion by offering generous donations towards the relief of the distressed? Help, to be really effective, must be immediately forthcoming.

Articles.

THE NATIONAL FRONT BROKEN.

THE Congress has forced Pandit Malaviya and Mr. Aney out of the Parliamentary Board, and in doing so, it has virtually forced the Hindu Mahasabha out of its own fold. If the Mahasabha were more narrowly communalistic than Muslims would be under the communal award this result would be welcomed by nationalists. But in the fight that is now going forward between the two communities, there is no question whatever that Hindus show a greater spirit of nationalism than Muslims; and every nationalist will deplore the so-called National Congress being more tender towards those who would perpetuate communal divisions than towards those who would heal them.

We can understand people being despondent about communal electorates being got rid of and therefore acquiescing in the British Government's communal decision, which, though unjust and anti-national, has the great merit of putting an end somehow to our internal dissensions. Some of the Liberal leaders frankly take up this attitude. They were the most accommodating of all in their negotiations with Muslims and others who asked for separate representation of their communities. They could not come to a mutual agreement on any terms which would be considered at all reasonable. A continuing disagreement, they saw, would block all future progress, and they felt further that they could get better terms if the British Government shouldered the responsibility of allocating the number of seats in the legislatures to different communities than by direct negotiations between the communities themselves. This was of course a very bitter experience that they had. They therefore decided to swallow the humiliation involved in the process and begged the Premier to take the question in his own hands. Having done so, there is no choice left for them now but to accept for the present the Premier's decision, however inequitable it may be, and for the rest to hope that at a suitable time in future it will be amended by agreement among the communities. They do not conceal from themselves or from others the fact that the chance of this coming about is very slender indeed, but they bow to the decision only because they think it is inevitable.

One cannot resist the impression, when one reflects on the turns and twists in the Congress policy in this respect, that the Congress leaders also are at heart utterly despondent about their being able in the near future to modify the communal award and that they are prepared in practice to accept it for an indefinite length of time. If a Constituent Assembly which they envisage could be relied upon to change the award, they would obviously have no compunction in rejecting it now along with the White Paper. But they do not reject it because they are conscious that they will have to abide by it. Why else would they regard the possibility of some nationalist member of the Assembly tabling a resolution disapproving

the award as deplorable? And why would they prohibit a Congress member voting in favour of such a resolution, if one was moved in the Assembly? Mahatma Gandhi is now said to have made a concession in this respect only to two individuals. In the generosity of his heart he is, we are told, "even prepared to give freedom of conscience" to Pandit Malaviya and Mr. Aney to vote in favour of a condemnatory resolution. Every other Congressman is under orders to vote against it and, if possible, defeat it, even if in doing so they have to run counter to their own conscience!! If this is not acceptance of the communal award we wonder what is.

In rejecting the White Paper, we reject the communal award by implication; why, then, do you want a specific resolution rejecting the award? the Congress asks. It is just because of the wobbling to which the Congress takes recourse. If a Congressman is bound to vote in favour of the rejection of the White Paper, why should he be bound to vote against the rejection of the communal award? This shows that the Congress does not treat all the parts of the White Paper on the same footing. Some of them are acceptable to it, others not. Apparently, the communal award, like the extension of the franchise, is acceptable to the Congress, and that is why those who are opposed to it ask for a separate resolution expressing condemnation of the communal award. In this they are surely right, and the more the Congress quibbles about it, the more will suspicion grow that the Congress will not lift its little finger against the award either now or at any time in future.

We have never been able to understand why the Congress is raising a nest of hornets about its ears unnecessarily. It rejects the White Paper; why should it not say, it rejects the communal award too? Who will be offended by it? The Nationalist Muslims? They are Nationalist indeed if they feel disapproval of such an anti-national decision like a blow to themselves! The communal Muslims? But how is it incumbent upon the Congress to keep them in a pleasant mood? If the Congress must refuse to reject the communal award because the Muslims like it, similarly it should refuse to reject the White Paper, because all sorts of toadies and flunkies like it. Why, the communal Muslims are against rejection of the White Paper too. But the Congress does not alter its policy on that account. Why should it alter its policy in regard to the communal award because they are against its rejection?

For fear of alienating a handful of Nationalist Muslims (whose nationalism often requires quite a big opera-glass to see), the Congress has chosen to alienate the whole Hindu community, just that community which has made untold sacrifices in the past in the interest of the Congress. Probably the Mahatma feels that there is not much driving power left in Pandit Malaviya and that the Pandit and Mr. Aney will do nothing more than record a platonic dissent and can therefore be safely ignored. Mahatma Gandhi may be soon disillusioned about this. The Hindu community will be forced to carry on a militant and aggressive propaganda against the Congress candidates, and its representatives in the Assembly will be compelled to bring up a resolution recording the country's opposition to the communal award. The resolution will perhaps be thrown out by the combined strength of the official and Congress benches; but it will, first, expose the Congress as an ally of the bureaucracy and, secondly, afford complete justification to the British Government who have imposed the communal decision upon the country. It is a most serious political blunder on the part of the Congress.

SETTLEMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES.

DURING the recent textile strike in Bombay, the Local Government were several times urged to intervene in the dispute by appointing a Board of Conciliation or a Court of Enquiry under the Trade Disputes Act, but they obstinately refused to do so. They appeared to consider that their only duty was to imprison the leaders of the strike and stop meetings and processions. They ordered a fact-finding inquiry, but after the facts were investigated, they refused to arrange for recommendations being made by an impartial tribunal. It seems that the Government now realise that their duty does not end with maintaining law and order at any cost. In order to show that they are alive to their duty towards the workers, the industry and the public, they propose to bring before the Legislative Council a Bill providing a special machinery to inquire into industrial disputes and to make efforts to bring about their settlement. Let it be made clear that Government cannot pretend that their failure to intervene in the dispute in the past was due to want of a suitable machinery for starting conciliation proceedings. The proposed Bill provides for hardly anything of essence which could not be done under the existing Trade Disputes Act.

The basic proposals of the new Bill are that Government are to appoint conciliators charged with the duty of making an effort to bring about agreement in an industrial dispute and make a report to Government regarding the result. An obligation has been imposed upon the conciliator that if either one of the parties to the dispute or the Labour Officer appointed under the legislation suggests that he should take proceedings for the settlement of the dispute and if the conciliator is satisfied that a dispute exists or is apprehended, he shall issue notices to the parties to appear before him and that on the day fixed by him he shall hold such proceedings. If this is intended to be the foundation of the Bill it is a sound foundation in principle. It is the duty of a civilised Government to maintain peace in industry and when the peace is disturbed or threatened, it is their duty to intervene and make an effort to bring about conciliation. The Bombay Government must be congratulated upon its readiness to assume this responsibility and obligation. It is hoped that the Government of India will follow this lead. The present Trade Disputes Act has proved almost a dead letter on account of its failing to impose this obligation upon the Governments concerned. There is an omission in the proposals of the Government of Bombay inasmuch as there is no time limit fixed for holding conciliation proceedings after receipt of the application, nor for making a report to Government. If a conciliator causes unnecessary delay in taking action, such delay is likely to give an advantage to one of the parties to the dispute and the impartiality of the conciliator is likely to be challenged. In order to avoid this unfortunate result, the legislation should provide that within seven days from receipt of the application the

conciliator shall issue notices to the parties and within a fortnight or even earlier the first report shall be sent to Government. If within the time-limit prescribed a settlement is not arrived at it will be always open to the conciliator to call the parties again and make a further report.

Usually there are three parties to a conciliation proceedings, upon whose co-operation and good-will their success depends, viz. the conciliator and the two parties to the dispute. The present Bill adds one more party, viz. the Labour Officer. The provisions of the Bill necessitate that the conciliator's appointment shall be permanent or continuous. He will have the status of a public servant. It is necessary under the present circumstances that the conciliator should be a whole-time paid officer. In the textile industry in Bombay to which the provisions of the Bill will be applied in the first instance, neither the workers nor the employers are properly organised and there are no standardised conditions of work, with the result that occasions for the use of the provisions of the Bill will be numerous. The number of disputes in which stoppage of work takes place is at present large. But besides the cases where actual stoppage of work takes place, there are often more cases where there is a dispute but the workers do not resort to a stoppage of work for fear of the risks involved, but in which the need for a just settlement is as desirable as in those cases where actual stoppage takes place. As the success of the conciliation machinery depends upon the personality of the conciliator, it is necessary to lay down in the legislation itself certain qualifications such as knowledge and experience of economic, social and legal matters as a guide to the appointing authorities. The conciliator must not be one who has any pecuniary interest in the industry concerned and he should be required to take an oath of impartiality. It should also be provided that the appointment should be made after consultation with the organisations representing the workers and the employers.

The parties to the dispute are to be represented by delegates to be elected separately by the workers and the employers concerned. The Bill permits the Labour Officer to be elected a delegate by the workers. For other delegates it lays down personal disqualifications such as conviction for an offence, insolvency and age below twenty-one. The obvious object of Government in mentioning these disqualifications is to exclude the so-called extremist labour leaders. Moreover the conciliator is given the power of disqualifying any one as a delegate. These disqualifying provisions will only frustrate the object for which the delegates are to be elected. The conciliation proceedings are undertaken with a twofold object. Firstly, they are intended to arrive at an agreement acceptable to both the disputing parties and, secondly, if an agreement is not arrived at pressure of public opinion is sought to be so exerted as to compel the parties to be reasonable in

the light of the report of the conciliator, which may make it clear which party has obstructed agreement. If the object of laying down such disqualifications as will exclude extremist leaders is to make an agreement possible, let it be remembered that an agreement arrived at with delegates who do not properly represent and who have no influence with the workers is not of much value and will not be accepted by the workers who are one of the principal parties to the dispute. Nor will the public exert its influence if it knows that the agreement in question was not arrived at with the delegates in whom the workers have confidence. Curiously enough, the Bill expressly frees the Labour Officer from the disability attaching to other delegates on account of these disqualifications but it does not disqualify a conciliator from holding his post even if he is convicted or becomes an insolvent.

The Labour Officer has also been given a definite position in the conciliation proceedings under the proposed Bill, which is a novel feature. Though a Government Officer, he is permitted to be elected a workers' delegate. Where he is not a delegate but the workers are otherwise represented by delegates, the Labour Officer is to be present personally, the object of his presence being that he may be useful as an adviser or helper to the conciliator. In cases where the workers refuse to elect delegates, the Labour Officer will take his place as the workers' delegate. This last is obviously an infructuous provision. The Bill does not provide for compulsory arbitration so that an agreement arrived at against the wishes of any one of the parties can be imposed upon it. An agreement arrived at with the Labour Officer as the delegate of the workers is not likely to be accepted by the workers. The only compulsory part in the proceedings that is proposed in the Bill will be that there will be an inquiry, for which the presence of the Labour Officer will be available as an independent expert. Moreover the conciliator has power to compel the attendance of and examine any person on oath, which is sufficient for the purpose of inquiry.

To incite persons not to take part in the conciliation proceedings or to obstruct or to incite others to obstruct the conciliator is made an offence punishable with a very heavy sentence. This provision also is not likely to produce a desirable result. The chief intention of the Bill is to arrive at a voluntary agreement between parties and a provision of this kind is not in consonance with the spirit of free will. For the purpose of an inquiry, which alone is compulsory, the positive provision to compel attendance and examination of any person should be sufficient. Moreover the sentence provided for conviction is too drastic.

It is necessary to point out that some of the provisions of the Bill, which are aimed at the extremists and communists such as the disqualification of the delegates, power given to the Labour Officer to act as a labour delegate against the wishes of the workers and the heavy punishment of those who would advocate the boycott of the proceedings, are likely to

have the undesirable effect of not only making the workers hostile to the proceedings in a particular case but also against the whole machinery of conciliation. This is playing into the hands of the extremists and communists.

There is one provision in the Bill which is not directly concerned with conciliation proceedings, viz. the duty imposed upon the Labour Officer generally to watch the interests of the workmen and to represent their grievances to employers for the purpose of obtaining redress. Really speaking, this does not require legislative provision. To invest the Labour Officer with power to enter any place used for the purpose of any trade or industry or enter any residential premises provided by the employer for the workers and to call for and inspect any documents from the employers or workers does not require legislative sanction. But the usefulness of such a provision can only be tested by experience. Ordinarily the employers are not likely to refuse facilities necessary to the Labour Officer appointed by Government. Such refusal is the least likely to happen in the textile industry in Bombay where the Bombay Millowners' Association in dealing with the workers. Ordinarily the workers or their organisations will also not refuse to give information or documents to the Labour Officer. But in view of the fact that members of trade unions are selected for victimisation by employers and by Government for prosecution for sedition, picketing, illegally holding public meetings and processions, any attempt by the Labour Officer to seek information against the wishes of the members of a trade union is likely to create suspicion about his motives and instead of being regarded as a protector, as is intended by the legislation, he will be looked upon with feelings of hostility. It will, therefore, be wise not to put the Labour Officer in a difficult position by investing him with power to call for information and documents from the workmen. The one-sided power to call for information and documents from the employers alone can be justified by the existing relations between the employers and Government and the workers and Government. In any case the Labour Officer will have to be very careful if he wishes to succeed in doing his duties as a protector of persons who otherwise may not appreciate his efforts in their behalf.

While reviewing a legislative proposal for conciliation it is necessary to determine its exact place in the scheme for industrial peace. The object of this measure is first to bring together the two parties to an existing or an immediately threatened dispute with a view to settlement and, if that object fails, to put the public in the way of correct appreciation of the situation so that pressure of public opinion may be exercised to bring round the recalcitrant party to a position of reasonableness. The Bill provides for a formal inquiry and formal proceedings for the settlement of a dispute. The experience of the world is that very often formal proceedings are not as suitable for the settlement of a dispute as informal proceedings. Formal proceedings can only begin at

a very late stage either after the dispute has led to a stoppage of work or when the stoppage is imminent and bitterness has already been created. Moreover the atmosphere of formal proceedings inevitably involves publicity and red tapeism. Both these circumstances are not suitable for settlement. On the other hand informal proceedings can be quietly begun at a much earlier stage. Realising this, the Royal Commission on Indian Labour recommended the appointment of conciliation officers at least in Bombay and Calcutta to do the informal work. It is not clear what the intentions of the Bombay Government are. Is it intended that the conciliator, before beginning formal proceedings at a late stage, should remain always watchful and informally lend his help in the interests of peace? It requires to be seriously considered whether the same Officer who has informally interested himself in a case at an earlier stage can with propriety or effectiveness act as the presiding authority in more formal later proceedings. It is not also clear whether the intentions of the Government are to use the Labour officer for this informal and earlier work. But here again it will be very difficult for the Labour Officer to reconcile the two functions of his, viz. as the protector and representative of Labour and as an officer whose duty is to bring about conciliation as an impartial third party.

Lastly, to view the present legislative effort in its proper perspective it must not be forgotten that the most important thing is to create and maintain a right atmosphere for peace in an industrial organisation. Without going into the fundamental question of the proper organisation of an industry, whether it should be on a capitalistic or socialistic basis, it must be brought to the notice of Government and the public that the suggestions made by the Royal Commission on Indian Labour in this respect have not received the consideration which they deserve. They have pointed out that the lack of contact between the employers and the employees and their differences in race and language, due to the interposition of the Agency System between the directors and the managers, are some of the main causes of labour unrest. It is not unreasonable or unpractical to insist that not only those who have to manage the factory and supervise workers but even those who are responsible employers should learn the language of the majority of their employees, that the majority if not the whole of responsible managerial and supervising staff shall belong to the classes which are akin to the employees and that the Agency System condemned on all hands shall be abolished. The Royal Commission have recommended the formation of works committees and industrial councils as means of establishing contact between the workers and their employers. The policy of keeping the ring free is not adequate. The proposed Trade Disputes Conciliation Bill, faulty though it is in many respects, is sound in its main principles and if it is an indication of the recognition by the Bombay Government of their wider and special responsibility towards the working classes, there is room for hope. It is a great wrong

not only to keep the working classes in a position of ignorance and helplessness but to lay on them the heavy hand of the machinery of law and order and then to refuse to take full responsibility for maintaining industrial peace. May we say that the Bombay Government now recognise that it is a crime to act in such a way?

N. M. JOSHI.

ZANZIBAR INDIAN IMPASSE.

THE indignation aroused by the recent anti-Indian legislation in Zanzibar has found forceful expression during the last month at numerous public meetings held in this country and in writings in the press. It has also been echoed in the Legislative Assembly, though with little practical effect. The sympathy of the Government of India with Zanzibar Indians has never been in doubt. What however is not equally clear is, what can be done by the Government here to bring succour to them. Their request even for mere suspension of the operation of the hated legislation has failed to produce the desired effect, and the Government of India could not well ask for anything more in view of the meagreness of information available. This difficulty will be very largely removed when, as seems to be intended, Sir Maharaj Singh submits a detailed report on the Indian situation in Zanzibar after a personal study on the spot. The Government's decision must naturally await such detailed information.

Some relevant facts connected with the Zanzibar situation may here be conveniently set out. It is a protectorate nominally under the sway of the Arab Sultan, but actually administered by the British Resident under the orders of the British Cabinet. He is assisted in his task by an executive council consisting wholly of officials. The protectorate can as well boast of a legislative council with a membership of 17, two of whom are Indians. Need it be stated that their very small number militates against their voice carrying any weight in the councils of the protectorate? The Indian population numbers about 15,000, more than half of whom are permanently settled there. The principal industry of the island is the clove industry. Since Zanzibar has to its credit 80 per cent. of the world's production of cloves, it may be said to be more or less enjoying a monopoly in this commodity. It is in the fitness of things, therefore, that the clove industry should have attracted to itself Indian intellect and Indian capital, nearly a crore of which is said to be invested in it. The actual cultivator or the tiller of the soil is, however, not the Indian but the Arab or the African, for whose protection the new legislation, which has caused such a furore in the Zanzibar Indian community, purports to have been passed so hurriedly, in view of the approach of the clove season beginning from July 1st. Our countrymen seem to occupy, in relation to the cultivators, the position of financiers, making them advances of money on the security of their land. Except on this supposition it is difficult to understand how their interests could be prejudicially affected by the new legislation.

Notwithstanding the fact that the legislation affects Indian interests vitally, its full text is not yet available to the public in this country. But an idea of its contents can be formed from the following summary of its provisions borrowed from the *East African Standard*. According to this summary,

The most important provision is a moratorium of twelve months in respect of all mortgages, prohibition of alienation of Arab or African land without the permission of the Resident, and limitation of the period of mortgages to twenty years. In any event no mortgagee can under any circumstances get a title to the land, even if the mortgagor does not pay, and may only have the use of it for a maximum period of two decades. Another Ordinance sets up a new Clove Growers' Association with power to organise the marketing of cloves and to lend such revenue as accrues from an export levy on cloves and from other sources to the grower either on short term against crops or for maximum periods of fifteen years on a fixed repayment basis. Other Ordinances penalise the adulteration of cloves and provide for proper grading and inspection. It is also proposed by the new legislation to prohibit the granting of credit by tradesmen to Arabs or Africans.

The justification for the new Decrees is thus stated:

The reason for these emergency measures, which Government intends to implement at once, is the danger to the indigenous population and to the main industry of Zanzibar—agriculture—threatened by an increasing transfer of Arab and African land to moneylenders who are at present foreclosing because, owing to the depressed price of cloves, the producer is unable to pay his interest on loans. Behind the legislation is also the intention of Government to use all means in its power, including standardisation of quality, to raise the price of cloves (Zanzibar still having a virtual monopoly) to a point which gives the producer an adequate return but is low enough to discourage the development of competitive synthetic processes.

There is already a Clove Growers' Association, but it is proposed to reorganise and strengthen the organisation, giving it statutory powers, and in doing so to make provision for loans to producers which may help to break the stranglehold of the moneylender. At the same time the effect of the legislation will be to bring Zanzibar into line with the mainland by preserving the Native land for the Native owner. The endeavour of the Government to protect the producer against the extreme effects of the depression and to keep him on the land is, of course, of great interest to all primary producers in East Africa.

It may be hoped that the above quotations will have prominently brought out the emergency character of the legislation—an aspect which seems to have escaped notice altogether in recent discussions. It will also be seen that there is an almost disconcerting similarity in the situation with which the primary producer in India and Zanzibar finds himself face to face in the present economic crisis. The abnormal fall in prices of his produce has hit him so hard that he is unable to meet his obligations even by way of interest payment and runs the serious risk of losing his land to his creditor. It will be generally agreed that it is as necessary to avert this calamity in Zanzibar as in India. Among the emergency measures to this end popularly advocated in this country figure a demand for a moratorium not only in regard to all interest and debt payments to the creditor on the part of the agriculturist debtor but even in regard to the execution of court decrees against him. Be it noted that such

proposals are championed not by some irresponsible, unpractical, inexperienced and hot-headed youths but by responsible public leaders, some of whom have been adopted as Congress candidates in the forthcoming elections to the Assembly. In these circumstances it behoves us to ponder over the Zanzibar situation and dispassionately consider whether all the censure that is showered on the Zanzibar Government is well merited. From the information so far available, they seem to have done nothing for the protection of the Arab and African agriculturist beyond what has been so insistently demanded for that of the Indian peasant. Their action is sure to have some unpleasant repercussions on the fortunes of those who have lent money to the Zanzibar peasant, and these include a number of our countrymen. But would it be right for that reason to pillory the Zanzibar Government for promptly taking the very action for safeguarding the cultivator which is so vociferously demanded in India? Far from holding that Government up to blame, should not its spontaneous action in the interest of the man on the land evoke our admiration? And should we not exploit their worthy example for the purpose of urging the Indian Government to take similar measures? If the Zanzibar Government's recent action strikes any unbiassed observer in this light, one does not know how he can be blamed for it. In our anxiety to prevent injury to the interests of our countrymen we must not disregard those of the voiceless and downtrodden native who is unable to look after himself and deserves every consideration at our hands. After all he is the son of the soil and as such his interests must receive preponderating weight from all concerned. Does the Zanzibar Government's action stand this test?

AN UNBIASSED OBSERVER.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, July 13.

THE PROGRAMME.

I SHOULD imagine that the one matter upon which certain elements in this country, and almost every one of importance in India, would be at the most complete variance would be that of the time factor. Every one of recent Indian experience, and many others who have been sufficiently progressive and open to receive new impressions, but whose terms of service in India expired some years ago, are unanimous, to the surprise of diehards, reactionaries, and ultra-Conservatives at home, that the time factor is of the utmost importance. That, indeed, is the burden of a very important article in to-day's *Spectator*, by Lord Meston, entitled "The Dangers of Delay." He commits himself therein to the view that the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms themselves were long overdue, and the following sentences with which he concludes are significant: "It has always been a reproach that, in the matter of political progress, our gifts to India have come too late. We were certainly too late in recognizing the spirit typified by the National Congress. We should not have

waited for the war to start the advance embodied in the Act of 1919. If any further avoidable delay in dealing with the White Paper adds a third such error to our record, the result will be sheer calamity. There is still time for the Prime Minister and Lord Dunsford to avert it." Lord Meston is insistent, therefore, that the Joint Select Committee and the Cabinet would be wise not to allow very much longer time to elapse in producing their Report and legislation thereon.

I have reason, on very good authority, to believe that, so far at least as the Cabinet are concerned, they are most anxious, both upon grounds of Indian policy and upon purely party considerations, to get the India Bill through by the middle of next year. They have no desire whatever that the question of India should become a complicating issue at the time of the next General Election, whenever that should be held, and it cannot be later than October, 1936. It is improbable that the Report of the Joint Select Committee will be produced before the first half of November next, and Parliament will therefore merely adjourn next Tuesday and complete the session with a further sitting in extension of the present one, and opening about the middle of October. In accordance with Mr. Baldwin's promise, immediately the Report is published, he will have to consult his Party colleagues and the Party in general, and that will undoubtedly be a critical occasion. A Bill will issue almost immediately and will be without delay introduced in the new session of Parliament that will open about the beginning of December, and the Government hope to get their second reading before Parliament rises for the Christmas vacation.

There is, of course, many a slip in these matters. There may be more opposition within the Conservative Party than is anticipated in official Tory quarters. The local Conservative organisations, especially in the Provinces, are often more backward and less well-informed, as well as more liable to be misled. Unless, however, the Government can be reasonably sure, as they claim at present to be, of the allegiance of a majority of their followers in the House, they are almost certain to be faced with the gravest crisis in the House of Lords. The diehard Tory element there would be negligible were it not for the fact that upon occasions when what they consider to be the fundamental structure of the Empire is at stake, large numbers of Peers who ordinarily do not attend can be whipped up to take part in the proceedings of the Upper Chamber for the defeat even of a Government Bill. In these circumstances it is obvious that, not only for Party considerations, the Government must go very warily if it wishes to carry Parliament with it, and it seems almost certain, therefore, that in order to conciliate the largest possible proportion of the Tory Party, and with an eye to Tory solidarity at the next General Election (upon which, as he said at Bewdsey Mr. Baldwin is obviously counting, in order to defeat Labour) certain concessions will have to be made.

The best information that I can gather is to the effect that such concessions, if made, will not go to the structure of the White Paper proposals, but may very easily go to certain quite important details thereof, of which I have already given an indication in my recent letters. If my information is correct, and it is confirmed in a number of quarters, there is likely to be indirect election for the Central Legislature, and it is just possible, though no decision may have been yet taken on the question, the size of that Legislature will be rather on the small than on the large side. As a safeguard against hasty legislation, it is quite likely that in most of the Provinces there will be provision for two Houses of the Legislature, but I gather almost certainly that

law and order will not be reserved, though there may be some general provision conferring upon the Governor special powers in regard to the C. I. D. All this, of course, is in the realm of hearsay. No one has any exact knowledge. The Joint Select Committee is maintaining a very strict reserve, and in fact is understood not to have reached final conclusions on a number of major issues. In official circles generally ignorance of the probable result of the present discussions is quite properly professed. There is, however, with the exception of reactionary Press circles which have set up deliberately to fog the issues and mislead the public, a general consensus of opinion in well-informed non-official circles, based upon numerous small indications, all pointing in a particular direction. And, on the whole, I think it may be taken that the above forecast will not be very far out.

MAHATMA GANDHI AND THE PUBLIC.

For a man who has lost his influence with the Indian public, as such papers as the *Daily Express* are fond of alleging, it is quite astonishing how often he has been referred to and what a lot of space his doings have occupied in this week's British Press. Thus, one paper suggests that he refused to give interviews to Pressmen in Lahore unless he received payment therefor, obviously to be applied to the uses of his Harijan work. Another paper refers to certain episodes during his Harijan tour, in which he is described as having persuaded various persons either to part with or to bid for jewellery for the same purposes. In a third his arrival in Calcutta is described. In a fourth speculation is raised as to what he will do when his year of grace as a non-politician comes to an end in the first week in August. In a fifth again his influence upon Congress policy is discussed, whilst a sixth publishes a review of Mr. Hoyland's verse rendering of Gandhiji's translations of devotional hymns and prayers made whilst in jail in 1930. It is not a bad record and if, as a writer in yet another paper has declared, the Mahatma has a true artist's eye for the uses of advertisement and the advantages of propaganda, he can be well satisfied to the extent to which he is brought before the public eye by these extra authorities on news-values. If anything more were wanted, there is a standing advertisement of one of the Mahatma's well-known domestic idiosyncracies in the shape of a herd of white goats tethered just outside Henley-on-Thames, along beside the Oxford Road. So that Miss Muriel Lester, Miss Agatha Harrison, and Mirabai can be sure of securing news space for their friendly and affectionate references to Gandhiji.

OF INTEREST TO INDIA.

Lord Willingdon was made the object yesterday of malicious attacks in the *Morning Post* and other connected papers for his supposed responsibility for the death of "Ranji." The late Maharaja of Nawanagar, it is suggested, died as a direct consequence of the humiliations imposed upon him on the last occasion that he attended the Chamber of Princes by the Viceroy. This suggestion is strongly resented by those who are acquainted with the circumstances of the incident and all the surrounding circumstances. But, of course, from the point of view of the *Morning Post* any stick is good enough to beat an avowed supporter of the White Paper, or indeed of any scheme of Indian constitutional reform, and this would be especially true as regards one who has allowed the prohibited phrase "Dominion Status" repeatedly to pass his lips.

This week the Centenary of the Act of Parliament for the emancipation of slaves and the abolition of the legal institution of slavery within the British Empire, was celebrated by the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society, at a luncheon presid-

ed over by the Speaker of the House of Commons, and at which the other speakers were Sir John Simon and two other Cabinet Ministers. The occasion was one of the highest significance and large numbers of people deeply interested in Negro welfare were present. The *Daily Express* contains a cartoon to-day, showing how a century after Negro emancipation the people of this country are enslaved to fear and economic necessity. It is a fair, if bitter, comment upon the state of the world to-day.

Sir Chimanlal Setalvad arrived in London on private and professional business on Saturday. He is looking very well and has pointed out to a *News-Chronicle* interviewer the greatest importance of proceeding without delay to give India complete self-government. He is reported to have said: "Britain must choose between political power and trade in India. Let her give up the one and she keeps the other. Let her cling to both and she loses both. It is a grievous mistake to provide too many safeguards against possible abuse of the Constitution by India. No safeguards will be effective without good will. Trust India."

Miscellaneous.

CONGRESS ELECTION MANIFESTO.

The following election manifesto which was approved by the Congress Parliamentary Board at its meeting in Benares last week has been issued to the press.

THE Parliamentary Board appointed by the A.I.C.C. at its meeting at Patna on May 19, appeals to the voters for the Legislative Assembly at the forthcoming elections to record their votes in favour of Congress candidates.

Congress policy has been declared. The Board has received its mandate from the Working Committee in the resolution passed by that body at Bombay on 18th June.

THE COMMUNAL AWARD.

After quoting this resolution, the Manifesto continues:—

"Though much has been written for and against that part of the resolution which relates to the so-called Communal Award, the line is absolutely clear so far as Congress candidates are concerned. By common consent it is intrinsically bad. It is anti-national. But the Congress cannot refuse to take into account the attitude of Mussalmans in general who seem to want the Award; nor can the Congress accept it as Hindus and Sikhs reject it. No other policy than that explained above is consistent with the aim and history of the Congress, which has throughout stood for peace and unity and has founded all its activities on the firm belief that the various communities of India will act justly and honourably towards one another.

The only thing, therefore, which Congress candidates and the Congress can do is to promote and assist in securing an agreed solution. Suffice it to say that we shall never reach such an agreed solution by appealing to a third party or power. Then again those who have confidence about successful opposition to the White Paper proposals need not feel concerned about the Award. They should know that if the White Paper lapses, the Award, which was framed for the White Paper, must automatically lapse. If the Award is bad, the White Paper is worse. The Parliamentary Board has, therefore, to concentrate the attention of the voters on the rejection of the White Paper, and, as the only

alternative to it, upon securing the convocation of a Constituent Assembly.

THE WHITE PAPER.

The White Paper is in no way designed to secure complete or even partial Independence. It can easily retard the nation's progress towards it. It proposes a costly pretence of representative institutions in India, while all real control will be retained abroad. The safeguards with which it bristles are not conceived for the protection of the interests of India. On the contrary, they can be easily shown to prevent its economic progress, to deepen the poverty of the masses and perpetuate the British exploitation of and domination over India. If the proposals contained in the White Paper are carried out there will be no national control over the army or external affairs and the burden of military expenditure will remain what it has been, and in effect foreign control will continue over finance, and the fiscal and economic policy of India. If it be said that the proposals at least seek to give complete autonomy in the provinces, that is hedged in by restrictions which make it a sham and a shadow. No wonder that almost all parties have more or less condemned the White Paper scheme. What is the alternative? Though Congress claims to represent the whole nation in opinion, to the Government it is only one of the political parties, albeit very powerful. Time will show what the position of the Congress is in the country. The votes at the forthcoming elections also may show it somewhat. But it is clear that the Congress must not frame any constitution only to be rejected by Government.

The Working Committee has, therefore, as stated above, suggested an infallible alternative—a Constituent Assembly to be elected on the basis of adult suffrage or as near it as may be. We know such an Assembly can be convened only by agreement between the governing powers and the people unless it be after a successful revolution. We have in contemplation the former. We do not despair of its acceptance if the electors choose their representatives in the forthcoming elections with a clear mandate that the Constituent Assembly is the only alternative to the White Paper. The existing franchise is narrow and, therefore, not truly representative of the masses. The constitution of the Assembly is further such that members elected by the people cannot play an effective part in it. Nevertheless, if the verdict of the electorate is unequivocal, it cannot be flouted.

If the voters reject the White Paper and insist on the Constituent Assembly, it will no longer be said by the British bureaucracy that the people are quite satisfied with the methods and measures of the British Government and whatever they plan for them. It will be no small gain to have the illusion dispelled. Every vote for the Congress candidate, that is for the Constituent Assembly in place of the White Paper, will be a help to clear the atmosphere. We hope that all communities will unite on this simple issue.

REPRESSIVE POLICY.

The rejection of the White Paper and acceptance of the Constituent Assembly are not all that Congress representatives will attempt. They cannot be unmindful of reactionary legislation passed during the past few years, unhappily often with elected members' votes. Nor can they be unmindful of the way in which the non-violent struggle for liberty was met by ordinances of extraordinary severity, of the great sacrifices of thousands of Congressmen, including many women who went to prison, suffered privations and lathi charges and confiscation of property. It will be the duty of those Congress

candidates who are elected to press for restoration wherever possible and repeal of repressive laws and of ordinances now called Acts of the legislature. The extraordinarily drastic methods adopted towards Congress organisations in the Frontier Province will demand their special attention. It will also be their duty to demand an impartial scrutiny of methods adopted by the Government in the Assembly for the purpose of meeting terrorism and take measures to give effect to public opinion with regard to them.

The Congress Parliamentary Party will miss no opportunity of rendering such national service, be it small or great, as is possible through the Legislatures. We are fully aware that the powers of the Legislatures, Provincial and Central, are small and the nation must make an effort outside them for the realisation of its goal of Complete Independence. The constructive programme of the Congress, the successful prosecution of which alone can make our demand irresistible, can most effectively be carried on only outside the Legislatures. But there are matters which can only be dealt with through the Legislatures and which will engage the attention of the Congress Party.

ECONOMIC POLICY.

In order to end the exploitation of the masses, political freedom must include real economic freedom for the starving millions. The economic policy of the Party will, therefore, be in accordance with the Fundamental Rights and the Economic Programme contained in the Karachi Resolution of the All-India Congress Committee.

The Board, therefore, appeals to voters to show unmistakably that they stand for the Congress methods and objective and that they condemn the present bureaucratic rule and its methods.

CONGRESS WORKING COMMITTEE'S RESOLUTIONS.

The following resolutions were passed by the Working Committee of the Congress at its meeting held at Benares last week:

DISCIPLINE AMONG CONGRESSMEN.

THE Committee is of opinion that all Congressmen, whether they believe in the Congress programme and policies or not, are expected, and office-bearers and members of the Executive are in honour bound, to carry them out and that office-bearers and members of the executive who carry on propaganda or act against the Congress programme and policies are in accordance with rules made by the A. I. C. C. dated May 24, 1929, clearly guilty of breach of discipline and liable to disciplinary action.

ILLEGAL ELECTION METHODS.

The Committee has noted with deep regret that practices have crept into Congress election methods, which are reprehensible and even calculated to invalidate elections. Such, for instance, is the habit of some parties of making members by paying them fees with the only object of securing their votes, whereas the object of enrolling members is to keep them in touch with and interest them in the Congress programme and take from them such national service as they may be capable of doing.

The practice has also grown up in some places of candidates buying for the occasion sufficient khaddar to clothe temporarily voters for the purpose of complying with the relevant clause of the constitution, whereas that clause requires that voters should be habitual wearers of khaddar. The Working Committee has no doubt that such practice is illegal and

defeats the very end for which the khaddar clause was introduced. Election boards and presiding authorities are to invalidate the votes of those who are manifestly not habitual wearers of khaddar.

NO REFLECTION ON SOCIALISTS.

Regarding the misunderstanding created by the Working Committee's resolution of June 18 on Socialists, the Committee passed the following resolution:—

"Complaints have been made to the Working Committee that the resolution referred to above is a reflection upon the newly formed Congress Socialist Party and its programme. The Working Committee desires it to be known that the resolution was not intended to criticise any party or its programme, but intended to affect individuals engaged in loose talk referred to in the resolution.

KHADI AND SWADESHI.

Doubts having arisen on the Congress policy with regard to Swadeshi it becomes necessary to reaffirm the Congress position on it in unequivocal terms. Notwithstanding what was done during the civil resistance struggle, no competition is permissible on Congress platforms and in Congress exhibitions between mill-made cloth and hand-spun and hand-woven khadi. Congressmen are expected to use and encourage only hand-spun and hand-woven khadi to the exclusion of any other cloth.

Regarding articles other than cloth, the Committee adopted Mr. Gandhi's formula, which has been more than once discussed in the press.

SHIPPING SUBSIDY.

The Steel Protection Bill was introduced in the Legislative Assembly on Tuesday last. Mr. N. M. Joshi, the representative of Labour, was prevented by illness in the family from taking part in the debate on that occasion. But we seem to hear an echo of his speech that he would have then made in the extract, quoted below, from a speech made by Sir Stafford Cripps, Solicitor-General in the former Labour Government, in the House of Commons on 10th July in setting forth the Labour Party's objections to the Government's decision to give a subsidy of two million pounds to British tramp steamers for one year. Sir Stafford suggests, it will be observed, nationalisation of the Mercantile Marine and, if this is considered impracticable, stipulation for improvement of labour conditions as an integral part of the grant of a subsidy.

"IT would be far simpler for this House to say that we will take over responsibility for the continuance of this essential national service, fix the price of the service to be supplied so as to give the maximum service we desire to render, and so make our financial plans or arrangements that those who work this service shall be assured of a profit and a fair share of the national wealth. That would be a far simpler proposition than to try, through the indirect channels of profit, to assure the same results. Once one attempts to re-allocate by subsidy the national wealth one inevitably gets into the critical and crucial difficulties which have been experienced all over the world in the operation of subsidies. If one adopted the far more simple method, one would be adopting the direct method of Socialism. That is why the Right Hon. Gentleman (President of the Board of Trade) says that there is such an arguable case for Socialism when one is dealing particularly with what is, and must be, substantially treated as a monopoly as soon as one introduces the element of subsidy.

"The absolute necessity for attaching to any subsidy the most stringent conditions as regards the condition and earnings of the workers who are working in the subsidised industry is another aspect of the question of a subsidy which is of very vital importance indeed. We have protested time after time in this House against subsidies being given with no conditions attached as regards remuneration of labour or conditions of service. If this House is to re-allocate national wealth by this method and to say, "Here is £2,000,000 of it for the tramp industry," it is absolutely vital that that re-allocation should not stop at the owner, and that the guarantee to the owner of a profit should not be the only incident of the granting of the subsidy, but that there should also be granted to the officers and seamen a fair wage and decent conditions. The trouble is that that aspect is entirely overlooked when the necessary amount of the subsidy is being calculated in order to maintain the service. It is assumed that the present conditions will continue as regards the seamen and officers; it is only the owner who is to have his conditions bettered. We shall certainly press that if any subsidy of this kind is to be granted—perhaps it is the only way out for capitalism—it shall be made an absolute condition of the grant that, so far as those ships which are subsidised are concerned, a proper standard of wages shall be paid to the officers and the men, and that proper manning conditions shall be observed as well. It is well known, I believe, that when the figures were got out in October, 1933, of the comparison in the payment of pounds sterling to all the seamen and officers of the different merchant fleets, the British came only eighth in the list, and that certainly is not good enough if the Government are to put up a subsidy.

"When the community steps in to the assistance of an industry of this sort, it must step in to assist everyone in the industry and not only a certain class of people who are engaged in that industry. It is one of the strongest and most cogent criticisms of this method, which has been adopted in this country in agriculture as well as in the industry in which we are now starting to adopt it, that the conditions of the workers have been uniformly overlooked. We hope that the Right Hon. Gentleman on this occasion will see that the workers and the officers are not overlooked. It is stated that to some extent the conditions of the workers will be improved in that more of them will be employed, and that by this device more ships will be occupied in carrying cargoes than otherwise would have been possible. That may be true if the subsidy succeeds, but with all the surplus productive power in this country to-day this is not a good enough argument with which to answer the demand for better conditions. It is not sufficient to say that more seamen will get back into employment under conditions which are unsatisfactory when we have available such a great surplus wealth. If it be necessary, in order that the seamen as well shall get proper conditions, to increase the sum of money which is to be granted, it ought to be increased as far as we are concerned because it is absolutely vital and essential. That deals with the question of the subsidy."

BOOKS RECEIVED.

PROHIBITION OR CONTROL? By REGINALD E. HOSE. Canada's Experience with the Liquor Problem, 1921-1927. (Longmans.) 1928. 23cm. 132p. 10/6.

- NATIVE EDUCATION, CEYLON: JAVA, FORMOSA, THE PHILIPPINES, FRENCH INDO-CHINA, AND BRITISH MALAYA. By H. A. WYNDHAM. (Problems of Imperial Trusteeship Series.) (Oxford University Press.) 1933. 23cm. 263p. 10/6.
- SIR N. N. SIRKAR'S SPEECHS AND PAMPHLETS. Ed. By B. N. DUTTA ROY. (The Book Co., Calcutta.) 1934. 22cm. 280p. Rs. 2.
- INDIANS ABROAD DIRECTORY 1934, Comp. & Ed. By S. A. Waitz. (2nd Edn.) (Imperial Indian Citizenship Assn., Bombay.) 1934. 21cm. 672p. Rs. 5.
- FORWARD, OH TIME. By VALENTINE KATAEV. (Gollancz.) 1934. 21cm. 432p. 8/6.
- THE MONEY MUDDLE AND THE WAY OUT. By F. W. PETHICK-LAWRENCE. (Allen & Unwin.) 1933. 20cm. 79p. 2/6.
- WORLD SUGAR PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION. An Economic-Geographical Survey. By C. J. ROBERTSON. (John Bale.) 1934. 20cm. 142p. 5/-.
- FORTY-FIVE YEARS IN INDIA. Memoirs and Reminiscences of Principal Mackichan. Ed. By DAVID WILLIAMSON. (Ivor Nicholson.) 1934. 20cm. 116p. 5/-.
- BUILDERS OF THE INDIAN CHURCH. By STEPHEN NEILL. (Edinburgh House Press.) 1934. 20cm. 159p. 3/-.
- FEDERAL INDIA. By NARESH CHANDRA ROY. (The Book Co., Calcutta.) 1934. 20cm. 87p. Re. 1-8.
- HOW THE RATEPAPER IS GOVERNED. By KATE ROSENBERG. (Williams & Norgate.) 1930. 20cm. 127p. 3/6.
- THE INDUSTRIAL EVOLUTION OF INDIA IN RECENT TIMES. By D. R. GADGIL. (Oxford University Press.) 1933. 22cm. 327p.
- RUSSIA TODAY. By NITYANARAYAN BANERJEE. (K. N. Chatterjee, 120/2, Upper Circular Road, Calcutta.) 1934. 20cm. 173p. Rs. 3.
- FUTURE TRADING UPON ORGANISED COMMODITY MARKETS IN THE UNITED STATES. By G. WRIGHT HOFFMAN. (University of Pennsylvania Press.) 1932. 24cm. 482p. 21/-.
- THE PROFESSIONS. By A. M. CARR-SAUNDERS AND P. A. WILSON. (Clarendon Press.) 1933. 24cm. 536p. 25/-.
- THE THEORY OF WAGES. By J. R. HICKS. (Macmillan.) 1932. 24cm. 247p. 8/6.
- FOREIGN INVESTMENTS IN CHINA. By C. F. REMER. (Macmillan.) 1933. 24cm. 708p. \$5.00.
- RETAILING AND THE PUBLIC. By LAWRENCE E. NEAL. (Allen & Unwin.) 1933. 22cm. 191p. 7/6.
- CORPORATION FINANCE. By EDWARD SHERWOOD MEAD. (7th Edn.) (Appleton.) 1933. 22cm. 726p. \$3.50.

DIABETICS!
STOP SUFFERING!

**YOU CAN
BE CURED.**

in your home without
DIETING, FASTING or INJECTIONS

HOW?

Well, write now for a FREE
Booklet that will reveal to
you the STARTLING NEW
THEORY OF treatment.
VENUS RESEARCH LABORATORY,
P. O. BOX 587 CALCUTTA.