

---

*Friday, 11th January, 1929.*

---

THE Committee met at the Town Hall, Bombay, at 11-15 a.m.

*Present.*

THE CHAIRMAN.

MR. KHAREGHAT.

MR. KAMAT.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Mr. Dange, you may commence your case.

MR. STONES :—Before Mr. Dange proceeds, I wish to know under what section of the agreement Mr. Dange has referred this case to the Inquiry Committee. There have been two similar cases in the past but neither of them was so tragic as the present one. In the case of those two mills—Toyo Podar and Sir Shapurji Brocha—all men who went on strike were paid off and the mills started again with new men. In the case of Manchester Mill the weaving department is entirely closed now. In this particular case they did not carry out the agreement of 4th October. They issued a threat to the spinning department to down tools. Therefore we paid off all the weavers in that mill entirely. In the Manchester Mill the spinning department is running and the weaving department is closed. We do not want to work the mills with men who threaten and intimidate workers to go on strike. We told the weavers that if they were not willing to work on 3 looms they might go elsewhere and work. The Toyo Podar Mills have done the same thing. I am wondering under which section of the agreement Mr. Dange brings forward this question before the Committee?

THE CHAIRMAN :—Mr. Dange has to show that.

MR. DANGE :—The point is that there was no strike in the Pearl Mill ; that the management paid the wages due to the workers for December without informing the workers that they were dismissed ; that they re-opened the mills with a new complement of hands ; that in the weaving and other departments of the mills men belonging to our union were dismissed ; and that therefore this is a case of victimisation. It is for that reason that this case has been brought before the Committee. It is wrongful dismissal and a case of victimisation particularly. If, however, the facts are to be given they are like this :—

On 30th of December the attack on the weaving master took place as it is reported in the newspapers ; and it is also reported that some weavers took part in that act. This attack was not preceded by any stoppage work. The stoppage might have been only in that section where the attack took place or for those workers who took part in that act. But then the mill had not gone on strike at that time. After the attack the management closed the mill. Therefore it is not a case of strike.

Afterwards we received a notice from the management dated 2nd January, 3rd January and 4th January that the workers would be paid

X9 (47):97.231.128+

F3.4

134421

their wages due for December and that we should inform them to receive their wages. We wrote in return to the management that we would inform the workers. We also wrote:—

“ According to your letters, the workers of your mill were asked by our Union to receive their wages due to them for December on the days you mentioned. But, it is quite possible that many, whom the information did not reach, may not have yet taken their dues.

“ We do not know the reason for such an early payment. Anyway it proves our contention before the Inquiry Committee that if owners desired, wages accounts can be ready within less than a week of the closing of a month.

“ We are unofficially informed that you are opening to-day with a new complement of workers. Is it a fact ?

“ Awaiting reply.”

The reply was given but nothing was said about the re-opening of the mill. They said in reply that those who were left unpaid would be paid on the 10th. We sent another letter but received no reply. Then we wrote on the 9th another letter as follows:—

“ I learn from the workers of your mill and members of our union that you have restarted the mill but have not taken back the old hands.

“ You will please mark that we do not condone the crime that may have been committed in your mill, by some men. That crime has been followed by the usual process of law. But, I do not understand why you should discharge men for the crime that none knows who committed.

“ You will also note that there was no strike in your mill on the day of the crime and all departments were working until you stopped the mill.

“ I am therefore to request you to take back all the men who are not proved guilty by law and not victimise innocents.

“ I propose to lay this point before the Inquiry Committee to-morrow.

Now, sir, the mill has restarted working and I may point out that women from the spinning department, from the carding department, reeling and winding departments have been dismissed without any reason. Most of the weavers are not taken back. A blank card is given to the jobbers to reinstate or discharge any man they like. This power has been given in the drawing-in and other departments of the mill. We find that particularly those who have done a bit more union work and taken part in putting forward the grievances of the workers in all departments particularly were dismissed. For example, we may take the case of the drawing-in department. Most of the workers were taken back. But 4 or 5 men who were especially

forward men were discharged and therefore the others protested and came out. This is going on in other departments also. There is also a case where a man was asked to help the management in other ways regarding the crime or tracing up. The man it seems had no knowledge and he refused. He also was sacked for no reason. Moreover, I am to point out that the management is taking quite a new course of action which in our opinion is very regrettable, because it is sowing seeds of another quarrel, that is, Hindu-Moslem fight. They are replacing Hindu jobbers by Muslim jobbers and Muslim jobbers by Hindu jobbers and appointing Muslim jobbers where Hindu weavers are working and Hindu jobbers where Muslim weavers are working. This may not have been done by the man responsible in the management but from below. But this means sowing seeds for a communal quarrel. Therefore we thought it best to bring this case before the Committee and draw their attention to the practices that are going on there and to see if they can make the management stop these practices of sowing communal quarrels and take back these men who are victimised for union work and are wrongfully dismissed.

MR. STONES :—Regarding the first point we are prepared definitely to prove that there was a strike. Mr. Dange says that the men in the weaving shed did not stop work. All men in the weaving shed stopped work. I believe Mr. Dange was present when they did stop work.

MR. DANGE :—No, sir.

MR. STONES :—Within a very short period after the assault. This is a very important matter. A most revolting, ghastly murder was committed and it is an important matter to the whole textile industry. The matter is criminal and it is under the investigation of the criminal authorities ; and it is difficult to speak out in full. If you would like me to, I will read to you the manager's statement as to what happened prior to the murder.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We cannot go into the subject of murder.

MR. STONES :—I realise the difficulty there. Their point is that there was no strike. Mr. Dange makes a point of it. Whether there was a stoppage of work in the weaving department, the assistant will make a statement on it.

ORAL EVIDENCE OF MR. J. J. MISTRI, *Assistant Weaving  
Master of the Pearl Mill.*

THE CHAIRMAN :—On the day the weavers struck work, do you know any details about that?—At about 2-30 p.m. when I entered the folding department in order to examine a new cut piece book I found that about 250 weavers came rushing and speaking out "Maro, maro," and approaching near us. So, Mr. Davar, the deceased, went before a bale of cloth situated near the wall. They came near and threw a missile on the deceased. In order to escape that, the deceased bent down. So, they took advantage of that and beat him with iron bars, stones and wooden pieces.



**THE CHAIRMAN** :—You assert that they stopped work before they came and attacked you.—They entirely stopped the loom shed and came into the folding department.

How far is it :—(The witness drew up a plan and pointed out how they entered into the folding department.)

All the weavers came out or were there some left inside ?—There were about 250, armed with stones and wooden and iron bars.

Do you say that most of them were weavers ?—They were all weavers.

How many weavers have you ?—880.

**MR. DANGE** :—You say you entered the Folding Department and you saw the men rushing towards Mr. Davar. Where were you before you entered the Folding Department ?—I entered the Folding Department and took my seat in my usual place ; five minutes had not elapsed when I heard whistlings and shouts of " Maro ! Maro ! " and saw them entering.

You went from the Head Office in the Folding Department ?—Not from the Head Office ; but from my cabin to the Folding Department through the Weaving Shed, because my cabin is at the back of the Weaving Shed.

You passed through the whole Weaving Shed ?—Yes.

At that time work had stopped ?—No ; work was going on very smoothly.

After you had entered the Weaving Department you saw 250 weavers coming towards you ?—Yes.

You say they were all weavers ?—Yes.

So, you can recognise almost all of them ?—Yes.

How many years have you been in the mill ?—About two years.

And after this incident did you go to the Weaving Shed ?—No.

So, you cannot say whether the workers were working or not ?—I could not see, but from the sound I could say whether the shed was working or not.

After the crime ?—After the crime they resumed work.

**MR. STONES** :—When did they stop the work ?—Before the crime.

So, they resumed work after this crime ?—Yes.

**MR. DANGE** :—Can you say that all weavers had stopped work ?—Of course.

Can you give me any reason why, if all had stopped work, all did not come to the Folding Department?—How could all come to the Folding Department? Nearly 250 had come, and some were staying near the gate to see what was happening.

You say some were standing at the gate. Where were you standing?—At that time I was standing near the wall.

From near the wall you could see the gate?—Yes.

From near the wall you saw all the weavers at the gate?—Yes.

May I know which place it was?—There was a wall near the Folding Department facing the left side.

Could you give the Committee some plan?—(The witness gave a plan to the Committee.)

Have you marked the place where you were standing?—Not exactly, but approximately.

May I request the Committee to put this plan on record?

THE CHAIRMAN :—That will be done.

MR. DANGE :—Did you identify any of the weavers?

THE CHAIRMAN :—We cannot go into that; we only want to know about this striking work.

MR. DANGE :—He said they were all weavers?

THE CHAIRMAN :—He said that.

MR. DANGE :—After this affair, what did the weavers do? Did they return to work?—Yes; they returned to work.

How long did they continue to work?—They were working till the management asked them to stop.

MR. KAMAT :—Were the weavers working from the morning till 12 noon?—Yes.

And the stoppage of work occurred after the mid-day meal?—Yes.

MR. STONES :—There is another witness who saw the weavers strike work.

ORAL EVIDENCE OF  
MR. A. M. RAMACHANDRA MUDALIAR.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What is your occupation ?—Folding Master.

Could you tell us about the beginning of this disturbance ?—At about 2-30 I heard the noise stop in the Weaving Shed.

You were in the Folding Department ?—Yes.

Going towards the Weaving Shed I saw a crowd of about 200 people coming towards where we were sitting.

Through the door ?—Yes. I saw them coming towards our side ; I at once went out to save myself.

You saw these men when they came in ?—Before they could come in, I had gone out.

What were they doing ?—They were shouting " Maro ! Maro ! "

What sort of men were they ?—They looked like weavers.

MR. STONES :—Did you stay on in the mills afterwards ?—No ; I went away to the office.

Did you stay on in the office when the mill stopped work ?—In the Manager's office.

Was anybody else there ?—All the clerks were there. It was not in the Folding Department but outside.

After this did the weavers go back to work ?—Yes ; the looms were working.

How long did they work ?—Till 4-30.

Did the weavers stop work when the police came in, or did they continue to work even after the police came in ?—The police came there before work was stopped.

Did the weavers stop work first or the motor ?—The motors stopped working, and then the weavers.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It is not a strike in the ordinary sense.

MR. STONES :—It is an affair which emphasises the point that it is impossible to run a mill with a staff of 200 intimidating the officers to an extent that it culminates in the murder of officials. The crowd went along to the Manager's office bent on mischief. It would be impossible to continue work in the mill with men who are suspects hidden in the various departments. They could not possibly work the mill with the same staff.

MR. DANGE :—May I request you, Mr. Chairman, to recall Mr. Jehangir Jamsetji Mistry, the Assistant Weaving Master ?

THE CHAIRMAN :—What do you want to ask him ?

MR. DANGE :—One question about the commencement of work by these weavers.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—He said they re-commenced work after the murder.

THE CHAIRMAN :—He said they resumed work.

MR. DANGE :—I wanted to ask one more question.

MR. STONES :—I would like to ask him a question myself on the same point.

*(Mr. Jehangir Jamsetji Mistry recalled.)*

MR. DANGE :—After the attack, you said, the weavers returned to their shed and commenced work ?—Yes.

Those who had come to the Folding Department returned to the Weaving Shed and those who were in the Weaving Shed started work. So, the Folding Department was working after that. Now, did you follow these men into the Weaving Shed ?—No.

You only guessed from the sound that they had resumed work ?—Yes. They went out of the Folding Department in the direction of the Manager's office.

You said that they went into the Weaving Shed and started work ?—Most of them went into the Weaving Shed and started work, but others went out of the Folding Department to the Manager's office.

You cannot say approximately when they started work ?—No.

You can only say that after some time the work was started ?—Yes ; that is so.

MR. STONES :—After a certain number of weavers went back to the Weaving Shed and a certain number in the Manager's office, did you stay there until the mill started ?—I went to the hospital at 3-30.

Then, how can you say that the weavers started work ?—After hitting me they went into the Weaving Shed and the looms began to make sound.

After that you went to the deceased ?—Yes.

And then to the hospital ?—Yes.

Certain things might have happened after you went to the hospital ?

THE CHAIRMAN :—At what time did you go to the hospital?—At about 3-30 p.m.

ORAL EVIDENCE OF MR. T. WATTS,  
*Superintendent, the Currimbhoy Group of Mills.*

THE CHAIRMAN :—Can you tell us what happened so far as you personally know?—I got a message in the Currimbhoy Mills that the Assistant Weaving Master in the Pearl Mills had been beaten. The police were sent for, they went and I followed. I got to the Pearl Mill at about 3-30. The mill was working. We sent for the Superintendent of Police. We got the names of three of the people who were pointed out to us as leaders in this business of strike in the mill. When the Police Superintendent came along he sent for these three men. So we sent for these three men in the Weaving Shed. The report came back from the policemen and the jamadar of the mill that these three weavers would not come out. They stopped work and the message they sent out was that they were willing to fight us. I got the motors running for, I should say, anywhere from half an hour to three-quarters of an hour after it was reported to me that the weavers had stopped. And then the police advised me, since the weavers were not willing to work, to stop the motors, and the police went into the department and drove out all the weavers, and we decided to have an identification parade.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is all that is material about this?—Mr. Dange came at about 4 o'clock.

MR. DANGE :—When did you get the news of this first?—About 3 o'clock ; between 3 and 3-15.

May I know the exact form of the news you received ?

THE CHAIRMAN :—It is not material for our purpose.

MR. DANGE :—I wanted to know whether the news was that they had stopped work or anything else. What was exactly the message?—Only that the Assistant Weaving Master was beaten. They were working when I went at half past three.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What have you to say on this evidence ?

MR. STONES :—We say the position is becoming intolerable. The men stop work, leave the work and go to another department. This act is tantamount to striking. In any case, we submit that it is impossible for the management to continue with the same staff after an actual murder has been committed.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Did you discriminate between those who kept on working and those who struck work ?

MR. STONES :—Mr. Watts will give you evidence on it. Mr. Watts, can you tell us on what basis you have engaged the new men ?

*(Mr. Watts recalled.)*

MR. WATTS (as witness) :—As the manager reported that he had no confidence in these jobbers—one of the head jobbers and an assistant jobber had been implicated by one of their own men—we decided that it was better to start with fresh men. So we engaged new jobbers and we gave them power—as they will be held responsible for anything that is done—power to engage whoever they want. We gave them sole power as they gave an undertaking that they would be responsible.

You have also dismissed employees in other departments, if so, what are your reasons ?—Because these people were instigated by weavers. They went from department to department. This was a source of trouble. We decided not to have them.

THE CHAIRMAN :—In the winding and reeling departments some of the women also were dismissed.—Some of these people, we found, were implicated with the weavers. Therefore we decided not to take them back.

Was any worker discharged for taking part in union activity ?—Because they gave trouble and dictated terms to us they were not taken back. It is not because they took part in union activity.

MR. DANGE :—I want to call a carding head jobber who has been dismissed.

MR. STONES :—I object to his being called as witness. It was not a dismissal. He was transferred to another mill which he refused.

MR. DANGE :—The reason for transfer and the alternative proposal put before is connected with this question. This is a case of victimisation, because men would not help the management in the way they like.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Is he here ?

MR. DANGE :—Yes, sir.

#### ORAL EVIDENCE OF MR. R. B. PANTHAKI

*Head Jobber of the Carding Department of the Pearl Mill.*

THE CHAIRMAN :—What have you got to say ?—First my manager called me and asked : “ Have you seen any man who did that in the folding department ? ” I said ‘ No ’. Then Mr. Watts asked me : “ Have you got any bad man in your department ? ” I said ‘ No ’. He began to get angry with me. I have worked there for 12 years faithfully. I asked him for what reason he is going to stop me. He said : ‘ I have many complaints about you. ’ Ten days before there was a strike. Two or three persons came to my department. They said : ‘ Kaka, you also go out of your depart-

ment.' I went outside. The police jamadar, an English gentleman came to me and asked me to go back to the department. I said: 'I am sorry because I cannot go in. If I go in they will make pieces of me.' It was the time of strike. Therefore I was standing outside. He ordered me to go away. If I run they will throw stones at me. Therefore I refused his order. I have served there for 12 years and I have got good certificates. Mr. Watts stopped me. After 2 or 3 hours the manager called me and said: 'I have received a letter from the head office, that is, from Mr. Watts. I do not want to stop you but I want to transfer you to some other mill.' I told that it was a very critical time to move from one mill to another, because I had good understanding with the men there. If I go to another mill, the men there may beat me. Therefore I refused. Afterwards when I started to go home at 6 o'clock, the jamadar sent word asking me to come up. I replied if he wants to say anything, let him come down and tell me. He came down, took out some envelope, wrote something, and said: "This is from the head office. Don't enter the mill premises from to-morrow. If you come I will take legal steps." Therefore I did not go.

MR. WATTS:—I may say that his own class of people, the Parsis, said that he was a dangerous and eccentric man. I ordered him to go back to his department. He did not go. There was a vacancy in the Bradbury Mill. I asked him to go there. He refused.

THE CHAIRMAN:—Mr. Dange, this is not a very strong case.

MR. DANGE:—This is a sample of discharge.

MR. STONES:—This is not a discharge.

THE CHAIRMAN:—Mr. Dange, will you wind up the debate?

MR. DANGE:—It has been admitted that there was no strike in the weaving shed and that a number of weavers entered the folding department and there are two witnesses who said that. It may be that few men were weavers or outsiders absolutely who had gone there. It is not proved that the whole weaving shed struck work. If 10 or more men leave the shed to commit an action, that does not become a strike. If these ten men prevent others from going on with the work, it does not amount to a strike. It amply proves the fact that the men did start work afterwards. It does not prove that they were intending to strike. Otherwise straightaway they would have circulated the intention.

One statement of the witness shows that he knows that they were all weavers and there were no other people from other departments so far as his knowledge goes. If men from the spinning, winding, reeling, carding, blowing and drawing-in departments are to be sacked, it is only for some other fault, or alleged fault, which the management has already recorded and they try to victimise men under the excuse of this incident, because if they want to victimise they can do it in the case of weavers and that too for some weavers and not the whole weaving shed. They have taken advantage of this and sacked the men they had on record. Mr. Watts admits that full power has

been given to jobbers. The history of Bombay shows that the giving of full power to jobbers means paying money to the jobber for getting work or the jobber appointing his own men. Secondly, Mr. Watts says that they wanted to dismiss the men who dictated their terms. In simple language it would mean that those who made any demand for increase in rates and who took any forward part were sacked, because some crime has been committed in another department by some man. It has been proved that there is no case for the dismissal of workers in the other departments and even for the weaving section there is no case for dismissing all men.

MR. STONES :—It is not a matter of 10 men committing a crime. It is a case of 250 weavers out of a total of 850.

MR. DANGE :—That number is questioned.

MR. STONES :—200 or 250 men according to the witness took part in committing a dastardly assault on certain members of the staff. A few men of these endeavoured to commit a further assault on other members of the staff. These men were subsequently hidden in the various departments of the mill. The management feel that among the large number of weavers some loyal men ought to be knowing who exactly committed the crime and that they have been prevented from informing them about it. They feel that with such men they cannot run the mill with safety and that is why they have taken up this attitude. They have dismissed some men and taken a new set of carefully selected men. The reason why they have given power of selection to jobbers is that certain jobbers have taken the responsibility to make careful selections. These are extraordinary times and that is why they have to take up this course. They have got to run the mill and therefore they have made the responsibility run down to smaller numbers of men.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We will now retire for consultation.

THE CHAIRMAN :—From the evidence which has been brought before us, it seems to us clear that the discharge of men, which is complained of, is not due to anything connected with the general strike and the circumstances under which the agreement of the 4th of October 1928 was arrived at, but to a subsequent incident, namely, the murder of an Assistant Weaving Master in the Pearl Mills, in which, according to two witnesses who were present, a large body of men estimated at 200 to 250 took part. We do not think it necessary to go into more detail in regard to this unfortunate incident : it is a crime that is being investigated by the police. Our jurisdiction in the matter is very limited, and the only clause of the agreement of the 4th October 1928 that give us any is No. 5, which merely says : " Any dispute arising out of the interpretation of this agreement shall be referred for decision to the Committee to be appointed." It is possible that a case of alleged victimisation by which a man is discharged because of some activities in connection with the general strike or even in connection with the trade union organisation in general might be a dispute coming under this clause. But, however that may be, we do not find any evidence that there is victim-



isation of that kind in the present case. It is possible that under the arrangements that have been made by the management for the discharge of old hands and the taking on of new hands some innocent person entirely unimplicated in this crime of murder has to suffer, but that is not a question on which we are really authorised to give a decision under the agreement. It is a matter which can be litigated, if necessary, in the courts of law under the ordinary process of action for wrongful dismissal; and whether the management were or were not justified in taking that step is not one which it would be desirable in the present circumstances for us to decide. We must, therefore, hold that no question which can be dealt with under Clause 5 of the agreement is shown to have arisen in this particular case.

That concludes the business.

There is just one point which I want to mention, so that it may facilitate discussion when we come to the Standing Orders. There has been a suggestion, which we are considering, in connection with the question of the stoppage of work during working hours owing to breakdown of machinery. We were told that there are rules in Lancashire governing that point and Mr. Stones told us that the same system is followed in Bombay. Therefore, it should be possible to have some rule as regards that in the Standing Orders.

MR. STONES:—We are going to consider that at 2-30 to-day.

THE CHAIRMAN:—We have a temporary draft, which you might consider. It is as follows:—

“ If the stoppage occurs during working hours the operatives affected shall be informed as soon as practicable whether they are to stay on or leave. If the period of detention in the mill after the stoppage is more than an hour, the operatives shall be paid in addition to what may be due to them for the work done before the stoppage, wages for the period of detention at the rate of one day's wages for ten hours. In the case of piece-workers the average daily earnings for the previous month shall be taken to be the wages for ten hours.”

You might consider this draft.

We would also like to have a draft of the new leave rules placed before the Millowners' Association, in order that it may be communicated to the other side for their consideration before the 21st.

MR. KHAREGHAT:—I would like to have reeling and winding rates for as many mills as you can.

MR. STONES:—Yes, they will be given.

MR. DANGE:—I have a request to make to the Committee. Will you kindly give us a copy of the proceedings of to-day and of your ruling on the point raised by to-night or to-morrow morning?

THE CHAIRMAN:—Yes.

The Committee adjourned till 11-15 a.m. on Monday the 21st January 1929.

---

---

*Thursday, 17th January 1929.*

---

---

Thursday, the 17th January 1929.

The Committee met at the Town Hall, Bombay, at 11-15 A. M.

Present :—

THE CHAIRMAN.

MR. KHAREGHAT.

MR. KAMAT.

---

THE CHAIRMAN :—This is an unexpected meeting.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We have come here to request you to grant us more time before we take up our proceedings again. You were good enough to give us a week's time to prepare for the final summing up. We now find that during the short time it has [not been possible for both sides to go into the evidence in full. The word "summing up" frightens us. After all we are amateurs. You are used to it; they do the summing up every day in the law courts. For us it is a very difficult task. We want to do it very carefully and both sides feel that if we are not careful in studying the evidence before we start summing up, we might perhaps make statements which might drag on the proceedings, because the summing up may again have to be discussed by one side having to say something against the arguments of the other side and thus arguments may have to be repeated. We want to avoid all that. We are agreed that if we get more time, say till the end of the month, or the 4th of February, then we shall come fully prepared and the summing up will not take more than is actually necessary and the whole discussion might be finished by the middle of February.

Besides that, the most important statement about the standardisation scheme is not yet ready. We have got figures from about 30 mills, and the others have not found it possible to send the figures yet. It is a very difficult task to go into each sort for that particular month in 1927. All the same the statement will be prepared. Since that statement is a very important one, we are anxious that the other side, as well as you, Sir, should have ample time to study it before we base any conclusions on that statement.

There is another reason also. For instance, we have amended some of our rules and standing orders. A discussion will have to take place on these amended rules also. We think that if the other side is given some time to consider those amendments we might perhaps cut short the summing up. On behalf of ourselves as well as the other side, I can assure you that the time granted will be carefully utilised with a view to cut short discussion at a later

stage. We think that if we are given postponement till the 4th of February, the discussion will proceed till the middle of February only : we want to finish it by that time, but we feel that postponement is absolutely necessary if the summing up is to be done in the way it should be done.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Have you not yet got an idea of the evidence of the Standing Orders for Operatives and the 17 Demands? You have heard the evidence, and we have had a lot of discussion about them.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**You are aware, Sir, that Mr. Joshi unfortunately had to leave off at a certain stage, and Mr. Bakhale came in. Mr. Bakhale has to study up what had been said by Mr. Joshi. Similarly on our side, latterly I was not able to attend ; I was out of Bombay for some time and I was not present when the workers' evidence was taken. So I have to study that evidence. Both our sides are agreed in asking for this postponement.

**MR. BAKHALE :—**On this point, I entirely agree with Mr. Saklatvala. I have been going through the evidence, and I find it very difficult to finish it up during the period you have set down. Personally I shall be very glad if you agree to the postponement till the 4th of February, because that will give me more time to go through the evidence. It will also lessen the work of the Committee to some extent. We are anxious to finish the work as early as possible, but this is our difficulty.

**MR. STONES :—**During the course of our discussion, certain suggestions were made either by one side or the other, and these were referred to the Millowners' Association, for example, fortnightly payment. It was impossible to get anything done during the Christmas holidays ; most of our members were out of Bombay. Anyhow we have done all these things in the sub-committee, but they have to go before the General Body of the Members. If the meeting is postponed, we may be able to put them before the General Body before we meet again.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**I do not think we should adjourn for another fortnight or so without any work at all.

**MR. STONES :—**Personally I do not mind. The trouble is every one of us is employed in the ordinary course of our duties : we cannot detach ourselves solely for this work.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**At the same time our instructions are to make our report as soon as possible.

**MR. STONES :—**Personally I do not mind if we go on with it on Monday.

**MR. BAKHALE :—**We are only asking for a week's postponement. We can meet on the 1st February.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**1st February is a Friday.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**There is much more than a week from the 21st January to the 1st February. I cannot see why discussion should not go on at any rate on the Standing Orders and the Seventeen Demands. I can understand if you finish up these things and ask us for a little more time to make your observations on the Standardisation Scheme. You are in a much more advantageous position than an ordinary counsel, who has to commence summing up as soon as the last witness is finished.

**MR. KAMAT :—**From the 9th January to the 4th February is a very long time from the public point of view.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**It will lessen discussion at a later stage.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**We have talked this application over, and we think that we should go on with the discussion on Monday, as already appointed, at any rate on the Standing Orders and the Seventeen Demands. We have already had elaborate discussions on these two subjects.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**We have already had a full discussion, but as regards the Standing Orders, there has been a good deal of outside evidence, and we have to study this outside evidence.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**There is not very much outside evidence. Most of the evidence is as regards the standardisation scheme, and that is the main difficulty before us. I should have thought that you should at any rate start discussion and if there are any particular points that have to be further considered, then we could adjourn till the following Monday as regards those particular questions. I must say we are dead against any further sitting idle while you are making up.

**MR. KHAREGHAT :—**What is that further statement you referred to Mr. Saklatvala?

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**That is the wages that were actually paid in July 1927 and the wages that would have been paid if the standardisation scheme were in force on that day. That will give you an idea of the actual cut on the varieties. That statement is still not ready, and I am afraid it will take a week more before we can tabulate the figures and give it to the Committee.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**The question of rates for particular sorts and so on is no doubt a difficult one, and we can quite see that there may be good grounds for asking for further time before you sum up your case about it. But I do not see myself that that is a sufficient ground for postponing the whole discussion on the general question of

minimum wage, employment of women, the unemployment consequent on the introduction of the rational scheme and so on. These questions can be discussed on Monday as well as on any other day.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The difficulty is we have got only one set of the evidence. The printing of the evidence has not yet been completed, and if we get a week or ten days we may be able to complete it by that time and get it up-to-date. That will facilitate reference during the discussion.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I feel that you have got more facilities than an ordinary counsel. By this time, ideas on the Standing Orders must have crystallised on both sides.

MR. STONES :—We have got to look after our own ordinary duties also. I have got nine mills here and Mr. Saklatvala three mills to supervise.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—If you take up the Standing Orders and the Seventeen Demands, it will mean that during those days there will not be time left for us to study the evidence regarding the Standardisation Scheme. So that, after you finish with the Standing Orders and the Seventeen Demands, we will require some time to study the case regarding the Standardisation Scheme.

MR. BAKHALE :—Even supposing we take the Standing Orders on Tuesday, it will not take us very far.

MR. STONES :—There are 4 items to be considered,—the Standing Orders, the Seventeen Demands, the New Scheme and the Standard Scheme.

MR. BAKHALE :—And the wage cut.

MR. STONES :—That is included in the Standardisation Scheme. We can take the Standing Orders for Operatives on Monday; the Seventeen Demands will follow, and if the Committee wishes me to take up the new system before we take the standard scheme, I will do it. That puts the standard scheme last.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—So far as the standardisation scheme is concerned, the criticism of the various witnesses will have to be explained. I suppose we might give some time for that.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I quite agree that the standardisation scheme and the wage cut are the items that do want a little more time.

MR. STONES :—The trouble is enhanced by the fact that while we are here, we are not in our office. Practically the whole of the work has to be done by Mr. Saklatvala and myself.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—With regard to the Standing Orders, having regard to all the discussion that we have had before us, we do not want to have simply a duplication of the things which have already been put before us. Each side can refer to the evidence of witnesses in support of their contention.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—Even there there is a lot of evidence which we would like to go through.

**MR. STONES** :—I do not think there will be very much to say.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—So, next week we can clear off the Standing Orders and the Seventeen Demands.

**MR. STONES** :—We have threshed out the Standing Orders; we have made suggestions, the other side have made suggestions, and the Committee have made suggestions. I think in three hours we should be able to finish the thing.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—The leave and stoppage matters will not need more than an hour.

**MR. STONES** :—If we finished that, the Committee would have something to go on in connection with their Report.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—I think we cannot agree to a total adjournment from Monday next. We must sit as we proposed, and finish off the Standing Orders and the Seventeen Demands.

**MR. STONES** :—Which will be taken first ?

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—I should take the Standing Orders first. We must also ask you to try and hurry up these statements.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—We are doing our best. When they were demanded, we pointed out that, though on the face of it they do not look elaborate, they are really elaborate. Particular mills are making over a hundred sorts. They have to go through the calculations for each sort on the standard basis; the staff is not quite habituated to these calculations, and they have to check and re-check them and then give the final figure.

**MR. BAKHALE** :—If not till the 4th of February, could you consider the possibility of adjourning till the 28th of this month ?

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Let us get over these two minor matters first, and then we can all concentrate on the standardisation scheme.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—If there is any particular point left over, it can be taken up afterwards.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**We won't finally close the discussion even on the Standing Orders, but we do want to get the bulk of anything that either side wants to put before us on record, so that we can more or less dispose of that part of our enquiry. We do not want simply a repetition of what has already been put before us. You can make any supplementary remarks, with reference to the evidence. I do not think you will find there is very much evidence as regards the Standing Orders. You can say, on page 'so and so,' the witness has said so and so. What the witnesses have said has got to be pieced together. Summing up in a court of law is generally very brief.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**As regards the Standing Orders, are we to take into consideration the legal aspect also?

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Yes.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**That means we shall want the assistance of Mr. Caroe again.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**He has already given a very full exposition of what his views are, and if there are any points we want to ask you about, it will be useful to have him here to consider the points. The same applies to Mr. Joshi on the other side. I think we must really make an effort to get rid of that part of the enquiry.

The Committee adjourned till 11-15 A. M. on Monday the 21st January 1929.



---

---

*Monday, 21st January 1929.*

---

---

Monday, the 21st January 1929.

The Committee met at the Town Hall, Bombay, at 11-15 A. M.

Present :—

THE CHAIRMAN.

MR. KHAREGHAT.

MR. KAMAT.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Mr. Pakhale tells me that unfortunately he is ill to-day. Therefore, would you start, Mr. Saklatvala, or have you any objection?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I was under the impression, these being our rules, it is fair that we should start.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is so.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I was going to refer to our letter of the 15th instant, which we sent you in connection with these rules. There are a few additions made in our rules; at least, we propose to make certain additions. You may remember that at the time we were discussing the rules we pointed out that certain matters had already been agreed to, and that was stated in Exhibit E to our written statement—for instance the calculation of the total amount of wages, fines, unclaimed wages, and so on. The other side believed that it would be much better if all these points were actually included in the Standing Orders, and we have now agreed to it. The new rule 14 has been introduced to deal with cases of a breakdown in the power supply, and we have followed there the Bolton rule, which Mr. Bakhale himself had proposed. The other alteration is that in rules 14 and 15 we are agreeable to reduce the period of notice from 1 month to 15 days. It was felt, when we were discussing these rules, that the period of a month was too long, and might be reduced with advantage to both sides; and we have agreed to that.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Would it not be better to say '14 days' instead of 'a fortnight'?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Mr. Caroe says it would be desirable to put down '14 days'.

MR. CAROE :—When the Secretary came to see me, I suggested 14 days.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As regards spoilt cloth also, we referred to that in our evidence we had mentioned that no cloth should be handed over to the weaver unless the matter was examined by a responsible officer, and we include that also in our rules.

Coming to the Standing Orders themselves, the impression gathered on reading the statements of the Labour Leaders as well as the questions put by them to witnesses is clearly that their objection seems not to be so much against a particular rule, but the objection is due to a fear that the rule might be abused. To give you an instance, at page 2134 of the Oral Evidence, during the examination of Miss Wincate, Mr. Asavale stated that employers may even resort to stopping a machine deliberately in order to "play off" the men. You, Sir, then pointed out that it would be a fraud. So, it is not so much the rule that is objected to as abuse of the rule. Again, they said that power should not be given to the Manager, because Mr. Bradley (I am glad he is here now) believes that that power will be abused. On page 1892, Mr. Bradley was asked "You know that there is no Truck Act here as there is in England to regulate the imposition of fines. When you give such wide powers as are provided in the standard rules in the hands of the managers they will be abused?" Mr. Bradley replied "Unfortunately they are abused." Similarly, they say that the gateman should not be given the authority to search, and there again Mr. Bradley says that if that authority is given, it will be abused. On page 1888, Mr. Bradley was asked "Do you think that this rule will be abused by the gateman?" Mr. Bradley's answer was "I think it will be abused by the gateman and the millowners into harassing the workers. I shall deal with the evidence presently. I want to submit that you cannot prove any rule itself to be unreasonable simply on the ground that it may be liable to abuse. That is all that I want to point out. Ordinary reasonableness must of course be exercised in applying all these rules.

As regards the rules, we are all agreed that, instead of having varying rules in different mills as at present, such rules should be standardised, and that is one of the demands of the Labour Leaders themselves; and when we were revising the rules we naturally took the opportunity to make them as fair and as reasonable as we possibly could. It was for that reason that we consulted not only our Solicitors but also the Labour leaders themselves before arriving at the final stage. And that we have succeeded to a great measure is proved by the evidence of Mr. Rajab himself. On page 2032, Mr. Rajab was asked: "How do the standing orders published by the Millowners compare with the already existing ones in the mill?" Mr. Rajab replied "In each and every mill there is even a longer list of standing orders. This is sometimes put up in the shed and sometimes in the time-keeper's office. There are a number of rules in that. Some of them are even stricter than the standing orders of the millowners." That shows that, at any rate when revising the rules, we have certainly seen that they are not as strict as some of the old rules, or, in other words, that they are fairer than the existing rules.

Then Mr. Bakhale, for our benefit, had quoted the Lancashire Rules. They are given fully on page 1587. I do not want to go again into a discussion of those Rules. But I want to point out that those rules at any rate clearly show that there is not much difference between them and the most important of our own rules, specially those rules which have been questioned most by the Labour Leaders themselves. The first 3 of the Lancashire Rules practically cover our rules 14 and 15, and in both cases the practical effect is really identical. Both parties have to give notice, and in case of failure, the party so failing has to give a recompense to the other side. The first rule also recognises two classes of operatives, just as we do in our Rule 9, where we discriminate between probationary and permanent operatives. The English rule says "Every person employed (except persons casually employed or working as substitutes for sick or absent work-people.)" They also recognise the same distinction between workers. Then Rule 5 of the Lancashire Rules is most important. They too reserve the power to dismiss a man without notice under certain circumstances, when certain acts have been committed. We have the same proviso under our Rule 17. The only difference that I find is that in the English rule they perhaps use more diplomatic language. They talk of the employee being discharged without notice, whereas we are perhaps more blunt or put it more bluntly, and say the employee should be summarily discharged. If a man has to be discharged on the spot without notice, it is clear that the Manager of the mill or somebody in the mill at any rate should have the authority to do so, and in our rules we specifically give that authority to the Manager in our rule 3. Under our conditions, we have necessarily to be more explicit, and our rules must be clearer than in England, with a view to avoid misunderstanding in the future. For this reason it is that our rules are more numerous than the English rules. But, at any rate, they are not so numerous as the Railway Rules, which have been given on page 1869 and onwards. The Railway Rules number about 61.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Those are the G. I. P. Rules ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes; That occurs in Mr. William's evidence. In fact, Mr. Cameron of the Bombay Municipality also maintained, and rightly so, that the Standing Orders should be quite definite in the case of an industry like ours as also in Government Departments. That is given on page 1810. Mr. Cameron was asked "You think it is quite necessary that in a large industry the standing orders must be definite, if discipline is to be maintained?" His reply is "I think so. As a matter of fact, you will realise that, when you get to probably large employers of labour like Government, where every detail is laid down."

Now, I will briefly take you through the rules themselves, and I hope to be able to show that there is abundant proof that our rules are certainly fair and reasonable, not from the evidence of our own witnesses but from the evidence of independent witnesses called by the Committee, or from witnesses called by the other side. The first important rule where there was a lot of discussion is rule No. 3, which is "The decision of the Manager upon any question arising out of in connection with, or incidental to these Orders shall be final, subject however to appeal to the Managing Agents." Here, Mr. Addyman has given very important evidence. On page 1718, Mr. Addyman goes so far as to say that there should be no appeal to the agents, as this, to a great extent, undermines the authority of the Manager; the manager is on the spot; he knows exactly what is going on, and he should really be the final judge. Mr. Addyman was asked by you, Sir, "Do you give the right of appeal from the manager to the agents or the owners?" His reply was "No. That has never been at any time necessary. It is looked upon as the ordinary management of the mill, and so far as that is concerned nothing goes beyond myself." He was again asked "Do you think it is derogatory to discipline if further references are allowed to the agents?" He replied "It would be derogatory to discipline. The sooner labour realises that the manager on the spot, who is in direct touch with them has the full authority to control labour in the mills, the better." On this matter I have not been able to consult my Association, and I have no authority to make any alteration in this rule. But, after reading what an experienced Manager like Mr. Addyman says, I really feel inclined to suggest that some addition might be made in these rules (of course that is purely my personal view) that "the Manager's decision will be final, subject, however, to an appeal to the Managing Agents in case where an important principle or policy is involved," or something of the kind. As regards mere administrative details, where there is a difference of opinion, the Agents may not be appealed to. But, as I have said, I have no authority to say that on behalf of the Association. Then again, on page 1723, Mr. Addyman says "I think the Managers have common sense enough to administer the rules. They have risen from the ranks of labour and they know the requirements of capital as well as of labour." Even in the Municipality, although there is no such rule, still the practice prevails. Mr. Cameron, in his evidence, on page 1302, when he was asked "Have you got any such rule like that?" answered "No, but that fairly represents what is done in the case of the municipality; putting myself in the position of the Manager, and the Commissioner in the position of the Managing Agents."

Then, as regards rule 14, we made it clear that, although the rules are supposed to be put up by individual agents, no alteration is to be made, if that agent is a member of our Association, without the authority or the consent of the

Association. In fact, it is quite clear that we are now standardising the rules; it is not that the standardised rules will be put into force only for the present and then each owner can do what he likes.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**About alterations, you also agree to posting up prior notices about any proposal for alteration?

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**Such notice will be posted. We have provided for it.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Would it not be desirable to expand the rule a little and provide for a consultation with the operatives concerned or their representatives?

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**That might come when we decide the constitution of the Joint Committee, as to what changes have to be made in consultation with the Joint Committee. I think that will be the proper place to put it—when we frame the rules about the Joint Committee.

**MR. KHAREGHAT :—**It is consultation, not approval. The Chairman, I think, advisedly used the word "consultation."

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**It is consultation. There is nothing in the rules about the Joint Committee, and we do not know whether or not that will be effected.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**They themselves do not want that these rules be again put before the Joint Committee. It was made clear by Mr. Bakhale that they need not be put before the Joint Committee. You have pointed out that they are being discussed with them for the present. As far as these rules are concerned, once they are adopted, there is no need for separate consultation. When they will be altered, then it will depend upon the constitution of the Joint Committee as to whether such alteration is going to be placed before them or not.

**MR. KAMAT :—**Have you any suggestions as regards the procedure whenever the need arises for any alteration?

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**For the present we have decided that no member can make any alteration without consulting the Association. The Association is now considering the setting up of a Joint Committee. In fact, I might say that the Association has already approved of the principle that a Joint Committee should be set up. As to the exact constitution of the Joint Committee and as to the points which may be handled by this Joint Committee, we have still not come to any final conclusion. That is why I say that we had better leave that point to the time when we discuss the constitution of the Joint Committee.

Then, as regards the hours of work, all that we wish is that there should be two recesses. On page 1592, Mr. Bakhale has also agreed that there

should be two recesses. He says "I therefore insist that the mid-day rest period should be one hour, and, at the same time, there should be half an hour's recess in the morning, to enable the people to take their food." So that, they also want two recesses. There is complete agreement as far as the two recesses are concerned. The only difference is as to the time, and, as we had pointed out, we are absolutely in the hands of labour there. The law does not permit us to make any changes. This is really a case where co-operation could be extended by Labour Leaders to us, because they also want two recesses, and we also desire two recesses. They need not mix up this question with the question of a reduction of hours. Later on they might press for  $8\frac{1}{2}$  hours or 8 hours work. That is a different question, to be dealt with by itself. Instead of mixing this question up with the question of a reduction in the working hours, if they help us and bring about the two recesses, I think it will be to the benefit of all. As we said before, we are absolutely in their hands. This time was not arbitrarily fixed by us; we believe it is equally suitable to the workers themselves. If they have other suggestions to make, we are perfectly willing to consider them. So long as the working hours remain as at present, we do not mind when the recess is given, and how the recess is given, whether they want two recesses or three recesses, and at whatever intervals. As I say, we want their co-operation and we hope it will be forthcoming.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—So, you are only against the reduction of hours of work?

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—We are against the reduction of hours. That is our only objection.

Then, Sir, Mr. Addyman on page 1716 said in the course of his evidence that he thought that the locking out process would be better than fine. Even then a fine automatically comes in. Locking out means that a man who is locked out loses his wages for the time he is locked out. The idea of locking out is that the man should not be fined heavily for coming late. Later on we provide that such fines should not exceed two per cent. of his wages. We have already provided that safeguard, so that the man may not be fined disproportionately to his fault. Then, on page 1787 Mr. Ramsingh says :—

"Operatives attending late are liable to be shut out and treated as absent, but may be admitted on payment of fine."

This is discipline; otherwise discipline cannot be enforced. People will come at any time as they like."

Turning to the practice that obtains even in the municipality we find that on page 1803 Mr. Cameron, in replying to the question :—

"Suppose a man comes late to your workshop, what do you generally do?"..... said "He is allowed ten minutes grace. The attendance of the men who come late is marked in red ink in the book. If a man is a habitual late attender, we see from the book that his attendance is marked in red, and he is warned."

Later on he says in reply to a question :—

"They are marked absent for the day?..... Yes.

MR. BAKHALE :—You take him the next day?.....He can start after the recess hour, and we pay him for half the day's work."

This practically comes to more than 2 per cent. of his pay. At any rate whatever be the practice, for the sake of discipline something has got to be done. The only question is whether the fine we propose is reasonable or not.

Then there is another thing :—

"Operatives shall only take their food at the recess times. Any break of this order will incur dismissal."

No doubt, this appears harsh; but at the same time we maintain that there would be no justification for this practice which is allowed at present after we provide a special recess in the morning for taking food for half an hour and again three-fourth of an hour in the afternoon. There is no justification for men taking their food during working hours. Even here if we turn to Mr. Addyman's evidence on page 1723, we find he was asked :—

"You know that many of the operatives are boarders and very few have got their relations to bring their *khana* to the mills? These boarders have to go to their places to their meals?.....His reply was :—

"This system of taking meals at any time must cease. Under whatever conditions labour lives, it must make its own arrangements. In no country and in no industrial centre in the world except in Bombay work-people are permitted to take their meals as they like."

Then, Sir, turning to page 1855, we find that with regard to the practice that obtains in the railways: Mr. Kamat put the following question :—

"Do you insist on your operatives taking their food only during the recess hour?"

The answer was: "Yes, we do." Then the question was asked :—

"Five thousand men can manage to have their food within one hour, between 12 and 1?..... Yes." and the reply was, "yes."



Then Mr. Bakhale asked :

“ If an operative takes his food outside the recess period, what do you do with him? Do you fine him, or dismiss him?” The reply was “ We should not dismiss him for a fault like that. He would probably be cautioned the first time, and if he still continued to have his food at other times, and not between the proper hours, he would be fined.

Mr. Bakhale further asked :—

“ The millowners have got a rule which says: “ Operative shall only take their food at the recess times. Any break of this order will incur dismissal.” Do you think that this punishment is rather too hard?” The reply was “ It depends on how often he does it. If a man is fined in our shop for taking his food within working hours, say 3 or 4 times in a year, he would not get his increase.”

They also inflict harder punishment if it is repeated. Of course all these rules are proposed to be reasonably interpreted and reasonably applied.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Would it not be better to alter the rule in such a way as to make a provision to the effect that ‘ on an agreement being reached as regards the recess hours, with the operatives.’ This will not necessitate the mill to go through all the procedure for the amending of the standing orders.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**We hope by the time we put this rule into force to come to an agreement with the other side. Even with regard to the standardisation scheme or standing orders we do not propose to introduce them immediately after the report of the Committee. We have to give some time to our side and some time to the men to understand what the alterations are. By that time we hope to come to some agreement.

As regards No. 7 ; this point has again been raised in the Demand No. 11. They say that this should not be enforced. Here too, whatever the practice had been in the past, we maintain that it would be subversive of all discipline and that we should do away with anomalies while we are revising our disciplinary rules. The only objection brought forward by the other side is that weavers should not be given the ticket. We have already pointed out that the ticket system has been in existence —as in Sir Ness Wadia’s mill—and I shall show from the evidence that there cannot be any objection to this proposal. Apart from the objection of a particular group of men, what we have to consider is whether the rule is reasonable or not—whether in a largely organised industry the men should be given a ticket whereby his presence may be

checked. Here again, we find that with regard to the municipality there is a rule like this. Mr. Cameron was asked—on page 1795 :—

“Have you got any ticket system or the giving of any number of badges?..... Every man is given his number and they have specially shaped tickets, for example the fitter has got a triangular ticket, and that is to make them more easily identified.”

The fitter is a highly paid man and a skilled worker and they have no objection in being provided with a ticket. This is only to make them easily identified. Then again as regards railways, if you turn to page 1855, Mr. Williams was asked this same question as below :—

“You say you have got a ticket system, How is it worked?” The answer was, “The man takes his ticket as he passes through the time office ; he then hangs it on a board placed at the site of his work.”

Turning to another public institution, The Tramway Company, we find on page 1967, Mr. Moberly explains the clock system :

“On page 3 of your statement, referring to the ticket system for the workshops department you say “clock system. All hands clock their own time.” Will you please explain what the system is?.....Our system now is to have a clock at the entrance.....”

Then he goes on to explain it. He says :

“An employee comes in, takes his card out, inserts it in the clock, presses a trigger, which automatically prints the time he comes in on his card.”

MR. KHAREGHAT :—In the case of these tickets do you insist that the weaver should carry the tickets or their badges on their person ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Nobody asks that these badges or cards should be carried on their person. There is already this system prevalent with regard to all operatives except the weavers.

MR. KAMAT :—You would not insist upon their carrying the tickets on their person, if they think it derogatory ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We do not ask anybody to carry his ticket on his person. The time-keeper distributes the tickets. The men should take them from him and keep them.

MR. KAMAT :—Some witness said that they did not like to be like prisoners with the tickets about them ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—In the old rules which we discussed with the other side, we wanted to introduce such a rule. Mr. Sasakura has also in his

evidence stated that he is giving badges. That is for another purpose, to identify a man as belonging to a particular department. Very often we find that spinners without any business go to the folding department. Unless the man carries a badge it will be difficult for the jobber to find out to which department he belongs. That was quite another rule. That rule after discussion with these gentlemen we have dropped. This refers to the attendance tickets which are given to men in all the departments except weavers. Even in some mills the tickets are given to weavers. Then proceeding to the evidence of Miss Wingate on page 2136, we find that she was asked with regard to tickets :

“Do you not think that it is a waste of time of the piece-worker?”  
She replied, “It is commonly done in the West and in a good many of the mills in India.”

Then the other rule is a corollary to the rule which I just now read.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Before you proceed further, I think it would be better that you lead evidence on the point that this practice has been in existence in the Spring Mill, Textile Mill or any other mill.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes, Sir. I think, if I mistake not, Mr. Ramsingh has stated in his evidence that when he was in the Kohinoor Mill, there was a ticket system for weavers, and that the system continues.

THE CHAIRMAN :—There is correspondence on this subject that passed between Mr. Dange and Sir Ness Wadia. I think it would be advisable to have that point cleared and led evidence in that connection.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—What Mr. Dange says is that the rule was there but it was not actually put into force.

MR. DANGE :—The rule might have been in existence. But there was no notice of that on the boards. There are rules of the Company by which we can find out whether a rule did exist or not.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Perhaps the best thing would be to clear the point. Mr. Saklatvala may call some managers to give evidence on Wednesday and Mr. Dange may call some weavers to prove the contrary.

MR. ASAVALE :—I think Mr. Harrison or somebody from the Spring Mill stated that it was introduced just before the strike.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Let the point be cleared.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The weavers object to this rule under a misapprehension owing to the old rule which proposed to give a badge in order to indicate the department to which he belongs. It is just likely that weavers may

object to that. We found that there was a certain amount of opposition and so we dropped it. We hope that at a later stage if we can come to some agreement with the other side to introduce it.

Then as regards Rule 8, we think that it is only fair that if there is ticket there should be some check. We say :—

“ Any operative who, after presenting his ticket, is found absent from his post without leave without sufficient cause is liable to be treated as absent without leave.....”

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Would it not be better to substitute the words ‘from his proper place or places’ for the words ‘from his post’?

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—Even then the difficulty would arise, as to what the proper place of a workman is. For instance in some mills the weaver has to go to the west room to bring west and in other mills west may be provided for him in the shed.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—If it is the custom that he has to go and get it, the words “the proper place.” may be preferable.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—I would like Mr. Caroe to consider it.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Instead of ‘without leave without sufficient cause’ think it would be better to say ‘without leave or other sufficient excuse.’

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—There is no objection. Mr. Joshi suggested the word ‘duties’ instead of the word ‘post.’ But Mr. Caroe has come to the conclusion that ‘post’ is a better word.

**MR. ASAVALE** :—‘Proper place’ would be a better word.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—As regards Rule 9, I do not think it is contentious. So also with regard to No. 10. There is nothing particular about that rule. Then we come to Rule 11. On this rule there is a good deal of controversy raised. This refers to search. I will not dilate on the rule itself as there has been sufficient discussion on the matter. Turning to page 1599, there is a very good authority to show that the rule may be maintained. I say I have got the good authority of Mr. Asavale himself. You will find on that page Mr. Asavale says :—

“Whenever you have suspicion search them and there is no harm.” That is what we intend to do. Nobody is going to search all operatives but we are going to search only men who are suspected. We only want some authority to be given to the gateman for doing so. The legal position of it will be explained by Mr. Caroe. Then on page 1649 Mr. Sasakura was asked by Mr. Stones :—

“When the gateman suspects, does he search the man?” The reply was “If he suspects he can search.”

Then again on page 1788, the rule was read out to Mr. Ramsingh, the Manager of Morarji Goculdas Mill, and he was asked whether he was in favour of it. He said :—

“ I am very sorry to say that I do not like this. But I have to agree to this rule, because there are so many theft taking place. ”

Even though he was not in favour of the rule he said that such a rule was necessary in order to control the mill. On page 1806 we find the following question put by Mr. Asavale and the answer to it by Mr. Cameron :—

“ Have you got a system of searching ?.....If only a man goes out with anything bulky about his person, or if anything is suspected. He is not searched in the ordinary course. We have a watchman at the gate. ”

This is what is done in the municipality and this is exactly the practice that prevails in the mills, which we want to keep up. With regard to railways on page 1852, Mr. Williams says :—

“ You have got valuable property in your work-shops and occasionally it may be stolen by the worker. Do you take any precaution as regards that? .....Yes ; we have a sergeant in charge of the ward and watch, and he stands at the gate, and if he finds that any workers have anything on their person he stops them and searches them. ”

I come now to the practice obtaining in the Tramway Company. (Page 1917—about the middle). Mr. Moberly says in reply to a question “ Have you got any such rule in your workshop ? ”

“ Yes. We have no female operatives ; so that we can ignore them. All the employes leaving our workshops pass between two watchmen, whose duty it is to see that nothing is concealed in tiffin carriers or in umbrellas. Further the Jemadar of the watchmen passes his hands over the clothing of all employees to make sure that they are not taking valuables out in their packets. ”

We of course do not propose to go so far ; we simply keep the right of search.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—** Supposing the words ‘ on suspicion ’ are added after ‘ search ’ ?

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—** We have no objection ; they may be added.

Then, Sir, even the workers themselves are not so much opposed to this rule as their representatives tried to make out. (Ref. page 1993—Oral Evidence of Mr. Mahomed Umar and Mr. Mahomed Ibrahim weavers of the Indian Mills).

This rule as regards search was read out to these weavers (Mr. Mahomed Umar and Mr. Mahomed Ibrahim) and they were asked "Are you in favour of this rule?" and their reply was: "When they suspect a particular man, they may search him, but not the others." Then, of course, Mr. Bakhale wanted to put them right by asking them "You told me just now that only one or two in a hundred stole things from the mill premises. That being the case, do you think that a rule like this making all the workers liable to be searched should be brought into force?" Then, Sir, you properly remarked that Mr. Bakhale was cross-examining the witnesses. At any rate they do not seem to object to the man suspected being searched; their objection is to all men being searched, which would cast a slur on all hands. But that is not intended.

Then, as regards Rule No. 12, I do not think that there is any material difference of opinion there. It only says:—

"Before the beginning of each month a notice will be posted outside the Time-keeper's office and in the Mill stating (a) the days on which the mill will be closed during the following month, and (b) the date or dates on which wages will be paid."

THE CHAIRMAN :—There is a question about the payment of wages early.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We always try to do it as early as possible. Our practice is to make the payment before a holiday. If you will refer to the list for the current year, you will find the date in January is 13th, because the 14th is a holiday; in February we do it on the 9th because 10th is a holiday; during March the holiday comes on the 17th, and therefore we do it on the 15th; in April the holiday comes on the 11th, and we do it as early as the 9th; and so on. We try to do it as early as possible. During the Divali holidays especially we try to accommodate the men. But, as I said, our actual experience is that if we try to do it before the 10th, it really involves special work and we have to employ extra men or give additional overtime allowance to men employed for about fifteen days or so.

THE CHAIRMAN :—In some cases, you do it before the 10th?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—In some cases we do; especially during the Divali holidays. In the past we have done it even on the 8th, but I think that is the earliest. That, again, is a point which I think might be discussed by the Joint Committee that is proposed to be set up. The other side can go into all the details, and find out whether our trouble is real or not. If we can expedite it we shall certainly do it; but I think that is a point that might be thrashed out by the Joint Committee.

MR. ASAVALA :—Their is nothing to be thr~~u~~shed out. You have only to put it in the rule.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The rule leaves the exact date to be determined later ; it only says that the date should be published. We have pointed out that there is real difficulty in making payment before the 10th. We can fix the date later ; the rule merely says that the dates should be published.

Then, Sir, going on to Rule No. 13, where the question of "play off" comes in. Here also, let me go back to the evidence of Mr. Sasakura at page 1650. Mr. Sasakura was asked about Rule 13 : "Have you got the play off system in your mills ?" and his reply is : "Yes, but we have no such rule." Of course, as we have pointed out, during the discussion, there is no fixed rule at present in any mill, but that is the custom. In fact, the nature of our industry is such that all the departments are inter-dependent on one another. If work suffers in one department and we cannot carry on in another department, or if owing to trade fluctuations we are unable to work all our machines, this has got to be done. I think we have said enough as regards the practice which actually obtains at present, and Mr. Sasakura also bears this out. He says that although he has got no such rule in his mill, still the practice prevails.

Then, let me go to page 1719—Mr. Ramsingh's evidence. He gives a very good reason. He was asked "Are you in favour of this" and he said :—

"Yes. I will just tell you. As a result of stoppage the mill loses profit on that loom and the overhead charges are increased. So, it is the mills that have to lose much. So far as possible, the mills never keep either their machinery or looms idle. If the mills are not profiting by stopping the looms, the workmen would not be justified in asking compensation. On the other hand, the mill loses."

Then, Sir, again on page 1798 in the municipality although perhaps the parallel is not quite exact some such system prevails. Mr. Cameron was asked : "Have you got the play off when there is any defect in the machinery ? Do you ask the people to go away temporarily when there is any defect in the machinery ?" And his answer was :—

"Yes : that is done. In the Road Department and in the Drainage Department, the amount of work which they have fluctuates with the orders from the various departments. For instance, if I have certain sewers which I want excavated or repaired, I send an order to the Drainage Department to carry it out. ..."

Thus, he explains the system as it prevails in the Municipality. Again, on page 1808, he explains this more fully. He was asked how the system of play off came into operation in his workshops, and he said :—

“ When we have scarcity of orders. For instance, we had about 3 months ago certain large development works, which were stopped through retrenchment ; we had also the Tansa pipe line.....”

and then he went on to explain how the system was put into practice.

Then, again, coming to the Railways, (page 1850) Mr. Williams says that there is no such rule as regards the railways, but he admits that he feels that there is no parallel between our industry and the railway workshop, and he says :—

“ Of course in a mill you could not do that. You would have to do something of the kind referred to in this rule, because you could not pay men for doing no work at all.”

So far as our industry is concerned, he too approves of this rule.

Then, on page 1890, Mr. Bradley has said that this rule does not obtain in the engineering trade. It is quite true that the rule does not obtain in the engineering trade, but Mr. Bradley will admit that there is no necessity for such a rule in the engineering trade, when there is only an hour's notice on either side. When asked “ Does not your industry get depressed sometimes ?” he said :—

“ Yes, especially engineering. The workers are engaged on an hourly basis, and if a slack time comes, there is an hour's notice on either side. It just means that the foreman comes along and gives you an hour's notice and you are finished.”

Of course, it is practically play off. There is no such rule in the engineering trade because the contract can be cancelled after an hour's notice.

THE CHAIRMAN :—He could then go and get work in some other mill.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—When we play off a man he can go and engage himself in another mill.

THE CHAIRMAN :—He has got to give a month's notice or a fortnight's notice.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—When we play him off, the usual practice is to tell him, when he comes to work that there will be no work for him for that day, or for the next week, so that he can immediately go out and seek employment elsewhere.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is not in the rule. There is a legal liability on him to work for you, unless of course he gives the usual notice.



MR. SAKLATVALA :—That is quite true. But we also say that the man is not dismissed, but is simply played off.

THE CHAIRMAN :—He has got to take a Holiday, as he has got to come back.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As far as the weavers are concerned, very often this is done, but the weavers of one mill go and work as substitutes in another mill.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It is a point on which Mr. Caroe can tell us something more—whether it is a one-sided rule or not.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I will take up one more point and then Mr. Caroe can explain. There is Miss Wingate's evidence on page 2134. Mr. Asavale asked : " If the employers do not want to work a machine, instead of giving notice, they may resort to stopping the machine deliberately in order to " play off " the men." You pointed out that it would be fraud. Mr. Asavale suggested : " But a rule like this gives opportunity for such a thing." The reply of the witness was :—

" It is a hardship in all industries, but it is understood. It does not happen only in India but in all countries when work is slack or there is a breakdown of machinery."

MR. KAMAT :—As regards " when it is necessary to do so because of the state of the trade," can you not look ahead for some time ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We do, and we do not play off men unnecessarily. But sometimes it happens that we have to change the counts immediately ; or sometimes it happens that although we have particular beams in stock for particular looms, still it is no good weaving that particular kind of cloth as there is no demand for it, and therefore we have to keep these beams back and start working on a different sort, and we have to play off the men.

MR. KAMAT :— How long ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It depends on each individual case; sometimes it may be for a day or two; sometimes it may be for a week. Owing to a change of counts some machines will have to be stopped. We may not have to work all the parts although the ring frames will be kept going ; sometimes we have to keep some ring frames shut, and so on.

MR. KAMAT :—Can you not see a week ahead ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Generally it does not go on for a long time. If the weaving shed is to be closed for a month or two, in that case notice can be given.....

MR. KAMAT :—A good management ought to be able to take stock of their orders and look ahead for some time.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It is not as regards the orders only. As I said owing to the inter-dependence of the various departments, sometimes when there is a change of count, one department has got to wait and we cannot go on paying the men when these machines are not working.

MR. CAROE :—Sir, the first question that really pertains to me is the legality of these rules. If you will refer to the evidence of Mr. Joshi (page 1923), you will find that Mr. Joshi says: "When I say that they are one-sided, I do not mean to say that they are illegal, but when a standing order is to be made, it ought to be, in my opinion, just, reasonable and equitable." The matter I have to argue is really at an end, because it has been admitted by the legal expert for the other side that the rules are legal. There is no doubt that in his evidence, Mr. Joshi raised one or two legal points as regards these rules, and therefore I must answer them. I think I did so on the first occasion, but I will just go through these rules again. The first rule that was dealt with was Rule 8 : it was suggested that the word "post" should be "duty." My criticism was that the whole mill might be covered by the word "duty," and it would be rather difficult to define it. You suggested that it might be "proper place or places of work"; that I think would be even better; that would cover the man walking from one place to another for the purpose of doing his duty. The words "without leave without sufficient cause" I put in for this reason. The words "without leave or without sufficient excuse" were found difficult of translation by one of my clerks. If they can be properly translated, those words would be better. He will have to establish a sufficient excuse. I quite agree that in the English language that would be very much better.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Do you think there would be difficulty in translating it into Marathi?

MR. ASAVALE :—I do not think there would be any difficulty.

MR. CAROE :—The next question was about the right of search. I have again been through all the cases which were referred to last time and the authorities, and I really have been unable to find anything which seems to me to criticise successfully the position I took up, that it was extremely dangerous to even detain a man or woman to enable them to be searched by a policeman without a particular provision to that effect. Apparently the idea of the representatives of the other side is that the management should detain the man until the arrival of the policeman. If my view of the law is correct, even that would be an offence unless the rule permitted the detention of the man, because as I pointed out to you on the former occasion it is an offence to detain a man and prevent

him from going where he wants to go. The offence does not begin with the search of the man; the offence begins at an earlier stage. I do not think that keeping a man to enable him to be searched by the policeman—which after all may take some time will be really any better. I rather doubt whether the policeman would be willing to search the man at all without taking him to the police station. It would be much more serious if a man is taken to the police station and nothing is found on him than if he is searched in the mill premises. So, I submit that the rule is really necessary. If the word “on suspicion” were added, as suggested by you, I think it would make it necessary to some extent to prove that there was some reason for searching the man—it could not be an indiscriminate search. But, as I pointed out, when several hundreds of men and women are walking out of the mill at one time, it really will be very difficult to detain the whole crowd and search every one of them; there must be a certain amount of reason.

MR. KAMAT :—Would you accept the words “on suspicion” or “on reasonable suspicion”?

MR. CAROE :—“On suspicion” would, I think, be probably better, because it would have to be reasonable suspicion. You might say that there would be no objection to the words “on suspicion.” I am told that it is not generally usual to search a man unless he seems to be bulky, or they have some reason to suspect him of thefts in the department. A man is not generally searched, unless there is some general suspicion either attaching to the department or some particular suspicion attaching to him.

The next point is Rule 13 and the question of “playing off.” There can be no doubt whatever that in any case the mill would be entitled to terminate the contract between the man and the mill by giving him 14 days’ notice under Rule 15. So that “playing off” is limited, at the outside, to that period of time. But of course, from one point of view, the rule is not really so unreasonable as it would seem, because if the mill cannot, on account of some emergency, work any machine or machines, the mill would suffer just as much as the man who is “played off” for the time. In a trade where every process is continuous upon the other, it is not always possible, even looking further ahead, to see whether any particular department may or may not be able to work. An accident in one department may, without any fault on the part of the mill, really stop the working of several other departments. From the evidence, there can be no doubt that that is the practice in England also. I think, subject to correction, Mr. Bradley admitted that. It was not a rule, but it was the custom, and Mr. Stones also referred to it. The point really is whether the workman is to be paid, when the mills are, through no fault of their own, forced to close down, without earning anything out of the man. That is the whole crux of the point.

If the man is detained in the mill for a short period, then he will have to be paid. But if he has to remain in the mill for one hour only, and if after that period he is detained longer, then he has to be paid for the whole period during which he is in the mill. If at the end of that hour he is told to go, he goes not get, under Rule 14, any pay at all. That is really the new Rule 14 which, I think, was rather based on what the book that was shown to us said, last time I was here. There can be no doubt that if the rule is there and is passed, the rule is a good one.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—I think you must make a distinction between cases where the mill has to stop for something beyond the control of the management for instance, an accident to the machinery, an epidemic, and so on, and cases where the management think it would not pay them to go on and the state of the trade makes it desirable to stop doing certain things and starting other work. That is more or less under the control of the management. It has been ruled in England in the former case that because of accident, etc., it is legal for the management (the case I am referring is one of mines) to stop, and the workman had no right to compensation. That is 1926, 1 K. B. 22. As I read that case, it does afford authority that in England, where a miner suffered because certain shafts had to be closed and the man claimed to be paid for the time, it was held that the mine owner was not obliged to pay. On the other hand, take the case of stopping when it is necessary to do so because of the state of the trade. That introduces different considerations. In a case, which Mr. Joshi cited (1903, 2 K. B. 728), a very strong opinion was expressed by the Court of Appeal that, even if there was a break, it was one that could not be recognized as valid, because of its uncertainty and one-sided nature, and so on. Therefore, although Mr. Joshi may have said that he did not object to the legality of the practice, that authority does show the illegality of any practice by which the men can be told that they have got to go and get no compensation, when it is for a reason that is within the control of the management.

**MR. CAROE** :—The point you are at, Sir, if I understand correctly, is this, that where there is a stoppage necessitated either owing to a breakdown of the machinery, or owing to a failure of what I might call the continuous supply through a mill, owing to the workmen in one department not appearing, or going on strike, and they are unable to feed the other departments...

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—I put a strike in the same category as an accident.

**MR. CAROE** :—In a case in which the mill themselves are not to blame, and it is impossible to carry on the work in any subsequent department, it would, *prima facie* on the authorities which you have cited, not be unreasonable to "play off" the men in the subsequent departments where there is no

work for them, but it would, on the authority of the other case which I dealt with last time, be unreasonable to shut them out without notice because, in the opinion of the Company, it was unprofitable to carry on. That is really the distinction between the two points. Assuming then that it would be necessary to really put in possibly some other words for a clearer definition of what is understood by "state of the trade."

THE CHAIRMAN :—You may consider it.

MR. CAROE :—I shall consider whether it might be possible to provide some words which might meet with the objection.

We have altered Rule 15, according to what was suggested, by reducing the period of notice to 14 days.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Before you go on : With regard to the words "strike, fire, catastrophe, emergency, or epidemic" occurring at the beginning of Rule 13, "emergency" is a general word. Would it not be better to say "strike fire, catastrophe, epidemic, or other emergency rendering it necessary or advisable to do so?"

MR. CAROE :—Yes, the other point with which Mr. Saklatvala dealt and with which I have to deal is regarding Rule 3, and that is the question whether the decision of the Manager should be final. You will remember, Sir, there was a case only the other day before Mr. Justice Kemp relating to a doctor who was dismissed from the service of the Municipality. It was referred to in the papers, and if you will remember, his case really collapsed in the High Court because it was held that there had been an enquiry at which the Municipal Commissioner and certain members of the Standing Committee were present and the doctor was present, and he was asked to say what he had to say and was given an opportunity to cross examine the witnesses. The whole point was whether the enquiry, as an enquiry before Mr. Clayton, was a judicial enquiry, and as far as I could follow the case from the reports in the newspapers, Mr. Justice Kemp held that it was not necessary to go through what you might call the absolutely strict judicial and legal formalities. It was held that the enquiry which was held was a fair and reasonable one, and the man was given the opportunity of putting his case before the committee. Once he had done that and the Committee came to a fair and proper conclusion in the matter in their opinion, it was an end of the case as far as the doctor was concerned, and he was never entitled in any court to go into the question whether he was or was not properly dismissed. Mr. Justice Kemp never went into that. He simply held that the Municipality and Mr. Clayton had come to a fair conclusion in the matter on the evidence brought before them, and that was the end of it. That is really the whole point that I have made throughout, and in support of which I cited authorities last time, that

the workman is not prevented from going to court. That we cannot contract against. But if he goes to court, all he can do is to say that the Manager has not properly treated him. He can say that the Manager has not heard him and he was not allowed to call his witnesses, and the Manager did not hear what the other workmen may have had to say. But if the Manager has heard the man and has given the man an opportunity of examining or cross-examining witnesses, then he cannot go on. It really is, with submission, not unreasonable because if every time that a workman had a complaint he was entitled to go to court and have its merits argued, it would mean that the Manager would have to go to court, the jobbers would have to go to court, the Assistant Managers would have to go to court, and the whole time of the mill would really be spent in going to court to argue small questions of discipline before the court.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Take a case like this. A man is charged with some misconduct which renders him liable to dismissal. The man says "No, I did not commit that act of misconduct." The Manager, after some enquiry, decides against the man and dismisses him. The man who is discharged has a right to bring a suit for wrongful dismissal, and then he has the right to be heard on the merits of the case, as to whether he was rightly dismissed or not. Would you not be rather depriving the workman of that right? In the case of a Government officer, he has a right to say that although he was heard, he was not dismissed properly; he did not take a bribe, for instance. Of course, the case of a Government servant is not a correct analogy, because Government can dismiss a servant of theirs without any reasons. But you can take any other case.

MR. CAROE :—I quite agree that I cannot prevent a man going to court unless there is a reference. I cannot do that, because the Contract Act prohibits that. No provision that I want to put in here would render that legal. I would also go so far as to admit that the man would be entitled to show either that he had not been reasonably treated by the Manager, that is to say, that the Manager had not heard him, or possibly that the conclusion that the Manager had arrived at on the facts put before him was really what I might call perverse. I do not think subject to what you say, with respect, that the court, sitting as a court, if on the evidence, it would come to a different conclusion, would have to find that the Manager was wrong. That is really the difference. It is just like a court of appeal often saying "If we had been the jury, we would have found differently. But the jury had the witnesses before them, and unless the jury are perverse, we cannot upset them on a question of fact." That is really what, I say, the court here would do.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Is that the ordinary law in England for, say, a man employed by a Company who is dismissed? If there is any case you can cite it, barring this Tramway Company case.

MR. CAROE :—I have got one case. It is a case which was cited against me in a case I acted in where a man was dismissed by the Bombay Cycle and Motor Agency. Of course it is not a reported case, but they also had in the agreement a clause that the decision of the Board of Directors shall be final. The court came to a conclusion adverse to me, that the man had been justifiably dismissed, but the court also held that they would have come to the same conclusion because the Board were the final arbiters in the matter. I will try and get the case after the lunch interval.

THE CHAIRMAN :—There may be the case that you cited. I think it was followed in 11, Calcutta. There it was held that the contract provided for submission to arbitration, and therefore did not come under this provision. But in the later case which Mr. Joshi cited, 1891, 64, Law Times, 96, which was identically similar, it was held that it was absurd to say that it was a submission to arbitration; that it was hardly a case like that of an engineer architect who is a sort of referee between the owner and the contractor. What I mean is that it is very difficult to say that submission to this rule would mean that the operative agrees that there shall be arbitration upon any particular dispute, and that the decision of the Manager as arbitrator shall be final.

MR. CAROE :—That is what I was trying to draft; because, otherwise what you say would be correct, and there would be no object in the rule any more, because the man after dismissal by the Manager would go to a court on every point.

THE CHAIRMAN :—But ordinarily, he would not go to a court. It may be the case of his Trade Union taking up his case, and bringing a suit. But they are not likely to do that, except in very big matters. The ordinary method which they prefer is going on a lightning strike.

MR. CAROE :—Mr. Coltman promised to let me have the case this morning, but I have not yet got it. I will try and bring it up after the lunch interval.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Supposing that we wanted to make it clear that it should not bar an operative from his right to file a suit, would it do if some words like the following were inserted, namely, "without any prejudice to any right of an operative aggrieved by his or their decision to resort to legal proceedings in a court of law"?

MR. CAROE :—That would be really rather worse than leaving out the rule altogether. That would practically mean that there was really a resort to law; not that one wishes to prevent a man going to law, but it would not help the Manager at all. I do not know how the Manager would take it if he was told that everything he did was subject to a suit in the law courts.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Would you prefer to miss out Rule 3, and simply allow an appeal from the Manager to the Managing Agents.

**MR. CAROE** :—I would have to enquire about it.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—That brings us up to Rule 15. In Rule 15 we have now made an alteration in the last portion. Where we had said before "If any permanent operative leaves without such notice he shall forfeit the whole or part of the wages due to him for the month at the discretion of the Manager by way of liquidated damages," we now say "If any permanent operative leaves without such notice, he shall forfeit the whole or part of the wages due to him for the fourteen days immediately prior to his so leaving without notice at the discretion of the Manager by way of liquidated damages." The period of one month is changed to 14 days.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—I think there is some misunderstanding. Was not Rule 14 meant for operatives like clerks drawing monthly wages?

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—No, it refers to the operatives on a daily earning basis.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—The two are different cases, if I mistake not. This was meant for people like clerks, who were drawing on a monthly basis, whereas the others are operatives drawing on a daily earning basis.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—There is a distinction between the two.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—The operatives provided for in the first case are put there on a monthly basis; that relates to clerks, I think.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—There are operatives who are on a monthly basis, jobbers and others.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—You pay them really on the day basis. Your scheme is worked out in that way.

**MR. CAROE** :—The word "operative" has been defined in Rule No. 2, and that definition would exclude the clerical staff.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—The view that will be taken by a court will be that the first part is intended to apply to people like clerks. If you are going to reduce the period of notice with regard to clerks there would be controversy.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—As regards these rules I wish only to point out that they are practically the same as in the Lancashire Rules. Rule No. 2 says :—

"In case any person shall leave his or her employment without giving notice aforesaid, the employer or employers shall be entitled to reasonable compensation for damages sustained, but such damages shall not exceed an amount equal to one week's average wages of the person so leaving."



There is weekly notice and the employer has a right to forfeit wages.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**In 15, Bombay Law Report, page 19, there is a case of a weaver who left the service without sufficient notice. The rules made it incumbent on him to give the Company 15 days' notice. The Company forfeited his wages for the notice period. It was held by the High Court that there was nothing illegal or anything against public policy in forfeiting the wages, as he had agreed to this.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**Operatives whose names are on the muster roll are on the daily wage basis. In what you call abstract book, the clerks on the monthly basis are entered. All these rules are intended to apply for those who are on the muster roll and who are paid monthly on the daily basis. It might be made clear. We do not intend that this rule should apply to our clerks because they have got a set of different rules.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Then objection has been taken to the fact that the mill can give notice at any time and that the operatives should give notice on a specified date, that is, on the last day of the month. Is it reasonable to impose this restriction on the operatives, when there is no similar restriction on the employers ?

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**That point also will be considered. It is but fair that the notice should be identical even as regards the day on which notice should be given. We ourselves think that it should be fair.

Then as regards rule 16, which says :—

“ Each jobber will be deemed to have knowledge of the rules under the Indian Factories Act as regards the employment of women and children and will be personally responsible to see those rules are not infringed.”

This is also more or less a legal question. Under the Factories Act the manager is of course responsible. But the manager explains these rules to the jobber who must be deemed to have a knowledge of these rules. After all, it depends upon the jobber for the strict carrying out of these rules. We simply put this rule in order to draw the attention of the jobber that he is responsible for this. This does not mean that the manager is relieved of his liability.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**You can delete this Rule 16 and have instead Rule 20.

**MR. CAROE :—**Yes, Sir. We agree. Both cover the same thing.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**Then as regards Rule 17, objection has been taken with regard to the power given to the manager for fining. As far as the legal aspect is concerned, Mr. Caroe will deal with it. But as far as the practice is

concerned, it obtains also in the municipality. On page 1806, Mr. Cameron the Bombay Corporation was asked what were the offences for which fines were imposed. He said :—

“ Misconduct, wilful disobedience of orders. We have a good system of fines for outside work. If a man who is sent out on a job does not go straight to his job, but wastes his time, he is fined.”

Again on page 1812, Mr. Cameron makes it clear that they have a regular system of fine. Then with regard to railways on page 1846 Mr. Williams was asked :—

“ Have you got any system of fines in your workshop ?.....Yes.

What are the offences for which fines are imposed ?..... For disobedience of the orders, for spoiling the work and of course for any breach of the rules. As we pointed out during the discussion we classify the offences into major and minor. In the railways and municipality they have not got any special classification. As regards strike rule XXVIII of the Railway Rules says :—

“ Persons striking work or intimidating or conspiring with other persons employed in these workshops to strike work, will be liable to be summarily dismissed, and forfeit all wages and provident fund, bonus, and interest thereon due to them.”

They even lose the benefit of provident fund. They are also dismissed. Since we are on these rules, we may point out that Rule XXIII of the Railway Rules says with regard to smoking :—

“ Smoking is strictly prohibited either in or about the workshops of the Company's premises, and any workman found smoking will be liable to dismissal.”

This is a much more drastic rule than ours. Then with regard to habitual late attendance, I think Mr. Bradley himself has admitted on page 1892 :—

“ In the case of permanent workers if they come late often, they will be reprimanded and finally they will get the sack.”

Here we propose to fine the man who habitually comes late. In the first place he will be warned and then he will be fined. As regards quarrelling, misbehaving and so on, similar rules obtain in other institutions. I think that has been admitted by Mr. Bradley. On page 1905 it was pointed out to him :—

“ In one case in 1901, 2 Kings' Bench, a rule saying that all workers shall observe good order and decorum while in the factory was held to be a good rule. Do you accept that ?.....Yes.”

Then at the end of these rules we say that the total amount of fine inflicted under this rule during any particular month shall in no case exceed

2 per cent. of the total earnings. Mr. Bradley pointed out that we have no Truck Act. Whether we have got a Truck Act or not, a most important provision has been made that the fine should not exceed a certain amount. Two per cent. is after all a very small amount. If we turn to page 1836, we find that the municipality inflicts a much greater amount of fine. The following discussion took place.

MR. CAMERON :—“Have you got any maximum limit?.....We have no limits.

Suppose a man draws Rs. 30/- a month, how much will you fine him, if he commits mistakes?.....There is a standing order that the fines must never exceed one month's pay in a year.”

It means  $8\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. of his total earnings. Then again with regard to railways, Mr. Williams was asked—it is on page 1847 at the top :

“Have you fixed a maximum for fines?.....His reply was “There is a rule that no man should be fined more than one-eighth of his monthly pay.”

This comes to  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. So, I think that it cannot be maintained that our rules in this regard are not reasonable.

Then, as regards Rule 19, as far as I remember, the only demand made by the other side was that the copy of the order should be given to the operatives in all cases. We say that, if a copy of such order is demanded, it should be supplied to the operatives. It is for the operative to demand it whenever he likes it. We agree that when once it is demanded we should give a copy of the order. The reasons for fine or dismissal will be recorded and if the operative wants a copy of that order, the manager is bound to supply it.

The other rules are non-contentious.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What about the rule regarding the returning of spoiled cloths to weavers?.....

MR. SAKLATVALA :—All these have been dealt with in the communication which the Millowners' Association sent to the press and also to the other side. This is given in our written statement as Appendix E. The terms formulated by the Bombay Millowners' Association begin on page 25. On page 26 at the bottom No. 5 stated :—

Fines and unclaimed wages.—Fines should be imposed in accordance with rules devised for the purpose, and referred to above as our Demand No. 4. Where faulty cloth is handed over to weavers, this will be left in the hands of some responsible officer not lower in rank than an Assistant Weaving Master. All fines recovered will be credited to a welfare fund, or utilised in some way

for the benefit of workers. As to unclaimed wages we have no objection same being made available to operatives at any time on sufficient identification.

Instead of leaving this here, we thought it would be safer to insert it in the rules. As regards the new rules we have not had any discussion with the representatives of labour. They are free to discuss these new rules.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—In England they are not returned. At any rate that is what is recommended by the Truck Committee of 1906.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—So far as we are able to judge the weavers prefer to have the cloth back. If a fine is inflicted in a case where the cloth is absolutely spoiled, and where it is proved that the weaver is responsible for it—if the cloth is absolutely unmarketable—then it will not be a case of nominal fine. Here it is not a case of fine for disciplinary measures but it is a case where the mill tries to recover a portion of the actual loss to it. Then it becomes a question what amount should the man be made to pay. This will depend upon the quality of the cloth, the price of the piece of the spoiled cloth and the realisable value of the piece of cloth and so on. So, we have to go into all these details in order to judge whether the fine inflicted is fair or not. Rather than that the practice has always been—so far we have not had any opposition from the weavers—to return the cloth to the weavers at cost price. If the other side wants evidence on that point they may call in some witnesses.

**MR. KAMAT** :—Some weavers stated that they did not want to take back the cloth.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Supposing you give the option to the weaver.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—Then the question would be about the fine. There we may leave no option to the weaver. The fine will be very heavy and it will be difficult to judge about the fairness of the fine itself. I am agreeable to give the option to the weaver. Can the other side suggest a better method?

**MR. ASVALE** :—Evidence has been led and the weavers are not in favour of taking back the cloth.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—Do you suggest that we should inflict a fine?

**MR. ASVALE** :—If it is proved that it is their mistake they are ready to pay the fine.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—What is the amount of fine that should be inflicted?

**MR. ASVALE** :—That has to be settled. You must look to the earnings of the weaver.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—We must look to the amount of loss that the Company is put to.

**MR. RAJAB** :—In some mills the fine never exceeds 4 as.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—For small faults fines are always inflicted from 1 to 8 as. Mr. Stones has already pointed out that in Bombay the practice has been that the merchants accept small pieces at a discount. If there is a piece of 23 yards and another piece of 17 yards in a piece of 40 yards the merchants will accept it at a small discount. We cannot possibly ask the merchants to accept 5 or 6 pieces of that one piece of 50 yards at a discount. So long as the mill is not put to a loss we do not want to punish the weaver. If the mill is actually put to a loss, especially in the case of finer quality dhoties—specially in Calcutta we have to compete with English goods where they do not accept any faulty goods at all—in such a case we have to arrive at some method whereby the Company will recoup some of this loss.

MR. KAMAT :—Just as you have a limit in ordinary cloth, you must have a limit even for this kind of cloth?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes, but the option will be nominal. I admit, however, that the limit of the fine has got to be defined.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Will 2 per cent. be too little?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It would be too little, especially in cases of fine cloth, where owing to the piece being spoiled, we cannot sell a cloth of the value of Rs. 15/- even for Rs. 5/-; for instance, artificial silk pieces. In such a case 2 per cent. of the wages as fine will mean only a few pias.

MR. KAMAT :—You can come to an agreement that the fine shall not exceed say one-fourth?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes, we can, and then give the option to the weaver either to submit to the fine or take the cloth.

MR. ASVALE :—You have to bear in mind that sometimes the cloth is faulty not through the fault of the weaver but through other causes. That will have to be taken into consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN :—If you can make any suggestions to make that point clear we will consider them. The difficulty is to devise anything workable.

MR. KAMAT :—You have a new rule, Rule 17, that deals with the question of granting leave. I suppose you wanted to formulate a set of rules about leave.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—There is no question of granting leave to operatives on full pay.

THE CHAIRMAN :—There is nothing about full pay. What was said was that leave without pay should be granted.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**Yes. We are now providing a rule for the grant of special leave, leave exceeding one day and not exceeding two months. When they go up-country, the operatives ask for a month's leave or six weeks' leave. That is why we have put "two months." We also provide that the period of leave granted shall be stated in writing by the head of his department, so that there may be no complaint later on. We also provide "In the event of an operative taking leave in excess of the period granted, he shall lose all rights to re-instatement unless he has previously secured permission in writing to extend the leave originally granted and returns to work on the first working day following the period covered by any such extension." So that, the period can be extended with permission, and the mill is bound to take him back if he returns on the day following the period covered by the leave given. At present what happens is, a man is granted a week's leave by the Weaving Master, but the man takes ten days, and says that he was given leave for 10 days. So to avoid any such dispute, we have framed this rule.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Where is the head of the department to state in writing? Is he going to give a certificate to the man? It is not very clear.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**We can provide that a copy of the order shall be handed to the man, or something to that effect.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**A record shall be kept of each such grant of leave and a certificate of such grant signed by the officer shall be given to the operative?

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**We have no objection.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**There will be a register I suppose?

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**The leave granted shall be entered in a register kept by the head of the Department and a certificate to that effect shall also be given to the operative.

**MR. KHAREGHAT :—**Why should there be the word "special?"

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**I can leave out the word "special."

**MR. ASAVALE :—**You should make it clear that in case of illness of the operative, on production of a doctor's certificate he shall be given extension.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**We provide for it.

**MR. ASAVALE :—**In case of illness, it should be obligatory on the part of the mill management to give him an extension.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**The difficulty there is this; a man goes to his village, and if we insist on a doctor's certificate, he will first of all say that there is no doctor in the village.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—In the case of Government Servants when there is no hospital, we take Patel's Certificates, but that is not always trustworthy.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—All these rules will be reasonably applied, hard and fast rules will be disadvantageous both to the man and the mill.

**MR. KAMAT** :—In the case of extension he has to secure "previous permission" in writing. Supposing there is no time, will it be enough if he merely applies?

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—Suppose he has already taken two months, and he applies for another two months, the Manager may not want to grant that leave.

**MR. KAMAT** :—Supposing, two days before the leave expires, he sees the necessity for leave for a further period, and he has no time to get a written permission?

**MR. ASAVALE** :—Anyhow work is carried on by the substitute; that being so, where is the harm?

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—The difficulty will be that when a substitute works for two months, or three months, he refuses to go away. In fact our rule provides that after two months the substitute will be looked upon as a permanent hand; that is why we put "two months. The substitute is bound to go away if we turn him out during the period of two months.

**MR. BRADLEY** :—It is unnecessary to provide that after two months the substitute shall be looked upon as a permanent hand.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—You wanted that; if it is necessary, leave it out. How will you distinguish then between permanent and temporary hands? If the regular worker goes away, we have necessarily to get somebody else in his place, but if we keep that man for more than two months, he will insist on continuing. It is provided for under Rule 9. At present when a man works for a long time, he insists on being kept. He says "I have worked so long; you may have called me a substitute, but I insist on being treated as a permanent hand." In fact the other side have taken the same view.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—You can provide for it by some such words as "unless he has previously secured permission in writing or for any reason beyond his control he could not do so."

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—Yes.

(After Recess.)

**MR. CAROE** :—Sir, with regard to the case in 64 *Law Times*—that was the case you referred me to—I have looked at that again, and I think it was decided rather on the particular facts of the case. I could not bring the autho-

rity here because the High Court would not allow me to take the book from Library. What the Judges—at all events one Judge—found was that there was some ambiguity in the rule under which the man was working, and that it could not be taken that a tramway conductor or a tramway driver had really agreed something which on the face of the rules was really possible of two constructions and therefore they held that there was no agreement for reference to arbitration. I do not think that the court held that if apt words were used—whether the words here are apt or not is a matter which I shall deal with later—but I do not think that the court held that it was impossible to allow such a reference to arbitration. In addition to that, the facts are different. What happened there was, a man filed a suit against the Company, and then, after that, in order to oust the jurisdiction of the court, the Manager, without hearing the man at all—he never heard the driver—signed a bit of paper saying “ I fine the man five shillings ” or whatever it was, and said that that was conclusive. The second ground on which the court went was that whatever the conclusion might be, it could not be good, because the man had never been heard and he never had an opportunity to urge his case before the manager, and also that the decision was much too late because the man had already started his case.

What strikes me as rather curious is, that if you look into books on Master and Servant, in most of the books the first case cited is referred to, and the second case is not referred to at all. Only in one or two books I find it referred to. In Smith's *Law of Master and Servant*, the note at the bottom of the page deals first with the case I referred to at considerable length, and then the second case is merely referred to. That is the only book on Master and Servant in which I find that case.

THE CHAIRMAN :—In that case, I think the wording of the rule was somewhat similar to this.

MR. CAROE :—It was. To take the matter out of the ambit of that case, it might be necessary to make perfectly clear in Rule 3 that the decision of the Manager upon any question arising out of, in connection with, or incidental to those orders shall be final, and that any enquiry before the Manager comes to such a decision shall be a reference to arbitration under the Indian Arbitration Act, 1889. That would cover the possible objection taken by the court in that case.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Do you think it would be a reasonable thing?.....

MR. CAROE :—If you will refer to Mulla's book on the Indian Contract Act, where he deals with the clause which ousts the jurisdiction of the courts, you will find that he particularly refers to what you referred to just now, the question of engineers and architects on building contract. If you will look also



at the Encyclopaedia of Forms and Precedents you will find that the authors say there that it might not on the face of it appear unreasonable to allow a matter like that to be placed for decision in the hands of a man who is really to some extent an interested party himself. The case of the architect is even a stronger case; what they have said is that it is convenient that a man who is acquainted with the affairs should be the arbitrator and he comes to a conclusive decision when the facts are before him. If the case goes to the court it may possibly take three months in the Small Causes Court, and it is very difficult for the people involved to really remember the facts and their imagination to a certain extent may play them false—I am not making any statement that they may say things intentionally. The manager was not really a party to the particular dispute. If the Manager dismisses a man because he was disobedient *to him* there might be some reason for complaint. But if the Manager dismisses a man for disobedience to a Weaving Master or an Assistant Weaving Master, the Manager must after all be credited with a sense of justice in the case. He knows the mentality of the man; he knows the business; he knows whether the thing is reasonable or not. It might in one or two cases work unjustly. Even the Judge of the Small Causes Court is not necessarily correct in his decision; he only goes by the evidence brought before him; and therefore, even after a decision in the Small Causes Court, either party might be labouring under a grievance. It is the same with the Manager.

In addition to this there is a case in 112, *Law Times*, page 1029. It is not quite on the same facts. There the opinion of the Board of Directors as to the conduct of a man being satisfactory was to be considered as final and they came to the conclusion that his conduct during the period of probation was such that they were not justified in engaging him again. The court held first that the Directors came to a *bona fide* conclusion, but that conclusion was wrong. And even in that case, Mr. Justice Ridley found that he could not interfere because it was held that they came to the conclusion honestly and not perversely.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Would that be an alteration from the existing practice ?.....

MR. CAROE :—I am told, in some mills it is the practice; in some mills it is not. If there be any doubt about it, it might probably be met by the addition of the words I suggested, *vis.*, “ that any enquiry before the Manager comes to a decision shall be a reference to arbitration under the provisions of the Indian Arbitration Act, 1889.”

Then, you referred me to 15, *Bombay Law Reporter*, page 19. I do not know whether I got the reference right. That was a case about *Ahmedbhai Habibhoy vs, a Fire Insurance Company*.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**That was about the Aryodaya Spinning and Weaving Co. *vs.*.....”

**MR. CAROE :—**However, there is another Calcutta case to the same effect in 2, Calcutta Weekly Notes, page 687. I could not find the other reference given by Mr. Joshi 89. *Law Times*, 594. Either I took him down wrongly or there is a typing mistake. He quoted another case, but it has nothing to do with this matter. It was a case where the man had not been heard at all, and they said “if you do not hear the man there is a natural injustice. That is the ordinary rule of justice, and therefore the thing is entirely illegal. If anything, that case is in favour of the millowners. Then he cited 4, Carrington and Pain 104. I do not see the applicability of that case to this. There the plaintiff had accepted a silk dress for part of his wages, but later on sued for the wages. The Court held that she had already admitted part payment and therefore could not sue for that. Out of the cases cited by Mr. Joshi, the only one applicable seems to me the one in 64, *Law Times*. There they found merely on the facts that it was open to doubt as to whether the man really submitted to arbitration. They said that it was absurd to say that he agreed to submit to arbitration.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**The wording is exactly the same in the other case.

**MR. CAROE :—**What I say is that the courts do not hold that it is impossible to refer to the Manager. That is what I say. No doubt, on the last case, there might be considerable doubt as to whether this rule as it stands here would oust the jurisdiction of the court to the extent which I ask it should, but if the words I suggest are added, I do not think there will be any doubt. I do not think either of the cases cited—certainly not those cited by Mr. Joshi—will show that such a rule is illegal. The Court never said that a provision like that was illegal.

**MR. CAROE :—**I do not know whether there is anything else you want me to deal with.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**You are going to look up the case about “playing off”?

**MR. CAROE :—**Yes. There was no doubt that the case which Mr. Joshi cited and I dealt with last time did undoubtedly hold—there cannot be any doubt about it—that a custom to that effect was bad. They held it was not proved and even if it was proved, they did hold that it would be an unreasonable custom. I do not think that case really affects the question as far as the rule is concerned. It may be for you to say whether a rule to this effect should or should not be introduced; that is another matter. If the custom had been proved, it would not have mattered because custom must be reasonable; but an agreement may be unreasonable. As long as two parties appreciate the meaning of an agree-

ment, if they enter into an agreement knowing what it means, it does not matter from the point of view of law whether the agreement is reasonable or unreasonable. Whether the agreement is reasonable or not is a separate question. Mr. Saklatvala has really argued that point. I think the rule might require alteration possibly, from what you were saying, to make clear the difference between matters which do not fall, so to speak, within the control of the mill-owners, and matters which may fall outside that. If men in one department go on a strike, or the machinery in one department stops, or that sort of thing happens, it might be impossible to give men work in other departments, without any fault whatever of the Manager or the Agents. In that case, it might be considered unreasonable to pay the men for labour which it is impossible to give them, because there is always a distinction between a pieceworker and other workers; the pieceworker must get his work generally, as a rule, apart from contract. It might be different if it was, as you, Sir, said, a question of the mill looking forward to the state of the trade a month or two ahead. I do not know whether it is possible to do that or not. If it is not, it would really come very much to the same thing. It really depends upon a definition of what is put in here as being a "state of the trade."

THE CHAIRMAN :—There is no definition of that ?

MR. CAROE :—There is no definition.

THE CHAIRMAN :—A possible solution is to leave it to custom, as regards "playing off" and the state of trade, where the operatives do not mind being "played off" for a day or two to get an extra holiday. The Trade Unions of England do not object to that. So, without having any rule, they can be played off. You might leave it to the regime of custom as to the state of the trade. It practically means with the consent of the operatives. They recognise that the conditions of the industry are sometimes such that you cannot give the men particular work ; that has to be stopped.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Sometimes we "play off" even at the desire of the men themselves. Just now, there is an instance in the Tata Mills. We have a shortage of weft ; we could not supply 20s weft owing to a shortage of labour in the spinning department, and the weavers had to wait. They came to the manager and said "Rather than keep us waiting off and on, give us a holiday for one day, and we shall come the next day, so that we may not have to wait after we come to work."

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is what is done in Lancashire very often. They take a day off. Within reasonable limits, both sides may recognise it. But to say that a mill has a right by contract to play off for a fortnight or 10 days is rather a different matter.

MR. CAROE :—I would put it to the Association to see if it can be done. Those are the two points.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Ordinary stoppage occurs only for a day or two ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—If it is going to be for a much longer period, then surely you do not mean to say that the operatives have to wait without any payment ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Even for longer stoppages, when we stop the machines for a fortnight, we are able to tell the men, and the men know it. Once the men are told, then there is no grievance. In fact, now that the period of notice has been reduced to a fortnight, we cannot “play off” the men for longer than that. At any rate, we shall consider this matter.

MR. ASVALE :—The suggestion made by you, Sir, that this rule should be dropped, will be acceptable to the operatives.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Is it your suggestion, Sir, to drop the rule altogether ?

THE CHAIRMAN :—I am not giving my opinion, but I am only putting it forward as a possible suggestion to consider.

MR. CAROE :—I have dealt with most of the questions of misconduct. On the question of good behaviour in a mill, there is rather an interesting case in the first index to the Cases in the Times Law Reports. You will find a case where a girl started dancing during the luncheon interval.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I think I have seen it.

MR. CAROE :—That was held to be a breach of decorum. Even innocent pastimes may be considered a breach of the rules. I merely cite that as an instance to show that, although on the face of it one may consider it as quite harmless, it was found by the magistrates there that dancing created dust, and the dust spoiled the machinery in the mill, and therefore they were liable, and they were fined.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I understand that Mr. Bakhale will reply to-morrow. Then you have got to start the Seventeen Demands, excluding of course the standardisation. Perhaps it will be convenient for both sides if we split up the standardisation into the spinning section and the weaving section, and take the spinning section next Monday; and then we will leave the weaving section over till the following Monday. When I say the spinning section of the standardisation scheme, I mean not only the Millowners' standardisation scheme but also the

Joint Strike Committee's scheme and also the rational system. That of course will bring in the question of cutting the weavers' wages, which is really the most important and difficult question. I hope you will do your best to be ready to argue accordingly.

MR. ASAVALE :—I was under the impression that Mr. Bakhale would be ready, but I do not know. I myself have not gone through the papers, because they were with Mr. Bakhale. I will see to-day whether he is prepared.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I am afraid we must make this rule : we are going to devote this week to the Standing Orders and the Seventeen Demands, next week to the spinning section of the standardisation scheme, and the third week to the weaving section, and we are going to consider the discussion closed on each head at the end of that week. We cannot give more time, and both the sides must make arrangements accordingly. I think we have done our best to give reasonable time.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I think that will give quite sufficient time.

The Committee adjourned till 11-15 A. M. on the 22nd January 1929.

---

---

*Tuesday, 22nd January, 1929.*

---

---

THE Committee met at the Town Hall, Bombay, at 11-15 a m.

*Present.*

THE CHAIRMAN,

MR. KHAREGHAT,

MR. KAMAT.

MR. CAROE :—If I may be allowed one minute. The case to which you referred is reported in 13 *Bombay Law Reporter*. The case I wanted to find is reported in xli *The Times Law Reports* on page 616—*Caven v. Canadian Pacific Railway Company*. It gives the rule *in extenso* as follows :—

“ *Discipline and Dismissal.*—No trainman shall be disciplined or dismissed until his case has been investigated and he has been proven guilty of the offence against him, and decision rendered . . . ”

Then it goes on to deal with the method of investigation. This man was tried before the traffic superintendent and dismissed. Then there was an appeal to the Privy Council from this enquiry. This is what the Privy Council says :—

“ Under arguments identical with those of the appellant, the railway company could plead as follows :—

‘ We, the company, entered into an agreement with the representatives of our men regulating the subject of discipline and dismissal. We challenge the conduct of one of our employees. We were parties to an investigation under the agreement and we examined witnesses in the course of that examination, and it closed with a determination by the investigators entirely in the workmen’s favour ; nevertheless we shall not act upon that report. The agreement binds us to reinstate him. We shall not do so. The agreement binds us to pay him back his wages. We shall not do that either. He stands dismissed, and, if necessary, we shall appeal to the courts of law to determine the whole matter *in foro publico.*’ This would be the exact parallel of the case now before the Court, stated not from the side of the workmen but from the side of the employers. It is needless to say that from whichever side the argument comes the law must address itself so as to distribute justice equally between both parties to this contract.”

THE CHAIRMAN :—It does not say that the decision is based on that.

MR. CAROE :—It is headed ‘ *Discipline and Dismissal.*’ The rule says :—

“ No trainman shall be disciplined or dismissed until his case has been investigated and he has been proven guilty of the offence against him, and decision rendered. He, however, may be held off for such

investigation for a period not exceeding 3 days, and when so held off he will be notified in writing that he is being held off for that purpose and advised of the charges against him. He may, if he desires, enjoy the privilege of the assistance of a fellow employee in stating his case at the investigation, and will be given a copy of statement made by him at the investigation. All material and necessary witnesses must be notified in writing to appear. If they appear, their evidence shall be taken in the presence of the accused. If they do not appear the accused shall be furnished with a copy of their written statements and their names. If accused is not satisfied with the decision he will be given an opportunity of reviewing the evidence and may appeal through his representatives to the higher officials. Should the charge not be proven the trainman will be reinstated at once and paid for all time lost at schedule rates and reasonable actual expenses."

The man being dissatisfied with the decision, without appealing to the higher officials instituted an action against the company for wrongful dismissal.

THE CHAIRMAN :—He could not go to a court. May I just have a look into it ?

MR. CAROE :—Yes, sir. It is a curious case. It exactly goes against the case I dealt with yesterday.

THE CHAIRMAN :—They hold :—

"But it is also decided that any person may covenant that no right of action shall accrue till a third person, contractually appointed and selected, has decided on any difference that may arise between himself and the other contracting party."

That is the main point they make. That is not sufficient to say that no action should be brought.

MR. CAROE :—The Traffic Manager should decide there.

THE CHAIRMAN :—They refer to the case *Scott v. Avery*. The noble Lord proceeded to state :—

"Is there anything contrary to public policy in saying that the company shall not be harassed by actions, the costs of which might be ruinous, but that any dispute that arises shall be referred to a domestic tribunal which may speedily and economically determine the dispute ? I can see not the slightest ill consequences that can flow from such an agreement and I see great advantage that may arise from it. Public policy, therefore, seems to me to require that effect should be given to the contract."

It does support your contention ; but the question still remains whether it is reasonable.



MR. CAROE :—That is another question. I tried to deal with the legal aspect of it.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We wanted to lead evidence whether the ticket system to weavers obtains in the Sir Ness Wadia Mill. The weaving master of that mill is here.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It would be better if we have it to-morrow.

MR. BAKHALE :—Before I proceed, I thank you, sir, for having given me permission to absent myself yesterday owing to illness. We have considered the amended standing orders submitted by the Bombay Millowners' Association. I have to say again that our objections to these standing orders still remain. We still feel that these orders are still one-sided and are not reasonable. They penalise the workers and at the same time do not make any provision to safeguard their interests. I will show you how when I go through them *seriatim* that these are one-sided and why we object to them.

I do not propose to take much time, because I have already dealt with the standing orders. We only state our objections and the suggestions that we want to make, citing evidence wherever necessary. With regard to Rule No. 2 we insisted on the definition of 'Employer.' I have fully given the reasons why the definition is necessary. My argument appears on page 1588 of the typed copy of the proceedings. I do not think it necessary for me to repeat the same arguments.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Why should it be absolutely necessary to have a definition? Your reason is that the millowner may be a single individual. The Millowners say that all millowners are companies. Suppose in future a case arises where the millowner is not a company. You can substitute the word 'firm' or 'owner' or 'employer' for the word 'company.'

MR. BAKHALE :—Our objection was that if they wanted to retain the word 'company' it would be necessary to define the word 'employer' also. If they are prepared to substitute the word 'firm' or any other suitable word, I personally may not take any objection, because that will meet our objection.

MR. ASVALE :—Are shareholders held responsible?

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is governed by the provisions of the Indian Companies Act. The directors, as a rule, are responsible. As far as I can see there is nothing insidious in the expression. Instead of giving the full names of every company in whose mills these are put up—like the Goculdas Morarji, Tata and Sons—the word 'company' is put in the rule.

MR. BAKHALE :—If to-morrow I own a factory, will this word 'company' refer to me?

THE CHAIRMAN :—As I said the word 'owner' or 'employer' can be substituted.

MR. BAKHALE :—I want that to be made clear.

MR. ASVALE :—All owners of mills are not members of the Association. These rules will be applicable to the members of the Association. It would be better to insert the word ' individual owner.'

THE CHAIRMAN :—Take the Japanese mills. Is it not a company? Really all of them are. This is quarrelling about nothing. All this can be altered when you get a case in future.

MR. BAKHALE :—As regards Rule No. 3, the most important point about this is the legal aspect of the rule. Mr. Joshi and Mr. Caroe have discussed the question very considerably. Mr. Joshi is not here and I am not proficient to explain the legal aspect of this rule. We stand by his criticism. Mr. Joshi on page 1923 states :—

“ Of course there should be a legal remedy left open to the operatives concerned, if they are dissatisfied. I do not think that this order will take away the ordinary rights of taking legal proceedings. But this rule may convey an idea to the operatives that there was no other remedy left open to them. Therefore, I may suggest the deletion of this order. If it is not possible, I may suggest the addition of words as below which were found in some reported cases :—

“ Nothing herein contained shall in any way prejudice or affect the rights and remedies which the other party may have under the laws for the time being in force affecting master and servant.’ ”

You have suggested some other word. I now leave the matter in the hands of the Committee, after saying that we stand by the criticism of Mr. S. C. Joshi.

With regard to Rule No. 4 our objection was that no alteration or addition should be made without the consent of the Millowners' Association. You yourself in the course of discussion suggested that words like ' without the consent of the Millowners, Association ' may be embodied in this rule. Mr. Saklatvala stated that it was the men that resented the inclusion of the word ' Millowners' Association.' All that we say is that an individual mill should not be allowed to make any addition or alteration without the consent of the Millowners' Association, and without the consent also of the workers' representatives expressed through their unions. On page 1532 you asked Mr. Saklatvala whether he will be prepared to set up a joint committee and consult it. He says :—

“ We can consult it but we cannot guarantee that we will adopt their suggestions.”

We want that a definite provision should be made in the standing orders that any addition or alteration should be made with the consent of the workers.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That they should be consulted.

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Suppose a joint committee is set up. Will you be satisfied with the matter being referred to that committee or do you want that the trade union should be consulted separately ?

MR. BAKHALE :—That depends upon the constitution of that committee.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Suppose both parties are equally represented.

MR. BAKHALE :—The members to the committee will have to be elected by the trade unions.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You stated that you were going to put up some proposal with regard to the joint committee ?

MR. STONES :—We have approved the principle of setting up a joint committee. We will put up the proposal next Monday.

MR. BAKHALE :—Then, sir, you asked a question with regard to minor amendments to the rules which may not be workable in particular mills. Then Mr. Joshi did not give a reply. I think even on minor matters it is necessary that the workers' representatives should be consulted. It all depends upon the joint committee that is going to be set up. In addition to the joint committee, we shall have to set up mill committees which will sit with the representatives of employers of that particular mill. They have done so in Lancashire.

MR. STONES :—Very little in Lancashire.

MR. BAKHALE :—Each factory has got a joint committee.

MR. STONES :—Not sitting with the employers.

MR. BAKHALE :—Whenever there is a disagreement or dispute there is always a joint committee for that particular mill. When that joint committee does not come to a settlement, it is referred to a higher joint committee. If the settlement is not arrived at there, it goes to a still higher committee.

MR. STONES :—It is in the case of spinning.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Do you mean a works committee ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I will read out the rules. (As per exhibit.)

MR. STONES :—That is not a mill working committee.

MR. BAKHALE :—I may modify my statement. This is a local joint committee.

MR. STONES :—It is the local trade union. The amalgamation of that trade union in that particular branch of the trade. A federation of all trade unions. There are three steps. There is no local committee. The committee of the local union is referred to there.

In our proposal we have provided for a committee of mill authorities and representatives of trade unions and above that a joint strike committee and thirdly an outside body to be set up under the Trade Disputes Act. We have also suggested three committees in our proposal.

MR. BAKHALE :—The point I want to emphasise is that if a particular mill finds a particular rule inconvenient or unworkable it must modify that rule with the consent of the operatives. What we insist upon is that nothing should be done as regards these rules by an individual mill without consulting the workers' representatives through their trade unions.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You first say 'consent' and then 'consult.' It is only in Soviet Russia that the consent of the trade unions is required to be taken; so far as I am aware no rule in any other country requires the workers' 'consent.'

MR. BAKHALE :—There may be distinction between the two words. Personally, if a reasonable proposal is put forward I am prepared to accept it. There must be consultation before any alteration is made in the rules.

As regards rule No. 5, "The mill will work each day for such number of hours as the manager may from time to time fix in accordance with the Factories Act." I have dealt with this question very fully, and my argument appears on page 1591 of the Proceedings. We said that it was necessary to fix the period as one of ten hours. You know, sir, that under the Factories Act, a mill can work 11 hours, and Mr. Saklatvala in his evidence said that if any mill wanted to do that that mill was at liberty to do so; however, he said that as the Bombay mills have been working ten hours a day, there was no possibility of any mill going in for an eleven-hours' working day. This is exactly our point: the Factories Act has nothing to do with an agreement arrived at between employers and workmen to reduce the working hours. It was as a result of the strike of 1920 that the mills adopted a ten-hours' working day.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You want to indicate that to be the maximum?

MR. BAKHALE :—We want to add these words: "Such number of hours shall not exceed ten a day."

THE CHAIRMAN :—That does away with the power that the Factories Act gives of having eleven hours in a particular case. Supposing you add "not ordinarily exceeding ten" after the words "such number of hours," would not that do? There may be a case where the workers may want to have a half holiday on a Saturday and in exchange for this agree to work for more than ten hours on other days.

MR. BAKHALE :—Whatever the wording, I am keen on this, that we are not willing to allow any mill manager to work his mill eleven hours a day.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You would not have eleven hours in any case ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes; that is what we mean, and therefore an amendment of that nature should be inserted. I do not know whether an amendment adding “Such number of hours shall not exceed ten a day” will offend the Indian Factories Act.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Would not that be in contravention of the Indian Factories Act ? The Factories Act says that they can work eleven hours a day.

MR. BAKHALE :—They also say that they shall not work more than 60 hours a week.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Legally an employer can work his men eleven hours a day, and if he does that he will not be committing an offence under the Factories Act. Of course if you agree to have ordinarily ten hours, there will be no doubt about that.

MR. BAKHALE :—Even in that case we shall have to find some terminology which will convey our meaning.

There was considerable discussion on Rule No. 6, about the working hours, and from the evidence I find that very few supported the idea of keeping the men inside the Factory for 11½ hours as laid down in this rule. Personally, I am in favour of having two recesses. So is Mr. Saklatvala and the Joint Strike Committee. I believe that by giving two recesses to the workers at convenient periods during the working hours, there is a possibility of the efficiency of the workers being increased to a certain extent and that is advantageous to both the sides. But, if you are going to give two recesses and at the same time keep the ten hours' working day, we are not agreeable to that. We say that as two recesses are likely to lead to increased efficiency on the part of the operatives, it is worth while to reduce the working hours from 10 to 9¼ as suggested by the Joint Strike Committee. We feel that the operatives will be able to give the same production during the reduced period as a result of their getting two recesses. It is an experiment worth trying ; it has not been tried yet. If that experiment is tried, I think the millowners will find that they can get the same production during the 9¼ hours as during the ten hours. They could even give three recesses as suggested by the Joint Strike Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You think the men will respond ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I think so. Mr. Sasakura, for example, was asked certain questions regarding this point. (Page 279 of the printed proceedings of the 6th November.) I think it was Mr. Saklatvala who put this question:—

“ In your recommendation you say that you must give three rest intervals in order that labour may be able to increase its efficiency. You do not want them to work for a less number of hours ; but you want them to work for ten hours a day but give them intervals ? ”

His reply is :—

“ I suggest only extra intervals.”

He does not definitely say whether there should be more than one interval and at the same time the mill should work ten hours. His reply is not quite definite on the point. Mr. Saklatvala asked him further :—

“ Do you suggest that they should work for 8 hours or 9 hours and so on ? ”

Mr. Sasakura replied :—

“ If mills can afford, we can reduce the number of hours. Sooner or later we must come to 8 hours or 8½ hours. It is a question of time.”

So he has admitted that a time is bound to come for the reduction of the working hours. When it was pointed out to him that under the Millowners' scheme of two recesses the workers would have to remain inside the factory for 11¼ hours, he said that the factory compounds are better than the workers' houses. I quite agree, sir, that it is so, but we must bear in mind that although factory compounds are better, the worker when there has got the idea that he is working there and is not free. I know that most of the offices in the Fort are much better than the houses of the clerks, but if you ask the clerks to work in the offices out of office hours, in the morning or at night, I am quite sure the clerks will not like the idea at all. It is not, therefore, a question of cleanliness of the factory or the uncleanliness of the workers' houses ; it is a question of the mental attitude of the worker who as long as he is in the factory compound feels that he is there to put in some work. So, we cannot reconcile ourselves to the idea of prolonging the staying period of the workers beyond the present hours. Mr. Addyman also said in the course of his written evidence that a midday recess of one hour is absolutely necessary. But the Millowners want to reduce the midday recess by quarter of an hour ; Mr. Addyman is not agreeable to that. Mr. Dongersing objected to having two recesses on some other ground. He said that if periods for taking food are fixed, there may not be enough room for all the workers to take food inside the factories. Mr. Ardeshir was also in favour of the *status quo*. Miss Wingate proposed a 9½ hours' working day, excluding the two recesses. She was in favour of two recesses, and also insisted on keeping the midday recess of one hour. She was not in favour of extending the hours within the mill premises to 11¼ hours. We have also similar evidence from the Municipal and Railway Workshops. We find from their oral as well as their written evidence that the workers in their factories do not work more than 8 or 9 hours a day. So, the evidence that we have got from these people proves that a large number of workshops in Bombay City work less than ten hours and also that the workmen in those

factories have got one recess period of one hour. These witnesses were in favour of a ten-hours' day, including the midday recess of one hour. Only the Joint Strike Committee is in favour of more than one recess being given to the operatives, and that for a very good reason. We, therefore, say that if the Millowners want two recesses in the interest of increased efficiency of the operative, they should be willing to cut down the working period from ten to 9½. I suppose that if they do so they will find that production does not suffer very appreciably. It was suggested before that after the words "the consent of the" the words "unions or" should be inserted, so that the sentence within the brackets will read: "This is subject to the approval of the Factory Inspector and the consent of the unions or the operatives." I stand by that suggestion.

The next paragraph is: "Operatives attending late are liable to be shut out and treated as absent, but may be admitted on payment of a fine." As regards this, we have got a considerable volume of evidence to show that a grace period is almost invariably allowed in almost every factory about which evidence was given here. Even now in most of the Bombay mills they have got a grace period. In Mr. Sasakura's mill 15 minutes' grace is allowed; in Mr. Addyman's mill ten minutes' grace period is allowed, and in addition to that the worker who comes after 6-40 is admitted at 10 o'clock in the morning and is allowed three-quarters of a day. Mr. Cameron said that in his factory 10 minutes' grace is allowed; Dr. Sandilands also stated that late comers are warned four times and on the fifth time are fined. Miss Wingate also was of the opinion that some grace period should be allowed to the operatives. Mr. Moberley also said that in his factory there is a grace period of 15 minutes. I therefore see no reason why a similar grace period should not be incorporated in these rules. Personally, I prefer to have a grace period of 30 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Would not that result in all the operatives taking advantage of the 30 minutes?

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not think so, because the workers, so far as I know, are not so unreasonable to take advantage of these rules just to defy the millowners.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It is human nature; is it not? For instance school boys do it.

MR. BAKHALE :—There may be a few operatives, I admit, who may take advantage of this grace period. I will point out about that that Mr. Addyman has definitely stated that although they have a grace period of 10 minutes in his mill, almost every worker is found at his machine at 6-35 (the commencement hour being 6-30). He engages about 800 men, and he has found by long experience that although they are given a grace period of ten minutes the workers do not take advantage of that, but try to be as regular as possible.

Personally, I am not in favour of fines, and I think if any punishment is to be meted out to the operatives who come late, it is better to adopt

Mr. Addyman's method than the method proposed in the Standing Orders. Mr. Moberley says that if a man comes 15 minutes late, wages for 15 minutes are cut, and if he comes half an hour late, an hour's wage is cut, and if he comes late by more than half an hour, then he is admitted after the midday interval and half day's wages are cut. There are thus several suggestions before the Committee as alternatives to the proposal of the Bombay Mill-owners' Association embodied in this rule.

Then I come to the third para.

"Operatives shall only take their food at the recess times. Any break of this order will incur dismissal."

I think, sir, that this should be dropped, because no evidence has been adduced in favour of this rule. Both Mr. Sasakura and Mr. Dongarsingh admitted that the punishment of dismissal may be a little too severe. Mr. Dongarsingh further stated that he would like to see this rule modified. Mr. Williams stated definitely that you should not dismiss a man for a fault like this. This appears at page 1855. "Caution for the first time and fine afterwards" is his remedy, and he further said that we should endeavour to correct the error of the ways of the worker.

MR. KHAREGHAT:—If they are given an additional recess in the morning, would not the workers agree to this rule?

MR. BAKHALE:—They will agree to take food only during recess if a morning recess is given and the working hours are reduced. But they will never agree to this punishment of dismissal for breach of the rule.

MR. KAMAT:—Do you mean to say that if this punishment is provided they will not consent to have the morning recess at all?

MR. BAKHALE:—They will consent to the morning recess. We are now having a joint consultation, and the workers' feeling is that they would not agree to the punishment of dismissal for breach of the rule that the workers should take food only during the recess time. That is all they can say at present.

MR. KHAREGHAT:—Will they agree to a rule that they should not take food except during the recess period if they are given a morning recess?

MR. BAKHALE:—They will agree provided the working hours are reduced; but they will not agree if the recess given is added to the number of hours that the worker has to keep himself in the mill.

Then I come to Rule No. 7, which deals with the ticket system. Mr. Saklatvala told us that the weavers were not given tickets formerly because the weavers provided their own substitutes.

Now, I should like to know whether the millowners have now decided to abolish the present practice of asking the weavers to provide substitutes. If they have done so, I can quite understand their trying to make this system



applicable to the weavers. But if they want to maintain the present system of making it incumbent on the weavers to provide substitutes and also to make the system of taking tickets applicable to weavers, then I am sorry I cannot agree to it. It is unfair.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What is the present position ?

MR. BAKHALE :—In the majority of the mills in Bombay, the weavers have to provide substitutes if they want to absent themselves. Therefore, there was no ticket system as has been pointed out from the other side, so far as the weavers were concerned. Now they want to introduce this system for this reason, as Mr. Saklatvala said, that the weavers provide for their own substitutes. Even after this, if the weavers are asked to provide, as before, their own substitutes, I do not understand the value of having this rule and compelling the weavers to accept the ticket system. If the weavers are going to be rid of this responsibility of providing substitutes, I can understand that there is some sense in this rule. But the weavers will remain exactly in the same position in which they were and they are to-day, and yet they are to be given the tickets unnecessarily. Therefore, on this ground alone, I cannot accept this rule of the Bombay Millowners' Association.

MR. KAMAT :—Is it the case that the owners say that they reserve the right of recognising or rejecting a particular substitute, if they choose to do so ? It is not an unrestricted right of the weavers ; that is what they contend.

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not call it a right at all. The point is this. If a weaver fails to give a substitute, cases occur when that particular weaver does not get leave, or cannot leave the mill premises. So, I do not think it is a kind of right. It is a kind of restriction, a duty imposed upon him. If a weaver wants to take leave, there are mills in Bombay which say that that particular weaver must provide a substitute. If he gives a substitute, that particular weaver is marked present ; as you know, that is the present practice. Therefore the Millowners say there was no necessity for the ticket system. But now they say that they want to introduce the ticket system in the weaving department also, but they do not say that they are not going to ask the weaver to produce his own substitute. Of course, whenever possible, he can produce a substitute ; but whenever it may not be possible for him to do so, the only thing he has to do is to work in the mill ; he does not get the leave. My point is that, if the practice of the provision of a substitute is going to remain what it is, and what it has been all these years, there is no point in having this rule of the ticket system.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Does not the weaver get some advantage from that practice. Is it not the case that if an ordinary operative wants leave, he has to go to the mill authorities and say he wants a holiday, and he gets it ? Whereas the weaver can, under this practice, if he wants to stay away, do so by simply sending a substitute ; he need not formally apply for leave. The weaver gets some advantage after all ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Which advantage ?

THE CHAIRMAN :—It seems to me the weaver is in a little more advantageous position than, for instance, the spinner. If the weaver sends a substitute, it is an indication that he is going to stay away. He does get advantage out of the present system.

MR. BAKHALE :—He does.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The advantage is not all on the side of the employer ; it is restricted, as you call it. The advantage is not all to the employer.

MR. BAKHALE :—If the weaver's position is considered in comparison with the position of the spinner, he may be getting some advantage. I quite see the point. But as between himself and the management, certainly the weaver has no advantage at all. On the contrary, he has got a definite disadvantage when he finds that he cannot get a substitute and at the same time wants to go on leave. There he is in a disadvantageous position. If the Millowners are going to take upon themselves the responsibility of providing substitutes for weavers, I can understand their insisting upon the ticket system. I am taking the argument of Mr. Saklatvala by itself. If he is going to do that, certainly, according to his own argument at any rate, no exception can be taken to Rule No. 7.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What is the hardship in having a ticket ?

MR. BAKHALE :—It was pointed out during the course of the evidence that supposing a weaver loses his ticket, he is fined ; he has to pay for it. At present, he is not required to do that, because he has not got any ticket at all. If there may be certain other disadvantages about the ticket system, I think Mr. Dange will be able to explain them after I have finished.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I cannot follow Mr. Dange's argument that having a ticket makes a man like an animal.

MR. BAKHALE :—This is my objection to the rule as it stands and the argument of Mr. Saklatvala.

MR. ASVALE :—If an operative forgets to bring his ticket, there is no provision that after taking his muster, he should be given a second ticket. If the ticket system is at all to be applied, there should be that provision.

THE CHAIRMAN :—In any case where the operative has forgotten his ticket, the man is there, he is found there, and nothing will happen. He simply tells the jobber that he has forgotten his ticket, and that will be the end of it.

MR. STONES :—The timekeeper knows the man, and he will say " All right ; bring it to-morrow."

MR. ASVALE :—Something to that effect must be provided.

MR. STONES :—We cannot provide for every little possibility that is going to happen in the industry. We shall in that case have to have three or four volumes of rules.

MR. ASAVALE :—He may not be allowed to come in. It may be taken that he has remained absent without leave, and he will be fined ; that rule will be applied to the man.

MR. BAKHALE :—Rule No. 8 deals with absence from the post without leave without sufficient cause. Mr. S. C. Joshi suggested to you to substitute the word " duty " for the word " post," and you, sir, during the course of the discussion suggested the addition of some such words as " except for temporary purposes." Your suggestion appears, I think, on page 1543 of the evidence. I think both these suggestions should be accepted and incorporated in the rules. You had some discussion yesterday about this point, and you yourself, sir, suggested some other word than either " duty " or " post."

THE CHAIRMAN :—" His proper place or places of work."

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes, and Mr. Asavale said there could be no objection to the substitution of the words suggested by you.

MR. STONES :—That was agreed to yesterday.

MR. BAKHALE :—Mr. S. C. Joshi also suggested putting in the word " or " between " without leave " and " without sufficient cause."

THE CHAIRMAN :—I suggested yesterday the words " without leave or other sufficient excuse."

MR. BAKHALE :—That will be quite all right.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That has been accepted.

MR. BAKHALE :—Then I come to Rule No. 9. The only objection we had taken was that, just as the millowners were free to dismiss a temporary worker without notice, the temporary worker also should be free to leave his employment without any notice at any time. This suggestion was accepted by Mr. Saklatvala, and this acceptance appears on page 1544 of the proceedings. I am sorry that suggestion has not found a place in the amended rules. What we suggest is that after the word " dismissed " appearing in line 4, the words " or may himself leave " be inserted. As amended it will read " A probationary operative is one who is provisionally engaged for the first time on a particular post for a period of two months during which he may be dismissed or may himself leave at any time without notice."

THE CHAIRMAN :—He may be dismissed, or he may leave at any time without notice ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes. Mr. Joshi also suggested the substitution of the word " discharged " for the word " dismissed," because the word " dismissed," according to Mr. Joshi, conveys some idea about a fault committed by the worker.

We have nothing to say about Rule No. 10.

About Rule No. 11, which deals with search, we had plenty of cross-examination, and we find, after studying the oral evidence, that no one had cited a case in which a rule like that existed. Almost everybody agreed that there was a practice in most of the factories to search a worker when he is suspected.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I think there was something said on page 1852. I do not know whether that is about a rule.

MR. BAKHALE :—On page 1855, I asked Mr. Williams “ You have not got a definite rule like that ? ” Mr. Williams said “ I do not know whether we have. I do not think there is any rule about it. In fact, if you saw a man going away with something that belonged to you, you would not stop to consider whether there was any rule to do so before you searched him.” That is what Mr. Williams stated during the course of his oral evidence. Mr. Bradley pointed out that in Lancashire a search took place under the police eye, and not otherwise. Mr. Joshi had also brought forth some arguments which appear on page 1927 of the proceedings. Mr. Moberly also said that he has not got any definite rule so far as his own factory is concerned. As pointed out by me when I was dealing with this rule, we are not in favour of this rule at all. Mr. Joshi said : “ If there should be a provision the wording may be on the lines of the Criminal Procedure Code which gives authority to a policeman to search. Therefore I suggest at the beginning the addition of these words :—

“ Whenever a gateman has reasonable grounds to believe that any operative has been dishonestly and fraudulently taking away any property of the company at the time of leaving the mill premises, he may be searched by him and if a female cause a search to be made by a female searcher.”

I quite agree with him that there is no necessity for this rule at all. I do not know the legal aspect of the matter, but I think that if there is any suspicion a worker may be searched even without having a rule like this.

THE CHAIRMAN :—On suspicion he may be searched. What is the objection to putting it in black and white ? What is the difference ?

MR. BAKHALE :—The rule says that all male operatives are liable on leaving the mill premises to be searched by the gateman and all female operatives are liable to be detained by the gateman for search by the female searcher. It was proved during the course of the evidence that the detected cases of theft were not many. I think in one mill the cases occurred 4 or 5 times a month. One witness pointed out that he had detected these cases twice or thrice during the course of a month, and so on. If that is the case, why are you going to have a rule like this in black and white, and unnecessarily create bitterness ? I am looking at this rule from the point of view of harmony between the operatives and the employers. You have that right

already. If on suspicion you find that a man has stolen something, certainly no man of common sense will deny the right of the worker being searched.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It is all very well with a man of common sense, but the operative may go to a court of law.

MR. BAKHALE :—So far as the legal aspect is concerned, I am not in a position to deal with it. If an opportunity comes up, Mr. Joshi may be able to explain it during the course of this week.

THE CHAIRMAN :—He has explained his views very fully. He says he thinks it is legal.

MR. BAKHALE :—He thinks it is legal.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What I am trying to get at is, supposing it is legal, what is the objection to put it in black and white. You say it creates bitterness?

MR. BAKHALE :—It creates bitterness in the minds of the operatives. After all, a mill employs 2,000 workers, and there may be 5 or 10 cases of theft.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Supposing it is put " he shall be liable to be searched on suspicion," have you any objection?

MR. BAKHALE :—If for the sake of 10 people, you are going to put down in black and white that all the operatives are liable to be searched, even that kind of phraseology may create a sort of bitterness in the minds of the operatives. I am looking at it from the point of view of harmonious relations between the employers and the operatives. If the employers can achieve their object by some other method, without putting it in black and white, I do not see why they should unnecessarily insist upon this rule and create bitterness.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Would you agree if the word " All " were deleted?

MR. BAKHALE :—I object to the whole rule.

MR. KAMAT :—What other method do you suggest?

MR. BAKHALE :—I wish to keep the *status quo*.

MR. STONES :—For the present there is this provision in the rules of all mills in Bombay.

MR. BAKHALE :—I would have no rule at all, because in Mr. Sasakura's mill there is no such rule. He said in Japan there is no such rule. In Mr. Addyman's mill there is no rule, although there is this practice. I do not object to the practice at all. Mr. Cameron also said that he has not got any rule, but it is always understood. Mr. Williams also said that there was no

such rule. I therefore say that there is really no necessity for a rule like this, because that can be done by some other way, as is done in the mills of Mr. Addyman and in the factories and firms of Mr. Williams and Mr. Moberly, and so on.

As regards Rule 12, we have only to add at the end "such date shall not be later than the 8th day of each month." It is about the day for making payments to the operatives. This point also has been fully discussed both yesterday and before, and I do not think it is necessary for me to add anything. But we insist that if you are going to have a rule like this, there should also be a provision making it obligatory upon the employers to make payments to the operatives not later than the 8th of each month. I have explained already the reasons for this addition.

MR. ASVALE :—There should be a provision that there should be only one pay day in all the mills. There should not be different dates of payment for different mills.

MR. STONES :—The existing rule is this : we endeavour as near as possible to pay on a day preceding a holiday. But some mills have a preponderating proportion of Mahomedan operatives, and they have different holidays from those of mills where the employees are preponderatingly Mahratta. So that, it may happen that we should pay in one mill on the 12th and in another, on the 14th, in rare cases. The general rule is that we pay on the same day in all the mills. The idea is to pay on a day before a holiday, and where the holidays differ in various mills the dates also differ. But in 29 out of 30 cases the pay day is the same for all mills.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—The Millowners themselves publish a list of holidays.

MR. BAKHALE :—Rules Nos. 13, 14 and 15 are really the most contentious, and even to-day, after the considerable discussion that we had, we are not agreeable to Rule No. 13. It has been admitted that this system of "playing off" exists in Lancashire. But even there there is no such rule as is contemplated here by the Millowners' Association. It is simply the custom of the trade and the condition of the trade which is responsible for this "playing off." If it is the custom, let it be allowed to remain there as a custom ; it should not be given the colouring of a rule like this. Further, I feel that strike, fire, catastrophe, emergency, epidemic, the condition of the trade and so on should not be linked up together in one rule. You have yourself suggested yesterday that it is better to split up the items and make a separate provision, if necessary, for things which may be called acts of God, for example, a fire or anything of that kind. Even as regards that, there is absolutely no necessity for a rule like this, because no court will hold that the company must compensate for the losses of the workers when there is a fire or any other act of God of a similar character. As regards the other items which are more or less the condition of the trade and the custom prevailing in Lancashire, although this custom prevails in Lancashire for a number of years, they have not put that down in the form of a definite rule. There is absolutely no rule about the "playing off" system, and I do not understand why there is any necessity for a rule like this in Bombay.

Trade conditions are more or less the same, and there is really no reason why we should have a rule like this. Further, there may be certain causes which may be responsible for the stoppage of any machinery, or department, or departments, and these causes may be due to the conduct of the millowners. It may be the policy of the millowners which may be responsible for the stoppage of the machinery or certain departments. If on account of that policy, certain departments are closed, I do not see why the workers should suffer. There may be some other factors like this, which may not be called acts of God, but for which the millowners themselves may, either directly or indirectly, be responsible, and I do not think it is fair that the workers should suffer on account of the faults of the millowners or the management. I therefore insist that this rule should be altogether deleted from the Standing Orders. Moreover, by having this rule, you deprive the worker of his right of going to a court of law. Suppose a mill stops to-morrow for certain reasons, or on account of the policy of that particular mill management ; if the worker feels that an act of God or anything like that is not responsible for the stoppage of the mill, and if he is advised by his lawyer to go to a law court, he can certainly do so. But when you put a rule like this, he is definitely debarred from going to a law court, so far as I understand the case. So, you are going to stop the only remedy that a worker can have in a case like this. I therefore suggest that the worker's remedy of going to a law court should be kept open to him. If the management want to put up any case about the stoppage of the department or about the stoppage of the whole mill before the law court, they can do so and the court may decide either in their favour or in favour of the worker, as the case may be. But I am anxious, in the interest of harmonious working between Capital and Labour, that a rule like this should not exist in the Standing Orders. Further, just as there are serious difficulties in the way of the management, there may be serious difficulties in the case of the operatives also. There may be a sudden illness or a sudden death in the family ; there may be loss of the property of the operative, say, on account of fire or flood. There may be some other catastrophes also. I do not think any provision is made in these Standing Orders allowing the operative to leave his employment without notice and without permission. He is a human being just as much as the Millowner is a human being. He has his own difficulties, and if you are going to provide for the difficulties of the employer, it is your duty also to provide for the difficulties of the employee. If you are not going to do that, then certainly I say that this rule is absolutely one-sided and unreasonable. If you are going to put the case for the employer on the basis of difficulties which cannot be foreseen, you must also consider the difficulties of the employee. If you are going to put your case on the condition of the trade, I say that it is the custom, and let it remain as a custom ; it should not be incorporated as a rule in the Standing Orders. Further, let the remedy of going to a law court be left open to the employee, if you are going to put up your case on the condition of the trade. I am, therefore, dead against this rule, and I believe if it is deleted, the millowners are not going to lose anything. They have up to now been " playing off " the workers ; they can do so even hereafter. If a case goes to a law court, and if the millowners properly present their case, I am quite sure the law court will take note of their arguments. There is absolutely no gain in having a rule like this. On the contrary, the only effect of having this rule will be, as I said before, to increase the bitterness

between the employers and the employees. I am quite sure the employers do not want this result, and if they are anxious really to avoid it, then, it is in their interest to avoid, as far as possible, such one-sided and unreasonable rules. If, however, they insist that a rule like this must be there, I suggest a corresponding rule on behalf of the operatives. Of course, my wording may be changed, but what I suggest will give the idea. I admit that both the rules are unreasonable, but if the other side is going to be unreasonable, we have no other alternative but to become ourselves also unreasonable to a certain extent. I suggest the following rule :—

“ The worker may at any time or times, and for any period or periods at his discretion, in the event of a domestic calamity such as death or serious illness in the family, fire or loss to his property due to fire, or catastrophe, emergency or epidemic, leave his or her employment without notice and without permission.”

MR. DANGE :—Strike should also be included. There may be a strike in one department, and there may be picketing with regard to the other department. The millowner may ask the workman to come, but the man cannot come in because he is afraid, and he is discharged..

MR. BAKHALE :—If they are going to insist upon having the ‘ playing off ’ rule we will equally emphatically insist that the leave rule should not find a place in the standing orders. If a worker is sick he has to take permission to absent himself and he has to inform the employer. The employers take the liberty of closing down the mill without notice on certain pretext.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—The workman when he is ill can inform the employer, “ I am ill and I cannot work.”

MR. DANGE :—At times he may not even find time to take leave. He may receive a wire necessitating his presence immediately in his village. He may receive it at one o'clock and the train may leave at 1-30.

MR. BAKHALE :—Even if he gets time to inform the jobber or head jobber, I do not want him to do it, so long as this rule of ‘ playing off ’ remains on the standing orders. Both the rules are unreasonable and therefore must be omitted. If that is not done and if this unreasonableness is kept in the standing orders, we too should like to be unreasonable.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Do you suggest that the employees should leave temporarily or permanently without notice ?

MR. BAKHALE :—The latter part of Rule 13 says :—

“ The employees so ‘ played off ’ are not to be considered as dismissed from service, but are temporarily unemployed and will not be entitled to wages during such unemployment. Such employees will be given the first chance of work again on the resumption of work on such machines or departments.”



Of course the question of wage does not arise. If they insist on that rule we will suggest that workers will leave without notice and take the first chance of joining that particular mill.

MR. KAMAT :—A domestic difficulty or calamity is not a demonstrable fact like fire in a mill. It is only known to himself. There is a distinction. You must provide for that.

MR. DANGE :—The state of the trade also is not demonstrable.

MR. BAKHALE :—As regards Rules 15 and 16 about notice I am glad that the millowners have brought down the period of notice from one month to 14 days. It is a small mercy which I should like to acknowledge. But I am not satisfied with the 14 days' notice, because we have already explained both orally as well as in our written statement that under the existing conditions the workers are likely to lose more by the insistence on giving notice than even the millowners. Therefore we suggest in our written statement that one day's notice should be considered sufficient for the purpose of this rule. We still adhere to that view.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—You would like to make contract from day to day. Is that your view? Workers will lose under this.

MR. BAKHALE :—That is the stand we have taken. If the other side is prepared to meet us, we are prepared to meet them half-way. First they had put in one month's notice and we had asked for a day's notice.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It was your own demand that there should be one month's notice on either side.

MR. DANGE :—That is the original demand and not even the ghost of the original demand remains now.

MR. BAKHALE :—In our 17 demands we said that when there was absolutely no rule about notice, at least observed in practice, there should be one month's notice on either side. After the Millowners' Association prepared their standing orders, we found that one month's notice on either side was not advantageous so far as the workers are concerned under the existing circumstances. Therefore, I think that we are perfectly entitled to modify our views just as Mr. Saklatvala is perfectly entitled to modify his view and bring down the notice period to 14 days. Even 14 days we consider too long a period so far as operatives are concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You are overlooking the interest of the industry. How can you carry on an important industry under keen competition? Should not that view be considered?

MR. BAKHALE :—I am quite prepared to consider that point. Mr. Bradley has pointed out in his evidence that in England in the engineering industry there is daily contract. Still that industry does not suffer.

MR. STONES :—In the textile industry in England it is a week's notice, to which this is analogous.

MR. BAKHALE :—In the textile industry in Germany there is hourly notice. I know this from my personal knowledge. I refer particularly to a jute mill which I visited in the neighbourhood of Berlin. I was told that the workers were on hourly contract. The point is this. We consider that 14 days' notice is too long a period for the operatives. The rule about notice and the rule about 'playing off' are absolutely inconsistent. If you are going to insist upon notice, delete the rule about 'playing off.' If you are going to insist upon the rule regarding 'playing off' then there is no meaning so far as the question of notice is concerned.

MR. STONES :—They are two different cases.

MR. BAKHALE :—That may be. Mr. Joshi, in his evidence suggested a week's notice on either side. So far as the Joint Strike Committee is concerned we stand by our original opinion of one day's notice on either side, if there is going to be any notice at all.

As regards the last part of Rule No. 15 about the forfeiture of wages, we are dead against it. It should be deleted. If the worker leaves his employment without notice, certainly employers can take legal steps against him. They can sue for damages. After all the employee's pay is in the hands of the employer. There is no question of how to recover the damages from the employee. But by making a rule definitely forfeiting the wages of the operative, you certainly shut out to the operative the legal remedy that he can take. You can dismiss him at any time without notice under one pretext or another. If he leaves under extraordinary circumstance without notice, you can forfeit his wages and prohibit him from going to a law court. The worker is put at a disadvantage from both points of view. I, therefore, say that it is absolutely unjust, one-sided and very unreasonable. We are not in favour of the rule about forfeiture. It should be deleted. If the employers suffer any loss on account of the sudden termination of service by the employee they have got legal remedies in their hand. They can do so. But to save that trouble they are going to penalise the worker. The earned wages are absolutely sacred to the employee. No God-fearing man would forfeit a wage earned by him by hard work. Even on this basis of common sense I believe this rule, in the interest of the employers, should be deleted. If they sustain any loss they can take legal remedies which are open to them.

As regards the dates for giving notice I have pointed out that the period should be common to both.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That has been settled.

MR. BAKHALE :—Rule No. 17 deals with leave. The rule says :—

“ When an application for special leave, leave exceeding one day and not exceeding two months is granted to an operative, the period of leave granted shall be stated in writing by the head of his department.

In the event of the operative taking leave in excess of the period granted, he shall lose all rights to reinstatement unless he has previously secured permission in writing to extend the leave originally granted and returns to work on the first working day following the period covered by any such extension."

I do not see any provision made entitling a worker for leave for a certain period. The evidence that came before us from different factories proves that they have a definite provision about leave. In certain factories 15 days' leave without pay is given. In certain others 15 days' leave with pay is given and in others 15 days' pay is given in lieu of leave. There is no such provision here. I have suggested that a rule giving two months' leave for 10 months' work should be incorporated in the standing orders. Then as to the method of taking leave that may also be incorporated in the rule as it stands. It is absolutely necessary that some provision must be made about leave.

The new Rule No. 14 is as regards the stoppage of machinery. It has already been pointed out to them that in some parts of Lancashire they have got six clauses about the stoppage of engine. We have got here one rule which deals with the same subject. In clause 2 (b) the following provision is made :—

"In addition to and including the foregoing, stoppage caused by a breakdown of engines, or other defect in the main driving, may be added together from one-making-up day to another, and shall count for payment if they total not less than two hours."

THE CHAIRMAN :—There is no merit in having all the clauses separately if they can be put in one rule.

MR. BAKHALE :—I want only the contents of those rules to be embodied here. These are small matters, but so far as the operatives are concerned, it is a good deal. I do not mind having one rule if the most important points in the Bolton agreement are incorporated in this rule. I do not myself think that all the points in the Bolton agreement have been brought out in Rule No. 14. There are a few more points which Mr. Dange will explain after I finish.

I do not think that I need add anything to what I have already stated about Rules Nos. 19, 20 and 21. We have already stated our objections and I do not think that any material change has been made in these rules.

The new Rule No. 22 says :—

"Wages will be calculated to the nearest pie and the percentage allowance paid for the high cost of living shall be calculated on this amount including annas and pies, but no payment of pies shall be made. If the last figure of this calculation is five pies or less, it shall be neglected ; if the last figure of this calculation amounts to six or more, the annas column will be increased to the next higher figure."

I do not understand the meaning of the words ' but no payment of pies shall be made.'

MR. SAKLATVALA :—If the total comes to Rs. 40-2-3, then the pies are neglected. Up to 5 pies no payment is made. If it is six pies and more then 2 annas is made into 3 annas.

MR. BAKHALE :—You have to make it absolutely clear.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—In calculating wages, suppose a man gets Rs. 20-4-3. Then we do not neglect these pies as is done in some mills. Seventy per cent. of this is added on to it, that is, say, Rs. 14-3-2. The total will come to Rs. 34-7-5. At the time of making payment this 5 pies is neglected. If it is six pies and more it is turned into Rs. 34-8-0.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It states the general principle at the beginning and then it goes on to say how it should be carried out.

MR. BAKHALE :—I am not prepared to lose even half an anna under this rule.

MR. STONES :—It is also in your favour.

MR. BAKHALE :—How ?

MR. STONES :—If it is 6 pies and more you get an anna.

MR. BAKHALE :—I should like to put my objection on paper. Perhaps the workers may gain, I do not know.

As regards Rule No. 23, it says :—

" The company shall be entitled to debit a weaver's wages with the cost of cloth damaged by the negligence of the weaver concerned. The piece or pieces damaged shall become the property of the weaver. The decision to debit the wages of a weaver with the cost of damaged cloth under this rule shall be made by an officer of the company not lower in rank than an assistant weaving master."

In the letter from the secretary of the Millowners' Association it is pointed out on page 1 :—

" New Rule No. 23 is to meet the demand from representatives of trade unions that cloth shall only be handed over to a weaver under an order by a responsible officer of the company."

I should like to know which trade union or which representative of trade unions have made a demand like this.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As far as that goes Mr. Bakhale is right. As soon as I received the letter I pointed out to the assistant secretary that it was not a demand from the union. The unions have taken up the position that the cloth should not be handed over to the weavers.

MR. BAKHALE :—I am not in favour of a rule like this. I am against the system of handing over the spoiled cloth to the workers. There are some mills in Bombay which have stopped this practice, because they found that it was no good. The object for which this kind of punishment is used was not achieved and therefore this rule was dropped in a few mills in Bombay. In a few other mills that exists. During the course of evidence it was pointed out that I went to the Khatav Makenji Mills to examine the spoiled cloth. Formerly there was no consideration given as the fault for which the cloth was spoiled. It may be due to the fault of the other departments or some other operatives in some other department. But no consideration was given to this point so far as I know. Large sums of money used to be collected from this mill. So, I made enquiries in the presence of the officers of the mill. We found on enquiry that the amount that used to be collected on account of spoiled pieces went down. There was a change for the better, because we found that weavers were unnecessarily punished in this way for no fault of theirs. It was also agreed then that some such kind of enquiry was absolutely necessary. I told you the reasons why I had to stop it. Personally I am not in favour of returning the spoiled pieces to the operatives. The system is bad and the object for which it was instituted is not achieved. The sooner the system is abolished the better it will be both for millowners and the operatives. First of all the spoiled cloth must be examined in the presence of the responsible officer of the mill and a trade union official or some responsible man in the mill in whom the workers repose confidence—I do not mean a jobber or head jobber. I found it in my experience that workers are nervous to express fully in the presence of the mill officials. So, if the enquiry is going to take place in the presence of the assistant weaving master, certainly the object of the enquiry will not be achieved. I therefore insist that if the system is to be continued at all, the enquiry should take place in the presence of the mill officer as well as in the presence of a trade union official or a representative of the worker elected by the workers themselves. If that is done, there is some chance of the evil being reduced to a minimum. So, I am not in favour of the last clauses of this particular rule.

The next point is, that the enquiry should relate not only to the question of debiting the cost of the damaged cloth to the wages of the worker, but also to the question of finding out who was really responsible for the spoiling of the cloth. Perhaps it may be found that some preparatory department was responsible for the piece being spoiled subsequently.

I do not think I have got anything more to say.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What have you to say to a suggestion to give an option to the weaver to take over the cloth instead of being fined ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Before an option is enforced, it is necessary to find out whether that particular piece was spoiled owing to a mistake of the weaver or of somebody else.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Supposing he admits that it is his mistake ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Then, of course, the option may be given to him. If he does not, then an enquiry is absolutely necessary.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—The rule says “ The company shall be entitled to debit a weaver’s wages with the cost of cloth damaged by the negligence of the weaver concerned.” So that the cost will be debited to the weaver’s wages only if the cloth is spoiled owing to his negligence.

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not think I have to add anything more. As I have already said, certain points which may have been left out will be dealt with by Messrs. Dange and Asavale. If any legal points have been overlooked by me, as they are bound to be, and if Mr. Joshi can find time (Mr. Joshi is not in Bombay to-day, he is expected here to-morrow) I hope the Committee will be agreeable to hear Mr. Joshi during the course of this week.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Oh yes, but you must place before him the points he has to speak about. You may have to answer some of Mr. Caroe’s points. We can hear him on Friday.

MR. BAKHALE :—That will be all right.

MR. KAMAT :—There is one point which wants some explanation. While commenting on the new Rule No. 17, you suggested that the worker should get two months’ leave after working ten months. How does that fit in with your remark that it should be a day-to-day contract of service.

MR. BAKHALE :—Even in Lancashire a week’s notice is quite enough for the termination of employment ; even so the workers get the usual holidays provided under the agreement between the employers and the workmen.

MR. STONES :—The workers here also get the Holi holidays and the Divali holidays. They have a definite list of scheduled holidays in Lancashire, and the Bombay Millowners’ Association also have a scheduled list of holidays.

MR. BAKHALE :—I think what we call leave here they call holidays there.

MR. STONES :—No. They have the Easter holidays. There is no system in Lancashire whereby a weaver is entitled to go away for two months.

MR. BAKHALE :—I am aware that in Lancashire a weaver cannot go away for two months, but the Lancashire weaver does not work a ten-hours’ day, and the climatic conditions are also not similar. Under our climatic conditions it is absolutely necessary for a weaver to take two months’ leave every year.

THE CHAIRMAN :—He loses his pay.

MR. BAKHALE :—The Standing Orders also provide for leave “ exceeding one day and not exceeding two months.”

**MR. STONES :—**We have stated as regards the substitutes that if they are engaged for more than two months they will be regarded as permanent employees ; we have made the figure here to correspond to the figure employed there.

**MR. BAKHALE :—**You may alter my suggestion ; you may put in that the workers shall be entitled to leave not exceeding two months. To meet Mr. Kamat's point, I am prepared to consider any suggestion made by the other side. My point is that the workers should be entitled to get some leave during the course of the year ; that is the point I want to emphasize.

**MR. DANGE :—**Rule 14 provides :—

“ In the event of a stoppage of machinery due to a breakdown or stoppage of the power supply during working hours, the operatives affected shall be informed, as soon as practicable, when work will be resumed and whether they are to remain or leave the mill. The period of detention in the mill shall not ordinarily exceed one hour after the commencement of the stoppage or breakdown. If the period of detention does not exceed one hour, operatives so detained shall not be paid for the period of detention. If the period of detention in the mill exceeds one hour, operatives so detained shall be entitled to receive wages for the whole of the time during which they are detained in the mill as a result of the stoppage. Operatives shall not be paid during the period of any breakdown or stoppage when they are not detained in the mill.”

I will illustrate a difficulty I feel under this rule. Supposing there is a breakdown of machinery at 2 o'clock, and the management informs the workers that work will be resumed at 4, and that they could go out of the mill during the interval, will they be paid for those two hours as for detention ?

**MR. STONES :—**Not under this rule, nor under the Bolton rule.

**MR. DANGE :—**I do not care what the Bolton rule is.

**MR. STONES :—**But this rule follows the Bolton rule.

**MR. DANGE :—**Suppose there is a breakdown at 2, and the workers are asked to go away and come back at 5, they will have work only for one hour after they return and they will then have to go away.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**If they are told that they are not going to be detained, they can go away and come back. I do not think there is anything in that point.

**MR. DANGE :—**Supposing a worker is asked to come back at 4 and he does not come back, then it would be called absenting himself without leave.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**The question is whether he should get any wages. The Lancashire rule is that if they are detained beyond a certain period they get wages. In the case you quoted, as they are not going to be detained, there is no question of their being paid their wages.

MR. DANGE :—There should be some limit laid down as regards the period between the breakdown and the call for resumption of work. Beyond a certain limit, the workers should not be liable to be called back to work on the same day. It would be very difficult for them to be roaming about the City for two or three hours and then go back to work on the same day. Some would like to go back to their homes instead of resuming work after a long interval.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What is the practice at present ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—If the machine stops at ten, and it is expected to be repaired at 12, the manager says to the workmen, " You can go away and come back after the midday recess." Then, they get wages for the time they worked in the morning and again in the afternoon.

MR. DANGE :—There is a practice in some mills whereby if the machine breaks down during working hours and they stop work, the men are paid for the whole day.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We have not had any evidence of that.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—They may put him on other work ; they may ask him to clean the machinery.

MR. DANGE :—This rule leaves room for the owner to get out of his obligation to pay for detention.

There is one more point that has not been covered by this rule, and that is detention inside the mill when work is not supplied to the operatives. We have led evidence to show that winders are sometimes detained inside the mill without supply of work.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The answer to that was more winders were employed in the mill than was necessary.

MR. DANGE :—Supposing only enough winders are employed, provision has to be made for payment of wages when work is not supplied and workmen are detained in the mill.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—That is a different case ; there being not sufficient work is a matter of trade. That is a separate question.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Supposing there is a breakdown of machinery at 2 and they are asked to come back at 4, what is the present practice ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Then, they will be paid for the time they worked in the morning and they will also be paid for work done from 4 to 6.

MR. STONES :—We do not pay compensation for detention unless it is for more than an hour.



THE CHAIRMAN :—You always get hard cases. Such rules will work hard either way. So far, however, as these rules follow the Bolton rules, they seem fairly reasonable, subject to the further suggestion made by Mr. Khareghat that it ought to cover not only stoppage or breakdown of engine but also other breakdowns due to emergencies that are mentioned in Rule 13 about “ playing off.”

MR. KHAREGHAT :—There may be a fire.

MR. DANGE :—When hard and fast rules are being laid down and a legal aspect is given to these rules, then I am entitled to anticipate a large number of hard cases which might crop up and say that they shall be dealt with by these rules.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Rules cannot be made to meet all hard cases.

MR. DANGE :—There is no provision to meet the case of pieceworkers who do not get a sufficient supply of work.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is another question. I suppose a complaint as regards that can be made to the trade union, and the trade union representatives can go round and ask the mill authorities “ what do you mean by not supplying enough work for these men ? ”

MR. STONES :—If the operative is not given work, he can go home. If he is detained he is given pay at a certain rate.

MR. DANGE :—If he has the choice of going home, then the question of absenting himself without leave without sufficient cause arises.

MR. STONES :—That is sufficient excuse. The excuse is that there is no work.

MR. DANGE :—Who is to define “ sufficient excuse ” ? Rule No. 19 is :—

“ Any operative who is adjudged by the manager on examination of the man, if present, and of the facts to be guilty of misconduct is liable to be summarily dismissed without notice, or, at the manager’s discretion, to be fined.”

Here I should like to add that the man should have the right to get help from the union officials or from the union ; he should have the right to nominate his representative also.

Then, among the clauses that enumerate the various kinds of misconduct, the phrase “ insubordination or disobedience whether alone or in combination with another or others to a superior or to the Manager ” is too vague. It has got the ideology of a feudal master and his slave.

THE CHAIRMAN :—All that has been stated ; there is nothing new in that.

MR. DANGE :—I want to make myself clear that we are out to take away this ideology.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You are summing up now ; we don't want mere repetition of what you have already said on that point.

MR. DANGE :—If these rules are to be kept, then I would suggest another rule which should be added to these. It is :—

“ No operative shall tolerate any insulting conduct, abuse, assault or noisy, obnoxious or quarrelsome behaviour from any superior or manager. If any such takes place, it shall be adjudged on a complaint from the operative by the company and the men's union. And the party guilty of such misconduct is liable to be summarily dismissed without notice.”

These faults, insulting conduct, abuse, assault, quarrelsome behaviour, etc. are supposed to be always on the operative's side ; but we have cases of such behaviour on the part of the superior officers also. No provision has been made to meet such misconduct on the part of the superiors.

Then take (b) :—

“ Striking work either singly or with other operatives without giving one month's previous notice.”

We are against this provision also as long as suitable conditions are not granted to the workers also. There is no provision made that complaints will be looked into within a reasonable time by the employers. When complaints are not redressed within a reasonable time, the last resort of the worker to secure redress of his grievances is a strike, and therefore he cannot give one month's notice.

MR. STONES :—That is to be provided for in the rules. Provision will be made for a reference first to the Mill Committee and then to the Joint Committee.

MR. DANGE :—We have no rules before us at present.

MR. STONES :—Those rules can be dealt with when they are placed before you.

MR. DANGE :—We object to this rule so long as we have not the other rules before us.

MR. CAROE :—I think it would be logical to reduce the notice period to a fortnight.

MR. DANGE :—Then (e) “ Theft.” The question of theft can be dealt with legally ; there is no reason why it should be brought in here ; there are legal remedies in the hands of millowners for dealing with theft.

Then (b) "Negligence in work or neglect of work" is too vague a phrase. Then comes :—

"(c) Smoking on the mill premises except in places where smoking is permitted."

In this case "mill premises" should be defined, because there is no reason why the workers during the recess while sitting under a tree in the compound should not smoke.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The Factories Act prevents smoking. The mill can allow smoking only in places set apart for that ; if smoking is allowed in other places, the mill manager is liable to be prosecuted under that Act. Then, we have also to comply with the rules of the Fire Insurance Company.

MR. ASVALE :—Are there any special places provided ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes.

MR. ASVALE :—Should they sit near the latrine ?

MR. STONES :—They do sit !

MR. DANGE :—It is better than smoking at a card table.

MR. ASVALE :—It is nowhere laid down that there shall be a place set apart for smoking.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That has been provided under the Factories Act ; under that Act we are compelled to keep a separate place for smoking.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Supposing the mill puts up an unsuitable place for smoking, that is a matter for the local representative of the workers to take up and arrange it with the mill management.

MR. ASVALE :—I only say that the place for smoking should not be kept near the latrines or water-taps.

MR. DANGE :—There is no provision that a separate place shall be provided for smoking or dining.

Then "absence without leave without sufficient cause from appointed work in the mill." There is a difficulty as regards this. In the weaving section the weavers have to leave their place of work to get weft ; they do not take the permission of the jobber to go for this. Now, if they leave for that, it may be absence from appointed work.

MR. STONES :—That is appointed work in the mill.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That will be altered into "Absence without leave or without sufficient excuse."

**MR. DANGE** :—Then (h) :—

“ Taking bribes from or giving bribes to any other operative or person employed in the mill, or from or to any other person having dealings with the company as a motive or reward for doing or omitting to do any act, the performance or omission whereof would be prejudicial to the interests of the company.”

I just want to know whether taking or giving bribes would be permitted if it is beneficial to the company.

Then the rule says :—

“ Fines imposed under this rule shall be utilised for the welfare work of the company.”

I want this to be changed into :—

“ Fines imposed under this rule shall be utilised for welfare work among the workpeople of the company.”

Spinning masters, weaving masters, head jobbers, etc., are not included in these rules, and therefore there is no reason why fines recovered from the workpeople should be spent on welfare work directed to their benefit.

**MR. STONES** :—When fines are imposed, usually the loss to the company caused by the fault which necessitated the fine is bigger than the fine. Therefore, the company must have sole power to utilise it in whichever way they think fit.

**MR. DANGE** :—Then all the employees should be brought under these rules. Even if the agent of the mill leaves the company's service without notice and he is fined, that fine should go to the welfare work of the company.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—We have similar rules for others. For example, even the manager of a mill cannot take anything with him without a gate pass when he goes out of the mill. He is liable to be searched.

**MR. STONES** :—Fines are imposed for loss caused to the company, and the company should have the right to spend the amount in welfare work of whatever kind. The operative is fined because he has caused loss to the company.

**MR. DANGE** :—In that case you cannot claim, as you do in your propaganda pamphlets, that all these fines are utilised for welfare work among the workpeople.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Please stick to the point. We do not want discussion outside our points.

**MR. DANGE** :—There is a provision made :—

“ Before the beginning of each month a notice will be posted outside the timekeeper’s office and in the mill stating (a) the days on which the mill will be closed during the following month, and (b) the date or dates on which wages will be paid.”

Here you might know there are two systems of wage payment. On the regular day for payment of wages if certain operatives are absent, or if some are on leave and return during the month at any time, no provision is made as regards the period within which they will be paid their wages. For example, if the pay day is the 15th, and if an operative is absent, in some cases he has to wait till the 25th or the 31st, or even till the next pay day. There is no provision for unclaimed wages and also for the wages of those who are absent on the regular pay day. We suggest that unclaimed wages should be paid on demand, as also the wages of those who are absent on regular pay day.

MR. ASVALE :—As regards new Rule No. 18, it says “ Each jobber will be deemed to have knowledge of the rules under the Indian Factories Act, as regards the employment of women and children, and will be personally responsible to see those rules are not infringed.”

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That has been deleted.

MR. ASVALE :—As regards old Rule No. 20, that is also deleted.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—No ; that stands.

MR. ASVALE :—Old Rule 17 says : “ Any operative who is adjudged by the manager on examination of the man, if present, and of the facts to be guilty of misconduct is liable to be summarily dismissed without notice, or, at the manager’s discretion, to be fined.” Then follow the acts or omissions which will be treated as misconduct. These things which are considered as misconduct are happening every day during the course of their work, and it is natural that those people whom the weaving master, or the manager, or the management do not want on the work will be dismissed summarily. Then there will be no choice for the worker to receive one month’s notice at all. Only in case of theft should this rule be applied. In the other cases, it should be stated in the rule that unless they have been heard through their representatives, and unless they have been found guilty, no action should be taken.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We have had a very full discussion about all this.

MR. ASVALE :—Provision should be made in the rule to that effect.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That has been suggested before.

MR. ASVALE :—My colleagues have not pointed it out here. It is only suggested in the evidence.

MR. STONES :—Mr. Dange has pointed it out.

MR. ASVALE :—Not in the way I have done. As regards theft, that should not be provided for in this rule. We have got the rule about search, and theft should be dealt with in that rule. I am quite sure the management will never keep a man who steals. Theft should not be included in misconduct.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What should be done if a man is found stealing ?

MR. ASVALE :—He should be dismissed summarily, as provided in other rules.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The other rule says he may be searched.

MR. ASVALE :—If he is a thief, he will be handed over to the police, and naturally that man will never be taken back.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You do not want to have the power to dismiss him ? Legally, mere handing over to a policeman would not give the company the power to dismiss the man, except under the ordinary rule of master and servant. Under the ordinary rule of master and servant, if the servant does something which is incompatible with his duties to his employer, he is liable to be summarily dismissed. There is nothing new in it. It is the ordinary rule of law.

MR. ASVALE :—As regards old Rule No. 18, the fine of 2 per cent. of the operative's total earnings for the month would be too much. That will be an indirect cut of 2 per cent. of the operative's wages. It should be provided that the total fines in a year should not exceed 2 per cent. of the operative's total earnings for one month. This should be so, taking into consideration the other rules under which the worker will be fined, and it will be a cut of 2 per cent. of the operative's wages.

Then, as Mr. Dange said, no provision has been made for unclaimed wages. As these unclaimed wages belong to the operatives and they are their hard-earned wages, they should be returned and not used as has been done up to now. They have been considered as the income of the company, and nothing has been done in the interest of the workers with these unclaimed wages.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—There is no provision made, and you want a provision to be made ?

MR. ASVALE :—There should be a rule how to use unclaimed wages.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That also has been dealt with in Appendix E of our written statement.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Is there any objection to a rule being put in ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—What we had said in that appendix was that we are prepared to give unclaimed wages at any time to an operative on proper identification. Then you yourself, sir, suggested that if you put it in the rule, a great-grandson might turn up after 60 years and claim the money.

MR. ASVALE :—There should be a time fixed.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—In that way, we are prepared to go further. Our present practice is that after 3 years the wages are not paid. We go further and say that if he comes at any time, that is even after 3 years the man turns up, we are agreeable to pay, but we cannot put it in the rule. If it is in the rule, as rightly pointed out by the Chairman, it would be very indefinite. The man might say that he was employed twenty years ago; his appearance may have changed, and there may not be anybody to identify him. He might go on claiming from one mill or the other. What is our position to be in that case?

MR. ASVALE :—Then you can make a provision that after 3 years it cannot be claimed.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It is "any time, on sufficient identification." If a great-grandson comes, there probably would not be sufficient identification. You will be protected in that way. There is no objection to having such a rule?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—There is no objection.

MR. ASVALE :—As regards a place for eating and smoking purposes, a special rule should be made that the Millowners should provide special places for taking meals as well as for smoking.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is implied. The reference to places where smoking is permitted, puts the liability of providing them on the mill.

MR. ASVALE :—There is no place provided for taking meals. They take their meals sometimes under a tree, or any place in the compound, or even near the latrines.

MR. STONES :—It is not under our control to do anything at present in the matter.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It is more when the entry recess is provided that they have to provide a proper place?

MR. STONES :—Yes.

MR. ASVALE :—The other points have been dealt with, and I do not wish to dilate upon them.

MR. BRADLEY :—I wish to touch upon one point in reference to Rule No. 6. The argument used by the Millowners is that they are anxious that a sufficient or adequate fine should be imposed upon those that attend late. I think that in this way an injustice would be done to the operatives. It is claimed that if the operative is only fined according to the amount of time lost, for instance a quarter of an hour or half an hour, if he comes late through no fault of his own, that is inadequate, and it is claimed also that, at any

rate, he will not get a fine of more than 2 per cent. of his month's wages. I claim that, by this method, they are not victimising the habitual late comer, but the late comer that happens to come late through no fault of his own, once or twice. The habitual late comer easily uses up his 2 per cent. fine during the month. But the late comer that comes half an hour late through no fault of his own gets a big fine for nothing. I think that the method used in many of the factories in England could be very well adopted here. It would give an incentive to the operatives to attend early, and it would not inflict, in the case of the late comer only once or twice, such a great hardship. That is the bonus hour, or pay equivalent to an hour's wage of piece workers should be given to operatives who attend regularly every day of the week or month. In the event of their coming late once, that hour plus the equivalent of the time lost, a quarter of an hour or half an hour or whatever it may be, should be the loss to the operative. Thereby, you would not be inflicting such a great penalty on the operative that comes late through no fault of his own, and it would also be more equitably dividing the fines that you are going to place upon the workers coming late. That is the point I want to stress, and I think it can be very usefully operated here. I do think that an injustice has been done by this rule to those that come late only now and again, and that the habitual late comer is not punished adequately.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Is the bonus hour one for the whole month once a month ?

MR. BRADLEY :—A bonus hour per week may be given. That is a matter for discussion. I think it would give an incentive to operatives attending regularly and early, and it would not inflict a penalty upon those that happen to come late just now and again through no fault of their own. Through some accident, they may be a quarter of an hour or half an hour late. They would then lose their bonus hour and equivalent time in wages ; whereas now they get a fine up to 2 per cent. That is the only point I wanted to stress.

THE CHAIRMAN (to Mr. Saklatvala) :—Is there any point which you specially want to bring to notice ? I think all of them have been very fully discussed. I do not think there is anything new that requires a reply from you.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—There were one or two questions I put yesterday about Rule 14, first sentence.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That was whether the word " operative " used in the rule contemplates the clerical staff or not.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It does not refer to the clerical staff.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—To whom does it refer ? We wanted to limit " operative " only to those who earn daily wages.



**THE CHAIRMAN** :—If the word “operative” does not include the clerical staff, I should have thought you would want only one sentence. For instance. “The service of any operative may be terminated by 14 days’ notice or by paying half a month’s wages, calculated on the average daily earnings of such operative for the previous month in lieu of notice.”

**MR. STONES** :—That is correct.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Nothing else is wanted.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—What do you mean by “half a month”?

**MR. STONES** :—It is not daily wages; it is really monthly wages. I do not know of any operative, except temporary employees, who are engaged on a daily wage.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—Daily wage would include holidays. You do not pay for Sundays?

**MR. STONES** :—The whole of the standard list is based on a month of 26 days, so that he would be paid one-half of that wage for a fortnight’s notice, that is, the wage for 13 working days.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—Originally you had 26 days.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—We really want to distinguish between an operative on time wages and an operative who is a piece-worker.

**MR. STONES** :—We want to add a clause there that a fortnight’s wage means one-half of the monthly wage, which is based on 26 working days; that is, 13 working days.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—We may say “The service of any operative on a monthly time wage may be terminated by 14 days’ notice or by payment of 13 working days’ wages in lieu of notice. Any operative drawing wages on daily earning piece rate basis may be dismissed by 14 days’ notice or by payment of 13 working days’ wages calculated on his average daily average earnings for the previous month.”

**MR. BAKHALE** :—Suppose the month is of 27 days’ working?

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—Then the average daily earnings are to be paid.

**MR. STONES** :—We take 26 working days throughout the year, and we would have to pay for 13 days. If it is February, it will be for 12 days. In the case of 27 working days, it would be 13½ days.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—There would be 12 working days in 14 days’ period, because there would be 2 Sundays or holidays.

**MR. STONES** :—Then they get an advantage. They get 13 working days’ wages for 14 days’ notice.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—I think it can really be put in one sentence ; it is only a matter of drafting. We can say : “ The service of any operative may be terminated on 14 days’ notice or by payment, if he is on monthly time wages, of 13 working days’ wages, or if he is on a daily earning piece-rate basis, by payment of 13 working days’ wages paid on his average daily earnings for the previous calendar month in lieu of notice.”

**MR. KAMAT** :—Mr. Stones, I should like to know the practice in Lancashire about welfare funds. Do the representatives of labour have any voice in the distribution of those funds ?

**MR. STONES** :—Fines go to the mill, and, with rare exceptions, they belong to the mill. The practice in many districts, and in the mill which I was managing at home, was that we had a bean feast, a sort of picnic in the middle of the year, and we had an employees’ dance at the end of the year, and the employers added a sum to that, and every operative had a free ticket for this picnic and a free ticket to this dance. The funds were the fines we used to have. The operatives had no control over those fines.

**MR. KAMAT** :—In a way they are involuntary contributions ?

**MR. STONES** :—It was some compensation for the damage caused ; the damage in every case exceeding the amount of fine.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Do any unclaimed wages go to the Welfare Fund or not ?

**MR. STONES** :—I do not know what is contemplated in the rules.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—I think it would be safer to keep it separate.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Yes, because they are liable to be claimed.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Unless you fix a period of limitation like 3 years.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—Yes.

**MR. CAROE** :—It would be rather difficult, because the time limit for minors is so great. If a man has earned his money, presumably his child would be entitled to have it even after 3 years on his attaining majority. In the case of minors, the time limit is so great that it would really be hardly safe to direct the Company to spend the money for the benefit of the employees, in the absence of an absolute forfeiture clause.

**MR. ASVALE** :—In this case there should be a time limit, 3 years, and after that the amount should be utilised.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Mr. Caroe has pointed out that it would be difficult to cover the case of minors. Say, a man is a father, he has earned some wages, he dies and leaves a minor boy aged 6 years. Under the ordinary law, the boy can bring a suit to recover the money 3 years after he has attained the age of 18 ; that is to say, 15 years after the man’s death, his son can claim the money.

MR. ASAVALE :—So much amount has accumulated in each mill. I do not think it has at all been claimed by the workers.

THE CHAIRMAN :—In banks also you get a lot of unclaimed money.

MR. STONES :—If it was in any way the large figure which Mr. Asavale says it is, I should like to say that the welfare funds of 3 of our mills are in difficulty, absolutely. The amount that has been granted from those funds far exceeds any forfeiture of wages. The mills are paying any time that a man can prove by proper identification that he has wages due to him.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It is in the interest of the workers, I suppose, to be able to claim at any time. So that, you cannot have it both ways ; that is the trouble.

I think it is agreed that there should be some rule about unclaimed wages on the basis of what is to be done.

We close the discussion on Standing Orders. The Seventeen Demands will be taken up next.

MR. BAKHALE :—I shall be ready to take them up to-morrow. I have not brought my papers here to-day and so I cannot take this question up after the lunch interval.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I do not suppose the witnesses from the Spring Mill will take very long. But take care to call the right people. Otherwise, a Weaving Master may come and say he does not know. It should be somebody who knows what was actually done, say, within the last 7 years.

MR. BAKHALE :—Before we close to-day, I should like to inform you that I propose to bring in one or two cases to-morrow for the interpretation of the compromise arrived at between the Millowners and ourselves. If you want notice, I will send it by this evening.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What cases ?

MR. BAKHALE :—One case is about the reduction in rates in one mill. We said that the rates would be paid on the basis of the rates in March 1927, and, in the case of a few mills, March 1928. There is one mill which was not working in March 1927 at all. It was closed long ago, and it opened in April 1927. Now the workers complain to us about the rates. I went to see the Manager and the management said that they would give only these wages and nothing more, because of the agreement. Personally, I feel that the question of agreement does not come in in the case of this mill, because it was not open in March 1927.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It may not be covered by the agreement, but you can take a month as near as possible to March or April 1927. Could you not come to some arrangement without bothering us ?

MR. BAKHALE :—We are anxious to come to some understanding, but the management are taking their stand on this.

MR. STONES :—Which is the mill ?

MR. BAKHALE :—It is the Dinshaw Petit Mill at Lal Bag.

MR. ASVALE :—It was closed for 5 or 6 months before April 1927.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Could you not ask some one on the other side to look into it ?

MR. STONES :—The case could come to the Millowners' Association first. If Mr. Bakhale approaches the Millowners' Association, the case might be handled.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is another complaint from the Indian Mill. It is an individual complaint of a fitter. He was getting a particular salary in March 1927. Now his salary has been reduced by Rs. 10. I went to the mill and saw the manager. I also saw Sir Munmohundass Ramji in that connection. They replied that they were not willing to pay his former salary. There are a few other facts also about this which I should like to place before the Committee. Then there is another complaint from that mill. When the mills went on strike last year, there was some cloth on each and every loom. Now, after the mills opened, most of the mills paid for these pieces of cloth. In this particular mill no payment was made at all. Some of the weavers had got the whole day's work on the looms, and they did not get any payment at all. We made enquiries about the matter, but the management practically refuses to make payment.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is a matter of making a legal claim ; it is not a question of the agreement.

MR. BAKHALE :—I think the fitter's case comes in under the agreement.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That may come in, but I would suggest that you should try and come to an amicable settlement ; it is not a very big matter.

MR. BAKHALE :—No ; it is the case of an individual.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We would be rather obliged if you could avoid bringing up cases which would take up time.

MR. BAKHALE :—We will not take much time.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Have you given notice to the Association and tried to arrive at a settlement ?

MR. BAKHALE :—As regards the Dinshaw Petit Mill, I shall deal with the Millowners' Association, or with its members, and if we fail to come to any understanding, then I am afraid I shall have to bring the case before the Committee.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**You will take up the Seventeen Demands to-morrow?

**MR. BAKHALE :—**Yes, barring rationalisation.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Barring anything connected with the standardisation scheme. We do not want a repetition of all the arguments.

The Committee adjourned till 11-15 a.m. on the 23rd January 1929.

---

**THE COTTON SPINNERS' AND MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION  
AND THE AMALGAMATED WEAVERS' ASSOCIATION.**

**JOINT RULES FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF TRADE DISPUTES IN THE  
WEAVING, WINDING AND WARPING DEPARTMENTS.**

---

The object of these Rules is to secure the consideration and settlement of trade disputes in their early stages, and thereby to preserve good feeling between Employers and Operatives. For the purpose of carrying out this object it is agreed as follows :—

I. In the event of a trade dispute arising between any member of an Association comprised in the Cotton Spinners' and Manufacturers' Association and any Operative Member or Members of an Association comprised in the Amalgamated Weavers' Association, the following course shall be taken :—

- (a) Before any notices shall be given by either party to terminate employment for the purpose of a lock-out or strike, the dispute shall be brought forthwith before a Local Joint Meeting of Representatives of Employers appointed by the Local Employers' Association and of Operatives appointed by the Local Operatives' Association, and such meeting shall be held within four days (exclusive of Sunday) from the date of an application by either party for such meeting; and if a settlement of the dispute be not come to at that meeting, or at an adjournment thereof, then
- (b) Before any notices shall be given by either party to terminate employment, for the purpose of a lock-out or strike, the dispute shall be brought before a Joint Meeting of the Representatives of The Cotton Spinners' and Manufacturers' Association and of The Amalgamated Weavers' Association, and such meeting shall be held within seven days from the date of an application by either party for such meeting; and if a settlement of the dispute be not come to at that meeting, or at an adjournment thereof, then

- (c) Before any notices shall be given by either party to terminate employment for the purpose of a lock-out or strike, the dispute shall be brought before a Joint Meeting of Representatives of The Cotton Spinners' and Manufacturers' Association and of The Northern Counties Textile Trades' Federation, and such meeting shall be held within seven days from the date of an application by either party for such meeting; and if a settlement be not come to at such meeting, or at an adjournment thereof, then either party shall be at liberty to take whatever course it thinks fit.

2. In the event of a complaint of bad material which the Local Secretaries of the respective Associations have been unable to settle, the Local Secretary of the Operatives' Association shall have power to claim a joint inspection by Representatives of Employers and of Operatives of the material complained of at the mill where such material had been given out for work, in which case each Association shall appoint Representatives to make such a joint inspection within three days (Sundays excepted) from the making of such claim, and failing, a satisfactory settlement at such joint inspection or at an agreed adjournment thereof, or if facilities be not given for a joint inspection within such period as aforesaid or within such extended time as may be mutually agreed upon between the Secretaries of two Local Associations, the complaint shall then be regarded as a trade dispute and be subject to the procedure provided by Rule 1 hereof in relation to trade disputes except that the procedure under Rule 1 (b) shall be disregarded, and the procedure under Rule 1 (b) shall be followed with this modification: that at the Joint Meeting held thereunder, the Representatives of the Amalgamated Weavers' Association shall attend with the Representatives of The Northern Counties Textile Trades' Federation.

3. Any determination of a dispute as to a weaving price shall take effect from the time when the work was given out to the Operative, except in cases of new cloth for which no definite provision is made in the Uniform List of Prices for Weaving, or the Colne and District Standard Lists of Prices for Weaving Coloured Goods, or any other List for Weaving which are recognised by the Cotton Spinners' and Manufacturers' Association, or for which no price has been officially fixed by the two Associations, and in either of those cases the weaving price and the time when it shall take effect shall be mutually arranged between the Employers' Association and the Operatives' Association, and failing agreement in any case, such disagreement shall be regarded as a trade dispute, and be subject to the procedure provided by Rule 1 hereof, in relation to trade disputes.

4. In cases of under-payment of the Uniform List of Prices for Weaving or the Colne and District Standard List of Prices for weaving Coloured Goods, or any other Lists for weaving which are recognised by The Cotton Spinners' and Manufacturers' Association, and where such under-payment is admitted by the Employer, or where the accused Employer refuses to consent to a joint inspection of work on application by the Employers' Secretary, the Operatives shall be at liberty to take whatever action they think fit without the necessity of bringing the matter before either the Local or Central Employers' Associations.

5. Whenever a settlement of any trade dispute shall not have been come to and operatives are on strike or locked-out of employment in consequence thereof, then meetings shall be held periodically between Representatives of the Cotton Spinners' and Manufacturers' Association and of The Northern Counties Textile Trades' Federation; the first of such meetings shall be held in Manchester four weeks after and at the same place and hour as the last meeting of representatives in the same dispute, and subsequent meetings shall be held at the same place and hour periodically every four weeks until the dispute be settled and without any formal application by either party for any such meeting; provided, however, that in a trade dispute relating to bad material, the meetings to be held under this Rule shall be between the Representatives of the Cotton Spinners' and Manufacturers' Association and the Amalgamated Weavers' Association and The Northern Counties Textile Trades' Federation.

6. If the attendance of any person or persons is desired by either party at any meeting to be held for the consideration of a trade dispute, and notice in writing is given to the other party of such desire, each party will, when so desired, request such person or persons to attend the meeting.

7. In the event of an application being made by the operatives in any section for an advance of wages, or by the employers in any section for reduction of wages, such application if not granted shall, before any notices are given by either party to terminate employment for the purpose of a strike or lock-out, be brought before a Joint Meeting of Representatives of the Cotton Spinners' and Manufacturers' Association and of the Amalgamated Weavers' Association, and such meeting shall be held within seven days from the date of an application by either party for such meeting, and if a settlement be not come to at such meeting, or at an adjournment thereof, then, before any notices shall be given by either party to terminate employment for the purpose of a strike or lock-out, the matter shall be brought before a Joint Meeting of Representatives of the Cotton Spinners' and Manufacturers' Association and of The Northern Counties Textile Trades' Federation, and such meeting shall be held in Manchester within seven days from the date of an application by either party for such meeting, and if a settlement be not come to at such meeting, or at an adjournment thereof, then either party shall be at liberty to take whatever course it thinks fit.

8. All meetings shall be held at such time and place as may be mutually agreed upon between the officials of the Employers' and Operatives' Associations.

9. The proceedings at Joint Meeting shall be regarded as strictly private and confidential. Every question discussed, every statement made and every opinion expressed, shall be treated by each person present as strictly private and confidential and shall not be communicated to any outside person, or to the Press, except by direction or permission of the meeting, and the name of any person attending a meeting, or the particular part taken by any person in any of the discussion shall not be quoted at any public meeting.

10. An application by the Employers for a meeting with Representatives of the Amalgamated Weavers' Association may be addressed to Mr. Joseph Cross, Ewbank Chambers, Accrington, or to the Secretary for the time being, and an application by the Employers for a meeting with Representatives of The Northern Counties Textile Trades' Federation may be addressed to Mr. Thomas Shaw, 243, Keighley Road, Colne, or to the Secretary for the time being. An application by the Operatives for a meeting with Representatives of the Cotton Spinners' and Manufacturers' Association may be addressed to Mr. John Taylor, or Mr. F. A. Hargreaves, 12, Exchange Street, Manchester, or to the Secretary for the time being.

11. In the event of an Association either of Employers or Operatives failing to appoint a time for and to give notice to the Secretary of the other Association affected by a dispute, of a Joint Meeting to deal with such dispute, in accordance with these rules and within the period limited for such purpose, or within such extended period as may be mutually agreed upon between the Secretaries of the two Associations, then either party shall be at liberty to take whatever course it thinks fit.

Signed on behalf of the Cotton Spinners' and Manufacturers' Association.

JOHN TAYLOR,  
F. A. HARGREAVES,  
*Joint Secretaries.*

Signed on behalf of the Amalgamated Weavers' Association.

JOSEPH CROSS,  
*Secretary.*

---





---

---

*Wednesday, 23rd January, 1929.*

---

---

THE Committee met at the Town Hall, Bombay at 11-15 a.m.

*Present.*

THE CHAIRMAN,

MR. KHAREGHAT,

MR. KAMAT.

ORAL EVIDENCE OF MR. T. HINCHCLIFF.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Are you the weaving master of the Spring Mill ?  
—Yes ; also before that I was of the Textile Mill.

We want to hear from you as to the practice of the weavers taking out tickets in the Textile Mills as well as in the Spring Mills.—We went on double shift from 1919 to April 1923 in both the mills. After we stopped the double shift, we introduced the ticket system for weavers in 1923.

You have been having that system since 1923 ?—Yes.

What exactly do the weavers do ?—The ticket boys give the tickets to the jobbers in the afternoon and the jobbers distribute them to the weavers. When they come in the morning the weavers drop them in the box. The ticket boys make a list of the tickets dropped and mark the names of absentees from the tickets that are not dropped.

This was first introduced in 1923 ?—Yes ; I received a letter from Sir Ness Wadia, who was then in England, instructing me to introduce the ticket system. This is the letter I received from him.

You received instruction from your agents to introduce the system ?  
—Yes ; these are the books for 1923, 1924, 1925 and 1926, containing the names of the weavers against their respective numbers with my initials below them.

Where is the book for 1927 ?—This morning I was not able to find out the book.

How long have you been able to carry on this system without any objection ?—We have been able to carry on this system until there was a departmental strike. After a departmental strike we generally wait for 5 or 6 days until all the weavers come in and then reintroduce the ticket system.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—When was that departmental strike ?—One in each year for one or two days since 1923.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You never dropped this system entirely ?—During the strike of September 1927, due to an oversight of the time keeper, the tickets were not renewed.

Not renewed at all?—It started again in April 1928. After the end of the general strike in October 1928 we introduced the system again. They ceased to drop tickets on 2nd January 1929.

MR. DANGE :—Can you tell me how many strikes there were regarding this system?—Strikes took place not with regard to this system but with regard to cleaning of looms and rates. When they go on strike they formulate a list of demands and this has been one of them. There was no strike particularly on the ticket system.

Since 1923 when this system was introduced, can you tell me how many strikes have taken place and the list of demands on each occasion?—I cannot give you the full list of demands.

Not the full list; at least those instances wherein this ticket system was mentioned?—From 1st June to 18th June 1923 there was a strike with regard to cleaning of looms. From January to March 1924, there was a general strike with regard to bonus. On 13th May 1925 the weavers struck work for one day with regard to cleaning of looms and the question of tickets was brought up on that occasion. There was a general strike from 18th September to 7th December 1925. From 17th to 18th October in 1926 the weavers struck work when I used to pull them up with regard to efficiency. Here also the ticket system was mentioned. From 15th to 25th September in 1927 the weavers struck work on the question of rates.

Was the question of tickets brought up on this occasion?—This question was not brought up.

In 1928?—It was a general strike.

Before the general strike?—There was no strike.

In the Spring Mill there was a strike?—January 1928; it was in the spinning section for about 10 days on the question of two sides. I cannot speak with regard to spinning.

Whenever these strikes took place and people resumed work, for how many days did they cease to drop tickets?—On an average for 6 or 7 days. After a strike it generally takes some time to bring round the men to normal routine.

Can you tell me in what way it was introduced in 1923?—What do you mean?

For what purpose?—It was introduced for the purpose of ascertaining how many have come late and how many substitutes will be necessary if there are absentees, as is done in other departments.

Is it a fact that these tickets were introduced when you stopped night working?—In the Textile Mill it was introduced in 1910.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Do you know anything about it?—People used to tell me that while Mr. Batliwalla was the manager, the tickets used to be hung on boards to find out easily the absentees.

Have you any personal knowledge of it?—No ; I came here only in 1919.

MR. DANGE :—Since the weavers stopped dropping the tickets from January of this year, have you been experiencing all the difficulties expressed in Sir Ness Wadia's letter?—Some time is lost in finding out how many are absent and how many substitutes are necessary. If there are absentees we have to put in substitutes. We do not know all this until we get the ticket.

MR. DANGE :—I want to know, sir, before I proceed to examine the witness further, what we are determining exactly?

THE CHAIRMAN :—We want to clear up the question of fact whether it has been actually put into practice in any of the mills and if so how far objection was raised. We are not going to give any ruling as to whether the ticket system is advisable for weavers. Four or five witnesses have been called and we want to find out how far the statement that the system has been actually put into practice is correct.

MR. DANGE :—I wanted to know whether we are considering the question raised in Sir Ness Wadia's letter written to the Union and a copy of which was also forwarded to you.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We cannot go further into that. We could say that if the system was in force in March or April of 1927 then it comes under the agreement. If that system is not kept up then it would be a breach of agreement pending our report. As regards the question how far this system should extend to the weavers, we cannot give now a ruling, as it is a question to be dealt with in our report.

MR. DANGE :—What have you got to say as regards men having stopped dropping tickets in March 1927?—I can produce the book for 1927, I have not brought it because I could not get it this morning.

MR. DANGE :—In that case we will have to bring some workers to enquire whether they were dropping tickets or not.

THE CHAIRMAN :—They have brought in some other men.

MR. HINCHCLIFF :—The head timekeeper and two ticket boys are here.

#### ORAL EVIDENCE OF MR. D. COWASJI,

*Head Timekeeper of Spring Mill.*

THE CHAIRMAN :—How long have you been timekeeper?—For the past 21 years.

Will you tell us what the practice has been with regard to weavers' tickets?—After the night shift was stopped we introduced the ticket system for weavers in 1923.

How do you personally know about it. You see the tickets dropped by them?—Yes; in the morning, I go to the gate with the ticket boys. Every man drops the ticket in the box. After that, my ticket boys sort them out. At 8 o'clock I send a report of those who are absent to the weaving master every day.

How long has that practice continued?—Sometimes when they go on strike they do not drop tickets for 8 or 10 days. When all the hands come in we again start giving tickets.

Then they drop them as before?—Yes.

MR. DANGE :—Can you tell me how many times weavers have burnt down tickets?—When they go on strike they never drop tickets. Whether they take them away or not I do not know.

When they come back after a strike, why do you allow them not to drop tickets for some days?—Because they were on strike we do not mind for some days until all the hands come back regularly. Then we recommence to give them tickets.

So you mean that the system is suspended every year for some days?—Not for some days. Only when they go on strike. But otherwise they drop the tickets.

Can you tell me whether they dropped the tickets in March 1927?—I cannot remember. I could not find out the book. I am sorry for it.

In January of this year what have you written in your book?—They did not drop the tickets. We sent out ticket boys inside and got the absentees from the jobbers.

Can you show the book for any month in which they have not dropped tickets?

THE CHAIRMAN :—Show some entries from the book. (The witness showed some entries).

Who writes these entries?—My ticket boys.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Whose initials are these?—They are the initials of the weaving master.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Who takes it to the weaving master?—In the morning when they do not drop the tickets my ticket boys put all those numbers and take them to the weaving master.

Do you see it before they take it to the weaving master?—No.

MR. DANGE :—Can you show me the book for October 1926 ?—There are entries from 1st to 15th October and then there is no entry.

Is there any entry for September 1927 ?—I told you that I could not get the book this morning.

MR. HINCHCLIFF :—I will send it down, sir.

MR. DANGE :—Have you got any book for the beginning of 1928 ?

MR. HINCHCLIFF :—After the strike by oversight the timekeeper did not give for printing new tickets. It was stopped in September 1928.

MR. DANGE :—It was begun in 1928 October and it again stopped in January of this year ?—Yes ; this is for the Spring Mill and for the Textile Mill.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Have you got the books for the Textile Mills ?

MR. HINCHCLIFF :—I have not got the books for the Textile Mills here.

MR. DANGE :—So the only question is whether they were being dropped in March 1927.

MR. HINCHCLIFF :—I will send in the books this afternoon as soon as I go back.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You cannot say from memory whether it was done in March 1927 ?—That I cannot.

MR. BAKHALE :—Some of these books belong to the old Weaving Department and some to the new Weaving Department. Why have you two separate books ?

MR. HINCHCLIFF :—The new shed was built in 1920 and the old shed in 1910 ; so we have always kept different books for these two sheds.

The system was common to both the sheds ?

MR. HINCHCLIFF :—Yes.

ORAL EVIDENCE OF (1) MR. FRANCIS GIRGOL DESILVA, (2)  
SITARAM BIKAJI,

*Ticket Boys of the Spring Mills.*

THE CHAIRMAN :—What has been the practice about tickets for weavers ?

MR. DESILVA :—They are to drop the tickets in the morning and they are to be returned in the evening to the weavers.

How long has that been going on ?—Since 1923.

What do you do with the tickets?—When the tickets are received I arrange them and see what numbers are missing and report them to the officer concerned.

Do you write anything in the book about them?—I write the missing numbers in the book.

How long has that been going on?—From the beginning of 1923 till the 15th of September 1927.

Do you (Mr. Bikaji) corroborate him (Mr. DeSilva)?—Whenever a strike occurred, the practice was suspended but resumed after four or five days. This practice continued till the end of December 1928.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What about the gap?—Excluding the strike period.

MR. DANGE :—Did they drop tickets in January 1928?—Yes; they did.

Did they drop them in December 1927?—I cannot remember.

Just before the mill was closed in January 1928 when spinning on two sides was introduced (I am giving this to refresh your memory) were they dropping tickets? Were they dropping tickets till the beginning of the general strike?—Yes.

MR. DANGE :—He does not know anything.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We have got the main facts.

MR. ASVALE :—When the system of dropping tickets in the morning prevailed, when they wanted to go out during the middle of the day were they given tickets?—No; they used to be given back the tickets only at half past four.

MR. HINCHCLIFF :—If a man went out he was marked absent unless he was given a pass by his Master.

MR. DANGE :—Supposing, on one day none of the weavers dropped their tickets, did you go yourself and find out which numbers were present and which not?

MR. DESILVA :—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Even when none of the weavers dropped their tickets?—Yes. I used to go inside and see what numbers were missing.

There is no question of missing tickets when none have dropped tickets?—I go in and see which weavers are absent and report them.

What do you report?—I go inside and see the vacant machines and then check the book.



MR. SAKLATVALA :—That is the case only when some tickets are missing.

MR. DANGE :—That shows the way in which these reports are framed. He has made it quite clear. Even when no tickets are dropped, he goes in and finds out the missing numbers.

MR. HINCHCLIFF :—If you look at the book for October 1926 (15th) you will find that no numbers are mentioned in that book when no tickets were dropped. You have got the evidence before you. If no tickets are dropped, no entries are made in the book.

THE CHAIRMAN (showing a book) :—Is it in the handwriting of one of you ?

MR. BIKAJI :—Yes.

Why did you not put the names of the people who were missing there ?  
—Because the tickets were not dropped in on that day.

Did you write this (showing a book) ?

MR. DESILVA :—Yes. I have marked ' Nil ' in the book because all the tickets were dropped and nobody was absent.

MR. KAMAT :—Did you ever get any instructions from the manager that if all the weavers refused to drop the tickets you were to go into the weaving shed and find out the absentees ?—Yes.

Have you any books here which will show such entries ?—No ; there is another book for that.

THE CHAIRMAN :—If you can please send some books for a period before 1926, please send them.

MR. HINCHCLIFF :—I will go round and get some from the Textile Mills too.

*(The witnesses withdrew.)*

#### THE SEVENTEEN DEMANDS.

MR. BAKHALE :—Demand No. 1 deals merely with the wage cut and to some extent is connected with the Standardisation Scheme. I do not think therefore it is any use my discussing this demand now, as we are going to discuss the Standardisation Scheme a little later. What we say in this is that the 1925 wages should be restored and the present practices resorted to by some millowners which result in the reduction of wages shall be stopped. This is met by the Standardisation Scheme which I think will not allow any individual millowner to reduce wages without consulting the Millowners' Association and the workers' representatives. As regards

ya (1070) 97.281. N28t

F2.4

134421

the 1925 wages, we shall come to it when we discuss the Standardisation Scheme department by department.

Demand No. 2 relates to the working hours of mechanics and of men in some other department, like the Folding Department. Here also I do not think it is necessary for me to consider the wages of carpenters, fitters and others because the wages question does not arise in this demand. We shall deal with it under the Standardisation Scheme for those particular departments. The only question that remains for me to deal with is about the extra hours that these people may be asked to work and the extra wage that we want the millowners to give them. The millowners say that they want to increase the working hours for the sake of discipline. I have dealt with that point in my criticism, which appears on pages 1494-95, and I believe that criticism still holds good. The millowners have based this demand of increased hours for mechanics on the plea of discipline. We had as witness a manager of one of the Bombay mills, Mr. Dongarsingh, who has given another explanation as to the fact that these people are now working less than 10 hours. I read out this demand to him and asked him :—

“ I think this concerns the mechanics and the folding workers in the mills? ”

and the reply is :—

“ Yes. At present 8½ hours a day is for mechanics, folding department men, sizers and also Universal winders. In my opinion, I think there is no reason why all these men should not work for 10 hours. Most of the people in the folding department have to work less hard than the weavers or spinners. The only question is of the mechanics. I do not remember exactly when, but between 1885 and 1895 there was a big strike in Bombay of these workers, and it was then decided that 8 hours a day should be fixed for mechanics. It was due to the fact perhaps that at that time there were many Anglo-Indian fitters and they had to take their breakfast. When they came to the workshop they did not loiter about but did hard work. They have to do not only hard work but intelligent work. Therefore less hours were allowed for them. I think that for mechanics 8½ hours a day will not be unreasonable. But others should be made to work like the rest.”

The next question and the answer were :—

“ The mechanics were given 8½ hours when the hours of work for others were 12?—Yes.”

The next question and the answer were :—

“ When the hours of work for the rest were reduced to 10, then the mechanics' hours were left as they were?—Yes.”

Then, I asked :—

“ By the mechanics working 8½ hours only, did the other departments suffer?”

The answer was :—

“ I do not think so.”

I will quote the next two questions and the answers :—

“ The intelligence and the skill required is just the same now as it was before—say in 1895 ?—Yes.

“ So, you have no objection to keeping these people only for 8½ hours instead of 10 hours. Do you think discipline will suffer in any way ?—I do not think so.”

So the argument employed by Mr. Saklatvala is not approved by Mr. Dongarsingh, who is manager of such a big mill as the Morarji Goculdas Mill.

THE CHAIRMAN :—About the strike mentioned by Mr. Dongarsingh, I tried to find information about it, but I have not been successful.

MR. BAKHALE :—You may be able to get that information from the Labour Office.

MR. MEHRBAN :—I searched for it in the Labour Office, but could get no information.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Perhaps they did not keep the records. Do you know anything about it, Mr. Saklatvala ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—No.

MR. BAKHALE :—If you write to Mr. Dongarsingh, he might be able to give further information about that strike. He has been in the industry for a long time ; although he might not have been in Bombay at that time, yet he must have been in touch with the general conditions in Bombay.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Yes ; he may be able to put us on to a clue.

MR. BAKHALE :—He has given two reasons for having 8 or 8½ hours for the fitters. One is that there was a strike, and by way of agreement they were allowed to work only 8½ hours. And the other reason is that their work is hard and demands intelligence. So, Mr. Dongarsingh agrees with us that the hours for these people should remain as they are. As regards the workers in the folding department and others he says that he sees no reason why they should not work 10 hours. I agree with him so far as his argument regarding the working hours are concerned. But my point is this—and I have referred to it previously—that these people also have been working 8 or 8½ hours for a very long time, and that practice has now become a convention. The question of discipline does not come in here also, because I suppose that the millowners were as keen about discipline then as they are now. But if it is found that on account of these people working 8½ hours or 8 hours, the other departments suffer to a certain extent, the

only alternative I can put forward is that as a long-standing practice is being broken the workers should be compensated for the increased hours they are being asked to work. You were responsible for allowing these people to work 8 or 8½ hours for a number of years, and now you cannot break that practice. If you are going to break that practice you must pay the penalty for having introduced the practice and continued it for such a long time. I therefore urge that in the case of the mechanics there is absolutely no reason why they should be asked to work more than 8 or 8½ hours, and that in the case of the other people, who are now working less than 10 hours, if by their working less than 10 hours other departments and other workers suffer to a certain extent and therefore they should be asked to work 10 hours, they should be compensated for the extra hours they have to put in. The Millowners' reply to this demand is :—

“ There can also be no question of a *pro rata* increase in wages as these operatives are already paid wages not only fully equal to but in some cases even higher than those received by workers on a similar class of work who put in full 10 hours.”

I do not think they have put in any evidence to substantiate this statement, either by witnesses from the mills or from other factories. On the other hand, we have a considerable volume of evidence, from the Municipality and the Railway Workshops, to show that these people do not work more than 48 hours a week. If you are going to consider their wages on a comparative basis, you must also take into account the hours of work they have to put in, and if you find that they are getting the same wages for 8 hours in other factories as they get in the mills for 10 hours, then there is a fair case for increase in wages so far as these people are concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Of course, if you apply that principle very strictly, whenever the master reduces the hours then the workmen ought to compensate the master.

MR. BAKHALE :—In what way ?

MR. KHAREGHAT :—By reduction in wages.

MR. BRADLEY :—It does happen in the case of piece-workers automatically : they get less wages ; there is a *pro rata* cut.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The argument must apply both ways. If they reduce the number of hours they can make a reduction in wages.

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not think that if the hours are reduced, the workmen put in less work. On the contrary, I feel that with the reduction in the number of hours there is keener intensification of work in order to get adequate production.

The third demand is :—

“ That the millowners shall not vary any of the present conditions to the disadvantage of the workers before securing the approval of the workers through their organisations.”

I think we have discussed yesterday fairly fully about the consent of the workers being obtained to anything which may go to alter the conditions of their work in the factories. This demand is more or less similar to that. There is, however, an argument employed by Mr. Saklatvala which deserves some consideration. He said that by means of this demand we want to push them back to the conditions of 1925. This appears on page 1427. We do want to push the millowners back to the conditions of 1925 so far as the wages of the operatives are concerned ; but we do not want to push them back on any other point. Mr. Saklatvala further stated that they were every time hindered in their progress by the unions ; and he also stated that the millowners had consulted the unions whenever a new reform or an alteration was introduced. I think I have dealt with this point previously, and I do not think I have to add anything to it now, except to state that I challenge Mr. Saklatvala's statement. No millowner, so far as I know, has ever consulted either the workers through their own accredited representatives or through their unions—I am not referring to consultation through the jobbers—before it was too late. I emphasize the phrase “ before it was too late.” When there was a strike or a disturbance, and conditions reached the stage of a breakdown, then certainly they did consult some of the representatives of the workers either officially or unofficially ; but that was not done before it was too late. I do not know of any instance in which they took the trouble of taking the workers into their confidence.

Mr. Sasakura has given evidence on this point (pages 1635, 1636 and 1637). He was asked a question on this point, and he replied, “ Yes, I quite agree that consultation with workers on such points is essential. As a matter of fact, no improvement which I made in my mill was given effect to without consulting the workers. But I only object to the form of organisation.” Several questions were put to him about the form of organisation. I asked him “ But do you not think that it is the right of the workers to frame their organisation as they like ? ” He replied “ Yes, they can.” I further asked him “ You are in favour of consulting the workers through their own organisations ? ” He replied “ Yes, but not outsiders.” Then I asked him a further question, viz., “ By way of illustration, suppose there is some organisation of textile workers. Now, there may be some outsiders who may be office-bearers of that organisation. If, however, the rules provide that the work of that organisation shall be conducted by a managing committee and not by the outsiders, and that managing committee consists of a very large majority of textile workers themselves (say there are only six or seven outsiders in a committee consisting of fifty members) do you not think that such a body will be acceptable to you ? ” He replied “ I cannot say unless I know who those outsiders are.” The next question was “ That means you do not object to outsiders as such, but you object only to certain individuals ? ” His reply was “ Yes.” That conclusively proves that he has no objection to outsiders being inside the Union, but he has got objection to certain individuals. Taking his evidence as a whole, I believe he is in favour of consulting the workers and their organisations, and he agrees with us so far as Demand No. 3 is concerned. On page 1773, Mr. Ramsingh Dongarsingh has expressed himself in favour of consultation. I therefore think that we have made a sufficiently strong case to prove that consultation with the workers is an essential condition if there are going to be established

harmonious relations between the workers and the employers, and if the industry is to be run on right lines without any friction off and on. My own feeling is that instead of hindering the progress of the millowners we are actually trying to help them as far as possible. Mr. Saklatvala says that whenever they consult the workers, progress is hindered. My point is that because they do not consult their workers, progress is hindered more. If they begin to consult the workers, their progress will not be hindered to the same extent as it is hindered at the present time.

Demand No. 4 is: "That the Millowners' Association shall not permit its individual members to vary conditions of service to the disadvantage of the workers without the sanction of the Association." In my statement last time I referred to the Articles of Association of the Ahmedabad Millowners, and I requested you to try to secure a copy of the Articles of Association of that body and compare it with the Articles of Association of the Bombay Millowners' Association. Some time ago, I had a talk with a representative of the Ahmedabad Millowners in the Bombay Legislative Council in connection with a strike in Bombay, and I definitely remember that he told me that, according to the Articles of Association of the Ahmedabad Millowners' Association, no individual mill is allowed to alter the conditions obtaining in that particular mill without the sanction of the Association as a whole. I do not want to deal with this point any more without seeing the Articles of Association.

Coming to Demand No. 5, which is that "the rates of new varieties shall be fixed by the Millowners' Association in consultation with the representatives of the workers' organisations," the Millowners say: "The rates of wages will be fixed under the new standardisation scheme, and, as the Committee maintain that this is a reform which must be carried out as soon as possible, and also for reasons mentioned in reply to Demand 3, the answer to this must be in the negative." I cannot reconcile myself to this statement.

THE CHAIRMAN :—They have modified that since.

MR. BAKHALE :—I think they have modified it.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The report of the Standardisation Sub-Committee has modified that, and now they agree that there is no objection to rates for new varieties not covered by the Standardisation Scheme being fixed after consultation with the workers.

MR. BAKHALE :—Then our Demand No. 6 has also been conceded.

Demand No. 7 deals generally with the rational scheme, and we had better postpone its consideration and take it up when we discuss the rationalisation scheme along with the standardisation scheme.

The next demand, No. 8, is about the minimum wage, and it is really the most vital demand that the Joint Strike Committee has put forth for the consideration of the Millowners. We have got sufficient evidence on this demand, and I think nobody has objected to the principle of the minimum wage.

as such. Mr. Sasakura, in his written statement, has agreed that there should be a minimum wage for the textile operatives in Bombay. That appears on page 3 of his written statement. On page 1639, I asked him "As regards demand No. 8, you agree with it. This is really a demand for minimum wage." He replied "I agree, because I am in favour of raising the standard of living." He was next asked "Do you think that there should be some provision for a minimum wage?" He replied "Yes." On page 1644, Mr. Asavale asked him "Do you not think that the average monthly wage of workers should be at least Rs. 30, if it be less than that?" The reply was "I think Rs. 30 should be the minimum. But in our mill we are paying less than that, according to the Bombay rate." The next question was "What is your opinion? Should it be at least Rs. 30?" The reply was "Yes." So, Mr. Sasakura not only agrees with our view that there should be a minimum wage, but he also agrees with us that the minimum wage should not be less than Rs. 30 a month. Mr. Stones, on page 1505, says "we refuse to accept this figure of Rs. 30. You will notice that the minimum wage given in our list is Rs. 13-8-0 plus 70 per cent. for the male sweeper and Rs. 10-8-0 plus 70 per cent. for the female sweeper. That means the minimum wage comes to Rs. 22.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**It comes to Rs. 22-15-6 for the male sweeper and nearly Rs. 18 for the female sweeper.

**MR. BAKHALE :—**Mr. Stones further said on page 1506 : "We do not claim it is a minimum wage. We did not consider the question of minimum wage, and do not propose to consider it until Government have considered the question." Again he says on page 1508, "when it comes before Government we will have something to say about it." It is rather difficult to reconcile these different statements of Mr. Stones, because, firstly, he says that he refuses to accept Rs. 30 as a minimum wage. It implies, I believe, that he agrees with the principle of a minimum wage; and later on he says that he is not willing to consider the question of minimum wage until Government considers it. I pointed out to you in my previous statement that this question of minimum wage had come before the International Labour Conference last year, and they had passed a certain Convention on the minimum wage and a few recommendations also, to be submitted to the national Governments.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**I have got a copy of those.

**MR. BAKHALE :—**At that Conference, the Millowners' representative was present with his advisers, and if their conduct there can be taken as an index of the attitude of the Millowners here, I am afraid that, whatever they may say to-day, they are not going to accept the principle of the minimum wage, because Mr. Narotam Morarji voted against the Convention when it was first put to the vote, and afterwards remained neutral when the final vote on that Convention was taken, and Mr. Narotam represents the Indian employers as much as he represents the Bombay textile employers also.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**The recommendation is that it should be fixed mainly with reference to trades where wages have not been fixed by collective agreement.

MR. BAKHALE :—In that Convention, they simply lay down a principle that for some of the trades, where the wages are too low and where the workers' organisation is poor, there should be a minimum wage. What that minimum wage should be has been left over to the Governments concerned, in consultation with the employers' and the workers' organisations. That is really the point in that Convention.

MR. KAMAT :—In the case of the textile industry in Bombay now, could you say that you are organised enough for collective bargaining?

MR. BAKHALE :—That makes my point stronger.

MR. KAMAT :—I am only asking you whether you are in a position to say that you are now so organised that you can make collective bargaining.

MR. BAKHALE :—If you think we are strong, we may claim as a strong party that there shall be a minimum wage. If we are weak, then we take advantage of the Convention and say "We are weak, and therefore we must have a minimum wage."

THE CHAIRMAN :—There is a good deal of difference between the two. If it is considered that the workers in the textile industry, at any rate in the past year, were sufficiently organised to get proper wages, then there would be more ground for saying that the present wages give a sufficiently minimum wage. If, on the other hand, they were not sufficiently organised, or weak, as you put it, and it is shown that their general level is below that in other industries which are effectively organised and are able to get better agreements, there would be a case to say that your lowest rates are below what they are in other industries.

MR. KAMAT :—Even according to the Convention, a good deal hinges upon whether you are organised or not. That is why I ask you whether you consider yourself sufficiently organised to be in a position to do collective bargaining.

MR. BAKHALE :—It is rather difficult for me to give an answer off-hand.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Which would you consider are the best organised trades or industries for collective bargaining? Are the railway people better off than yourselves?

MR. BAKHALE :—The total organisation for all the industries in India is not more than 10 per cent. I think the railway people are a little more organised than the textiles.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The people in the Postal and Telegraph Departments are well organised?

MR. BAKHALE :—The postal people are fairly well organised, the clerks and other people, not the postmen.



On page 1809, I asked Mr. Cameron "Are you in favour of a minimum wage?" His reply was "I am in favour of it. But I know that where it has been introduced the employers have been very strict in engaging the men; they see that they give a fair return on that minimum wage, and as a result a very considerable number of men who were not qualified to obtain that minimum have been discarded and have had to look for other avenues of employment." What he really means is that, if a minimum wage is given, the employers exact sufficient work from the employees. Nobody objects to that, if the employer does it; but in the main he agrees with the principle that there should be a minimum wage. On page 1901, Mr. Saklatvala asked Mr. Bradley "As regards minimum wage, I do not want to dispute the point; I want to know how it is arrived at in England. It might help us to arrive at some decision ourselves. How do you arrive at this minimum wage?" Mr. Bradley's reply was "It is based on the cost of living figures of the Board of Trade, etc., the same as in Bombay. I believe in one of the issues of the *Labour Gazette* it was put down as Rs. 43-8-0." Mr. Saklatvala then asked "For a family of 4?" The reply was "Yes." He was then asked "Therefore, would you contend that every family of four should have at least a little more than Rs. 43?" The reply was "It might be based on that. That is the cost of living; it leaves nothing for fun or enjoyment." Mr. Bradley was then asked "Do you think that they ought to receive Rs. 50?" The reply was "Yes." Mr. Kulkarni also expressed himself in favour of a minimum wage (pages 1920 and 1921), and he pointed out that in the railways the minimum wage is Rs. 29 for an unskilled worker plus some facilities such as free railway passes, leave with pay, and so on. Miss Wingate, in her evidence, also pleaded for equal pay for equal work, irrespective of the sex, and she further said, on page 2131 "My point was that in applying the standard rate, some provision must be made whereby a worker would not get below a certain amount." That shows that she is also in favour of a minimum wage. Then Mr. Moberly, in his written statement, has given us the minimum wages obtaining in the Traffic Department, in Schedule A. I find from page 5 of his written statement that, for the first year, conductors get Rs. 27 and drivers Rs. 26, and then the pay goes on increasing. He also points out that these workers get additional benefits over and above these salaries; 25 per cent. is added to the wages earned as allowance in respect of the increased cost of grain, and an additional allowance of Rs. 5 (plus 25 per cent.) is granted monthly to those men who have not been absent without leave and to those who have been absent with leave or on medical certificate for a total period not exceeding 7 days. These 7 days to include the leave mentioned in paragraph 5. Long service stripes are granted, and each carries an allowance of Re. 1 per month. In addition, pay for 15 days is also granted at the end of each year in respect of other casual leave taken during the year without pay; thus making a total of 22 days during the year on pay. That shows that even an unskilled worker in the Tramway Company gets much more than Rs. 30. So far as the evidence before us is concerned, I think a case has been made out for accepting the principle of minimum wage, and also for fixing the figure somewhere about Rs. 30. There may be some difference of opinion as regards the figure of Rs. 30 being the minimum wage, and I am quite prepared, so far as that figure is concerned, to get the matter fully investi-

gated by experts and fix the rate. I am more keen upon the principle of a minimum wage being accepted, and from whatever we know of the workers' conditions in Bombay as well as the cost of living obtaining here, we feel that Rs. 30 is really the minimum wage that a worker in Bombay should get.

THE CHAIRMAN :— You mean to include in that women workers as well as men ?

MR. BAKHALE :— Yes. The Geneva Convention last year, on minimum wage, laid down the principle in one of its recommendations that the national Governments should recognise the principle of equal pay for equal work, irrespective of the sex.

THE CHAIRMAN :— That is in the Peace Treaty ?

MR. BAKHALE :— Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN :— It has not been given effect to, as far as I can see, in any country in the world. The wages of women are generally 50 to 60 per cent. of those of the men, according to certain tables I have seen.

MR. BAKHALE :— I cannot tell you about that off-hand.

THE CHAIRMAN :— I should rather like to have some definite information if you could find any precedent, because I have investigated the matter, and I do not find any. Richardson's book " The Minimum Wage " gives a table of the average rates, and there it works out that a woman gets 50 to 60 per cent. of a man's wages.

MR. BAKHALE :— In that connection, Miss Wingate has made a pertinent remark in the course of her evidence.. She stated that the condition of Indian women workers is somewhat different from the condition of European women workers. For example, in Europe generally, except in Russia, the girls working in factories are unmarried ; while here most of the women are married and have got a few dependants. Therefore, she says that there is a stronger case, so far as India is concerned, for introducing the principle of equal pay for equal work, irrespective of sex.

MR. KAMAT :— Apart from the general principle, could you clear up the point whether this Rs. 23 roughly, which the Millowners propose as the lowest wage, is an adequate wage considering the cost of living in Bombay ? It works out to something like Re. 0-12-6, or a little less than that, on the basis of a 30-day month, not on the basis of 26 days ; and whether Re. 0-12-6 is an adequate wage for an adult male is the point which you have to clear up.

MR. BAKHALE :— Yes ; in that connection I should like to refer to the Working Class Family Budgets prepared by the Labour Office in the year 1923. They have taken a fairly large number of working class family budgets and have pointed out in the report that 49.5 per cent. of the budgets belong to the mill workers. Whatever our differences may be with regard to the way in

which the enquiry was conducted, we can use it to judge the conditions in Bombay so far as workers' expenditure is concerned. They have pointed out on page 11 of that report :—

“ The following table shows that one wage-earner in the family is the most usual although families with two wage-earners in three income groups are not uncommon.”

They further give an explanation as regards two wage-earners on page 12 at the top :—

“ In the class Rs. 40 and below Rs. 50 it will be seen that two wage-earners predominate. This is on account of the inclusion of scavengers' budgets where in 96 per cent. of the scavengers' budgets collected in this income class both husband and wife work.”

So, we may leave aside the higher figure of scavengers' budgets and confine ourselves to one wage-earner and the mill industry. After clearing this point that 49.5 per cent. belong to the textile industry and the remark in the report itself that one wage-earner is usual in that industry we can refer to Tables 1 and 2 produced in this report. On page 48 and 49 and 50 and 51 we have got the average income and group expenditure of families. On pages 52 and 53 we have the average income and group expenditure in families of a husband and wife and two children. We shall see therefrom taking the first table in Column 1 they give the expenditure of people earning below Rs. 30 ; in the second column they give the expenditure of people earning Rs. 30 and below Rs. 40 ; and in the third column they give the expenditure of people earning Rs. 40 and below Rs. 50. You will see therefrom that a family, getting less than Rs. 30 a month, has a balance of income over expenditure of *minus* Rs. 2-12-3. Over and above this, you will find another statement a few lines below 'Average monthly remittance to dependents.' In the case of people earning below Rs. 30 the remittance is Re. 0-1-4. So, the man earning below Rs. 30 runs into a monthly debt of Rs. 2-13-7. In a family having an income of Rs. 30 and below Rs. 40 the balance of income over expenditure is Re. 0-9-4. He remits to his dependents Re. 0-5-2. In the case of families having an income of Rs. 40 but below Rs. 50 the balance of income over expenditure is Rs. 3-4-11, out of which he remits Rs. 1-1-3 to the dependents outside Bombay. You will see therefrom that even Rs. 30 is not really an adequate wage.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What were the prices when these were compiled ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I should like the Labour Office to conduct another enquiry.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—They have got the cost of living index number which we have shown here.

MR. BAKHALE :—In this item of expenditure nothing else is added except food, clothing and miscellaneous expenditure. I therefore submit

that Rs. 30 is not enough for a Bombay worker to live in a city like Bombay. It should be much more. I think that our demand for Rs. 30 is really very very moderate.

MR. KAMAT :—Can you throw some light on the question of the wage for an unskilled worker in moffussil towns ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not believe in the process of levelling down. I believe in the process of levelling up. If you go to a small village perhaps the wages will be much too low.

MR. KAMAT :—I do not ask you about the levelling down or levelling up. I want to know from you whether the wages in the moffussil towns will be 12 annas to 13 annas per day.

MR. BAKHALE :—I have not got that information. I am speaking of Bombay and the cost of living obtaining here. I feel looking to the cost of living here that a majority of the operatives are getting too inadequate a wage to meet the ordinary necessities of life.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Except rent the cost of food will be the same practically in Bombay as well as outside. I do not know that exactly but I believe so. Clothing is practically the same.

MR. BAKHALE :—As regards food I think Bombay is a little more costly. That is my personal experience. Take, for example, vegetables. This is costlier than in Poona. Take again an article like ghee.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Those people do not use ghee in large quantities.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—They can use cocogem.

MR. BAKHALE :—Their requirements are very few. The kind of food they take is pointed out in this report on page 21 :—

“ The general conclusion is that industrial workers consume the maximum of cereals allowed by the Famine Code but less than the diet prescribed in the Bombay Jail Manual.”

I should like you to consider seriously how people taking this kind of food are expected to show greater efficiency, at least as much efficiency as the one that obtains in Japan or any other country. It is very difficult. They are taking less than ordinary food. I do not think that that food gives them sufficient nourishment. Even with that they are living practically in indebtedness. On page 44 of the same report they say :—

“ Approximately 47 per cent. of the families are shown to be in debt to money-lenders. The average indebtedness extends to an equivalent of two and a half months' earnings, and the usual charge is one anna in the rupee per month or 75 per cent. per annum, a rate which is not infrequently exceeded.”

On page 43 in Statement No. XXX, they say :—

“ About 97 per cent. of the working class families live in single rooms. Seventy per cent. of the total tenements in Bombay consist of one room only and 14 per cent. of two rooms ; 66 per cent. of the population live in one room ; and 14 per cent. in two-roomed tenements. The average number of persons per one-roomed tenement is 4.03 and in two-roomed tenements 2.11.”

The last item on that page is that the expenditure on education is only Re. 0-2-11 per mensem. Take any point you like. You will find that the conditions are miserable and pitiable. Unless you change these conditions it is impossible, whatever other remedies or methods you may adopt, to increase the efficiency of the operatives and to put the industry on a prosperous basis. My contention therefore is that in order that these people may improve their standard of life it is necessary that their wages should be proportionately increased and that there should be a minimum wage established in the textile industry in Bombay.

Another point raised in this connection which is always repeated on the other side is that labour has got about 90 per cent. increase in wages since 1914 ; which is not the case in any other industry and that therefore there is no necessity for any further increase at all. They take 1914 as the basis for this argument. The Labour Office conducted their first inquiry on the wage census in 1921. The second was in 1923 and the third was in 1926. In the first as well as in the second reports they have compared the wages then obtaining with the wages obtaining in 1914. The second report of the Labour Office challenges the figures of the 1921 report published by the same office. I will read to you a few relevant passages. On page 9 of the second report they say :—

“ The methods used on this occasion and in 1921 for arriving at average monthly earnings have been described in paragraph 13 above. The average monthly earnings for May 1914 are those obtained in 1921 Enquiry, when Part I of the Report contained dual sets of columns for 1914 and 1921. Consequently the 1914 averages should, theoretically, have been obtained on the same basis as those of 1921. But it is probable that the figures filled in in the columns for 1914 in the 1921 Enquiry Form were often obtained from the cash books of the mills, which would not necessarily give the same results as the muster-rolls, from which the 1921 figures in the corresponding columns were ordinarily obtained.”

It means it was not a fair comparison. On page 10, paragraph 27, they say :—

“ The 1914 figures must therefore be accepted with considerable caution, and treated as only approximations.”

On page 25, they say :—

“ But, with the data before us, it will never be possible to use either 1914 or 1921 as a base for real wage index numbers, although this does not imply that for other purposes the 1921 enquiry was not of value.”

The Director says on page 25 :—

“ I am not wholly satisfied that the Bombay Cost of Living Index Number is in itself satisfactory, and the Labour Office is now engaged in a task which has been under contemplation for some time, namely, the entire reconstruction of the Index Number on a wider and more locally applicable basis.”

This clearly shows that it is absolutely unfair to take the 1914 basis and then to tell us that 90 per cent. increase has been made. You cannot take that basis because you have not got the correct figures for 1914. Even in England they find some difficulty in securing the pre-war wages. I have got a copy of Survey of Textile Industries. There they have given a note :—

“ The comparisons of post-war with pre-war conditions which appear so frequently throughout the volumes are not to be taken as necessarily implying that pre-war conditions are regarded as a standard to which it is probable or desirable that post-war conditions should approximate. Pre-war conditions are, however, generally recognised as a convenient datum line for comparisons, and it is from this point of view that they have been used in these volumes.”

When it is difficult even in England to find out the pre-war figures we can easily realise how difficult it is to get exactly 1914 figures and then compare them with the present conditions and say we have given so much increase. The position is untenable. I therefore submit that it is wrong to consider the pre-war conditions with the present conditions and then say that workers are more prosperous. I must say that the present conditions are terrible and pitiable. They must be improved if the industry is to be improved at all.

Another point in this connection has been raised by the other side. That is the question of absenteeism. It is relevant to this question of minimum wage only from this point of view. They say whenever wages are increased there is a tendency on the part of the operatives to remain absent and indulge in the luxury of drinkng. During the course of the Millowners' oral evidence it was pointed out that the Labour Office statistics published in 1926 on absenteeism are not correct in the case of those people who are getting higher wages. Next to the sizers it is the weavers that get higher wages. In the case of these very people absenteeism is less. I challenged the other side when they said that the mills had not kept a record of the absenteeism of the weavers and therefore the figures were not accurate. I stated my point and requested you to ask information from the Labour Office. I suppose you have got the information, as I have got the copy of that letter. Mr. Gennings has stated that when the census was taken the mills were definitely instructed to keep a separate record of absenteeism in the weaving department. Therefore the percentage figure arrived at and printed in this volume is absolutely accurate so far as the weaving section is concerned. So, it does not support the proposition that people spend more money when they get an increase in wages and remain absent. This argument has been brought forward by the Millowners simply to obscure the issue. I therefore make it as clear as

possible that considering the question from any point of view it will convince you that there is a dire necessity for the establishment of the principle of minimum wage and that minimum wage being fixed at least at Rs. 30 a month. If as a result of this enquiry and as a result of the last strike the workers succeed in getting this principle accepted, I think the workers have achieved something of which they can be proud. Otherwise the present discontent and unrest prevailing in the mill area will never stop. It is bound to go on till their conditions are appreciably improved.

Demand No. 9 relates to forfeiture of wages that remain unclaimed for certain period in the mills. Mr. Dongarsingh stated that he never forfeited wages. Mr. Cameron said that he had not known of a case of forfeiting wages. This statement appears on page 1795. Mr. Moberly says :—

“ So far as the workshop department is concerned there is no case on record. So far as the traffic department is concerned it is only for dishonesty and leaving service without notice.”

On page 1971, Mr. Asavale put him a question :—

“ Do you forfeit the wages of a worker, if he is absent on the pay day, or if he does not turn up on pay day to receive his pay ?—Wages are not forfeited ; they are paid later in the month.”

Yesterday also I pointed out that it is not fair to forfeit wages earned by the operatives.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That question has been settled.

MR. BAKHALE :—So much the better.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It has been settled that on sufficient identification the wages should be paid.

MR. BAKHALE :—I have no objection to identification but I do not want that wages should be forfeited.

Demand No. 10 has been agreed to.

Demand No. 11—the ticket system—has been sufficiently argued yesterday and to some extent even to-day. I do not think it necessary to go into that question again.

THE CHAIRMAN :—About cleaning machinery I gather that it obtains only in one mill.

MR. BAKHALE :—For cleaning machinery I think there should be some common rule for all the mills.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We are considering a scheme as regards cleaning of the machinery and hope to standardise the practice there also.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Will you be able to submit the scheme soon ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We do not think it would be possible when we are considering the more important scheme of standardisation.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It is a minor matter.

MR. BAKHALE :—I will not call it a minor matter.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I mean that at present there is a complaint about this in only one mill. I do not know whether it is still going on there.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It is not general cleaning that is done by weavers in all the mills. As soon as they come to the mill they take away the fluff from the machine before they start work. Because Sir Ness Wadia put that up in the rule there is trouble. This is generally done in all the mills. It will not take more than 3 or 4 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN :—One weaver said that it takes half an hour.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That is the ordinary cleaning which is done weekly in some mills and fortnightly in some other mills. Anyway when we standardise the practice we will make it plain.

MR. BAKHALE :—With regard to No. 12—consolidation of high price allowance with the basic wage—Mr. Dange dealt with it on the last occasion and it is found on pages 1519-20. I think his statement is clear on this point. Mr. Cameron said that so far as his workshop is concerned it has been consolidated. It is to be found on page 1804. Mr. Moberly stated that it has been consolidated with regard to new employees. This shows that there is a tendency in Bombay to consolidate the high price allowance. We insist upon this consolidation from another point of view. This high price allowance was given to the operatives during the war period. It has always been pointed out as a kind of threat that the cost of living has gone down and the high price allowance may also be reduced. As a matter of fact in 1925 the millowners had decided to cut down the high price allowance by 20 per cent.

When you keep the high price allowances separate there is a tendency on the part of the employers to attack that allowance. Possibly on account of the removal of the excise duty, that cut was restored. But there may be occasions even in the future to attack the high price allowances. As I pointed out, this high price allowance is really no index of the existing cost of living. It was given on the wages as they existed in the year 1914, and 1914 wages cannot be taken as a basis. It is no use keeping this allowance separate, and then pointing out that as this allowance is given for higher cost of living, as the cost of living has gone down there is sufficient justification for a cut in that allowance. Our point is that the 1914 wages were too inadequate considering the cost of living as it existed at that time, and therefore those wages cannot be taken as a standard. It is difficult even to-day, in the absence of statistics, to prove that the wage, including the allowance, is enough



for the workers. I therefore say that you should consolidate the wages and the allowances, and make it the basic wage, and if, after a time, you find that the cost of living has gone down you can certainly make a reduction, or if you find that the cost of living has gone up you can give an increase, as is done in Lancashire. Anyway, so long as this high price allowance is kept separate, we fear that the employers will have a tendency to attack it and to cut it down. We do not want the present state of things to continue any longer, and we want to get the allowances consolidated with the wage and treat the consolidated amount as the basic wage hereafter. That is really the point we have in view.

MR. KAMAT :—In 1925 the millowners proposed a cut of 20 per cent. in the allowances and after the resistance on the part of the workers, they gave up that proposal entirely ; is that the fact ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I will put it this way. They proposed a cut of 20 per cent. on the high price allowance—the result of which was a cut of 11½ per cent. on the whole wages—and the workers struck work. Then there was an agitation on the part of the millowners to get the excise duty abolished, and I think they gave an undertaking to His Excellency the Governor that if the excise duty was abolished they would restore the cut. After some time—I think at the end of November—the excise duty was abolished by the Government of India and immediately the cut was restored.

MR. KAMAT :—So virtually it comes to this, that there was an undertaking given at that time not to effect a cut on this 70 per cent. if the excise duty was abolished ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That was not the undertaking. The undertaking was that the cut would be restored at that time if the excise duty was abolished ; there was no general undertaking that we would never make a cut in the future.

MR. BAKHALE :—You pointed out, sir, that in England one big union of the workers was not in favour of consolidation. I do not know exactly what the exact conditions obtaining in their case was. It may be that the cost of living at that time was going up and therefore they wanted to keep the allowance separate. If that were so, the case is quite the opposite here. So, I do not think we can copy the example of that union and withdraw our demand for consolidation.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Well ; that will be a one-sided demand. You say : “ If it is in favour of the workers, consolidate ; if it is in favour of the employers, do not consolidate.” In the book I referred to, the Trade Union Congress expressed the opinion that on the whole it was better to keep the cost of living allowance separate. They did so because they said that both the workers and the employers could realise that one part of the wages was for meeting the high cost of living and the other part was a sort of general standard wage, so that when the prices rose or fell they could concentrate on increasing or reducing that particular allowance. It does not get mixed up with the basic wage. If they are mixed up, both sides are apt to confuse the issues. That is the general line on which they argued.

MR. BRADLEY :—Was not that on the basis of a sliding scale ?

THE CHAIRMAN :—Yes.

MR. BRADLEY :—There need not necessarily be two separate portions of wages, but there may be one wage based on a sliding scale.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The allowance was based on a sliding scale ; it varied according to the index number of the cost of living.

MR. BRADLEY :—Speaking for the Engineering industry, a big industry in Great Britain, they have been fighting for consolidation.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I know that some of the trade unions are for consolidation.

MR. BRADLEY :—In many of the industries, the wage is on a sliding scale as a whole ; the wages stand as a whole and there is percentage increase if the cost of living increases and a percentage decrease if the cost of living goes down.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I am speaking of the textile industry in Lancashire. The general opinion in that industry seemed to be against consolidation.

MR. BAKHALE :—Mr. Cameron's evidence on this point is of some importance. It appears on page 1804 :—

“ Why did you consolidate the high prices allowance during the course of the last 12 months ?—One thing was that the question of book-keeping was very very complicated, and it simplified matters very considerably. Also, I think the Commissioner was of the opinion that it would be very difficult to reduce this allowance once it was granted ; and the best way to let those who were already in employment have the benefit of that was to have it consolidated with the pay, and the new-comers would take up service knowing well the new conditions.

“ THE CHAIRMAN :—You have had no trouble on account of that ?—Not the least.”

So, we stand by this demand and we insist that it should be conceded.

Then, I come to demand No. 13. This demand has already been argued about, and I do not think I need add anything more.

No. 14 regarding standard rules for the guidance of the members of the Millowners' Association regarding the grant of leave to their employees, is being considered by the Millowners' Association, and they have agreed to have standard rules.

No. 15. “ All the rules that are usually posted in the mills or departments should be standardised. . . .” has also been accepted by the Millowners.

No. 16. "Employment in the weaving department of the mills should be opened to members of the depressed classes."—To this also they have no objection.

No. 17. "That there shall be no victimization of men who have taken part in the present dispute, or in their union activities." This does not arise because they have stated: "The Committee do not know the reasons for anticipating any victimization either at present or in the future. There was no such victimization in the past."

MR. BRADLEY :—One other point which has reference to the question of reduction of wages. We find that the Millowners are attacking the basic wage and not the cost of living allowance whenever possible, to convey an impression to the public that the cut is only 5 per cent. or 6 per cent. on the basic scale. But a cut in the basic wage will affect the allowance for cost of living, so that there will be a double cut on the wages of the workers.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Was the cut in 1925 a cut on the basic wage or on the allowance ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—A cut of 20 per cent. on the allowances.

MR. MAHOMED UMAR RAJAB :—They said that there was only a cut of 11½ per cent. on the whole, although the cut on the allowance was 20 per cent.

MR. BAKHALE :—I have not to add anything more.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As regards the first demand, I think we have made it quite clear that there was no general wage cut, because we have pointed out that although the cloth production for the years 1925, 1926 and 1927 was the same the total wage bill was also the same, so that there could not have been a general wage cut. No doubt, some cuts have been pointed out by the other side ; they state they have been admitted by two or three mills. That is quite right, but, as we have said, those were only adjustments. For instance, the manager of the Simplex Mills stated (page 1861) that it was to equalise the wages of jobbers. It was their aim to equalise the wages of jobbers as far as possible. Formerly the jobbers used to be paid wages according to the amount of production. In one section there was too much of coarse cloth and in the other too much of fine cloth. The jobber who was working in the section which produced too much of coarse cloth got more than the jobber who worked in the section which produced fine cloth, although he did not do even as much work. Now, the jobber who got more would not make a complaint to the union, so that they could not know exactly what was the condition in the past. In our own mills, the Tata Mills (reference page 44 of the printed volume of evidence) in supplying details to the Millowners' Association we pointed out that we had made a cut in one sort, but at the same time we had made increases in seven or eight other sorts. Now, these increases would never be

brought to the notice of the labour leaders. A weaver who got an increase would not go and make a complaint. So, I do not blame the other side for putting it as they did. But our contention has been that these were ordinary adjustments. Such adjustments have always occurred. We have proved—and I think Mr. Addyman has also stated in his evidence—that the weavers never give full work in case of a new sort. Whenever a new sort is put up we have to make adjustments.

MR. ASVALE :—Workers receive less pay.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—A particular worker may have received less pay, and a complaint may have been made by him, and therefore you were perhaps justified in making this complaint. It may have looked a genuine grievance to you. But what I do say is this, that had there not been so much mistrust on the part of the labour leaders of whatever explanation we gave them, they would have found out what the true state of affairs was.

Mr. Bakhale now says that all that is meant by the demand that conditions shall not be altered is that we should be pushed back to 1925 only as regards wages. It was not quite clear, and we took it that they wanted us to go back to 1925 even as regards other conditions, because they strenuously opposed the three-loom and two-side systems which were introduced after 1925. If they say now that it is not their intention, then we have nothing further to say.

Then, as regards this ten hours daily work, I do not think Mr. Ramsingh is correct in the reasons that he has given, but apart from the reasons the question is whether that practice should be altered or not. There may be a custom, there may be a practice, but if that custom or practice was unfair to one side or the other, surely a change might be effected. Mr. Addyman—to whose evidence Mr. Bakhale has attached considerable importance....

MR. BAKHALE :—Not much.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Some importance at any rate—gives this evidence at page 1714 : He was asked :—

“ On page 2 of your note, you mention that years ago you established the system of making mechanics, fitters and carpenters to be on duty during the hours machinery is running. You say : ‘ All male operatives were brought into line without giving any *pro rata* increases to those whose hours had previously been less.’ Did you have any trouble when this was brought about ? ”

He replied :—

“ None whatsoever. They simply carried out the orders conveyed to them.”

Therefore, even as regards this convention, it was broken at least by somebody at some time. Mr. Addyman introduced the increased working hours years ago in his mill.

MR. KAMAT :—Is there any practice either in the railways or in the tramways or other factories where mechanics work ten hours a day ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—No, because in their case no other operative works for ten hours a day ; they have got 8 or 8½ hours for all operatives.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Had we any evidence from mechanics or fitters ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—What evidence ?

THE CHAIRMAN :—As regards their objection to any increase in their working hours.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—There has been no evidence.

MR. ASAVALE :—We had evidence from one fitter.

MR. BAKHALE :—That is, I think, from the Kohinoor Mills.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It is admitted that the fitters were allowed to work for 8 or 8½ hours.

MR. ASAVALE :—In some mills extra allowance is given for working extra hours.

MR. BAKHALE :—I cannot give the names of the mills exactly, but when in one or two mills in Bombay they introduced the 10-hour system, the workers resisted in the beginning but ultimately agreed to work ten hours provided they were given some increase and that increase was given. I think if you ask the authorities of the Finlay Mills they will be able to give some information, because the Kohinoor Mills followed them and the Kohinoor people told me that the Finlay Mills had given an increase. Mr. Stones will be able to give some information on that point.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Do you think that in the Finlay Mills they raised the number of hours for mechanics and gave them extra pay ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Do you know when ?

MR. BAKHALE :—It was in the beginning of last year or towards the end of 1927.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Then, our next contention is that although in the tramways, railways, or municipality they work less number of hours, we are already paying them more than they are paying, and that is the reason why we maintain that there is no justification for any increase in pay.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What are the rates ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Mr. Cameron's evidence, page 1795, which concerns the Municipality. He says the average wage of a fitter is Rs. 2 to Rs. 2-4-0. That means for 26 days they will get Rs. 52 to Rs. 56. The rate provided in our Standardisation Scheme is Rs. 50 plus 70 per cent. or Rs. 85. These people were allowed to work less for a certain number of years, and when in 1920 there was a reduction in the working hours for other people, at that time we did not think it necessary to ask the fitters to do more work, because that year was a boom year.

Then, as regards Demand No. 3, my difficulty is that I am still unable to understand what it really is. They seem to have shifted their ground. Is it consultation they want or approval and free consent. If it is mere consultation, I think we have made it abundantly clear that we have always been willing and are willing to consult them on all occasions. If you refer to page 1499, Mr. Bakhale himself says :

“ We have never asked for getting to ourselves the authority to direct the policy of the industry. What we want is that if you want to make any changes or any alterations in the workers' conditions, the workers have a right to be consulted. That is the only point I am emphasizing.”

Mr. Dange has also expressed himself similarly. Mr. Kamat says at page 1773 :—

“ I think Mr. Dange on behalf of the Strike Committee has admitted that the word 'approval' should be 'consultation'; and as far as consultation goes, the other side (millowners) have accepted it.”

Then, Mr. Bakhale made a point that we had not consulted them in the past. I think Mr. Stones has already given a reply. At page 1498, Mr. Stones says :—

“ I would like to state the condition in our own mills. So far as our own group is concerned, we have never, at any period, refused to deal with trade unions. I think we have dealt with even the discredited union of Mr. Mayakar. Similarly, we have dealt with Mr. Bakhale's union and Mr. Dange's union also, and we have done that every time we have had a complaint made by these people.”

MR. BAKHALE :—It is the last point that I want to emphasize ; we first make a complaint and then they send for us. That is exactly the point.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As regards consultation the other side has a definite assurance from us that there will be a Joint Committee set up, and if that Joint Committee is set up, I think this point will be met, because the Joint Committee is intended to go into all questions. I think Mr. Addyman has got something to say on this also (page 1733).

“ Do you think under the existing conditions, it is possible to secure labour representatives from the ranks of the workers?—At present perhaps it is difficult, but the time is not far distant when it will be possible.

“ What do you mean by that?—You find now in most mills workers who have received a certain amount of education. In my own mill, for instance, there are workers' sons who have been to school and received education up to the 4th or 5th standard, and in a few years' time that type of man will be the man to come out as a labour leader.

“ Till then, do you think that there should be no attempt made for organising these workers?—I think it is better for the industry as a whole if workers are organised, but when they are organised, it is most essential that they should be properly led.”

Mr. Bakhale himself has referred to this paragraph. So as regards this demand, if it is only consultation we are quite prepared to meet them, and, as I have said, we have never objected to dealing with trade unions if they are properly organised.

MR. BAKHALE :—What do you mean by “ properly organised ” ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We cannot recognise a trade union simply because it calls itself a trade union.

MR. ASAVALE :—There is registration now.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Now that registration has come, we are prepared to recognise every registered trade union. We have made that point clear and we have recognised them as a matter of fact.

Then, as regards Demand No. 4 : “ That the Millowners' Association shall not permit its individual members to vary conditions of service to the disadvantage of the workers without the sanction of the Association.” That point also has been met, now that there is a Standardisation Scheme and the Rules and Regulations are also being standardised and therefore, as far as the most important questions are concerned, there can be no variations without the consent of the Millowners' Association.

As regards Demand No. 5 also, now that a Standardisation Scheme will come into force, there will be no ground for complaint, as we have already agreed that when we frame rates for new sorts—for instance we have still to frame the rates for Jacquard looms and Turkish towels—then the Joint Committee will be consulted. Therefore that demand is also met.

No. 6. As you yourself have said, there is no difference of opinion and we have conceded it.

No. 7. You said you would prefer to discuss it when we discuss the Rationalisation Scheme.

Then, so far as I can see the most important question is the minimum wage demand. The minimum wage demand is a very important point not only from the workers' point of view but also from our point of view. It is a very large question which cannot be decided either by the representatives of unions or by the Millowners' Association. Mr. Bakhale, sir, was unable to answer the question put to him by Mr. Kamat whether the principle was to be applied to the textile industry or not. If you claim that you are sufficiently organised, then that Convention will not apply to you. Therefore, it is very difficult even for Labour to say whether the minimum wage principle has got to be applied to our industry or not. Then, if that principle is to be applied, the general level in the country has also got to be studied, the wages in other industries, and so on. That question, as I say, is a very large question. Mr. Bakhale himself just now said that he did not know what the wages were in other important centres. Not only that, but the cost of living figures will have to be gone into. Now, the only existing cost of living figures for Bombay are the figures produced by the Labour Office, and Mr. Bakhale himself questioned those figures in some respects. We all know those figures are not perfect, but we have to make use of them, because they are the only figures available. We both agree that they are not perfect, and that is why I say that if you have to decide on the minimum wage question, a wage census will have to be taken, and so on. Therefore, it is a very large question, and unless Government first of all indicate as to what they are going to do, indicate the grounds on which this Convention will have to be applied, I do not think we can say one way or the other.

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not want this Convention to be brought in when we are dealing with this question. I referred to the Convention only as a matter of illustration.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I think it will have to be brought in in discussing this question. It is the last word, an important pronouncement by an Economic Conference. Therefore, any views expressed there have to be discussed.

MR. KAMAT :—Mr. Saklatvala, apart from the question whether the Government of India would accept the Convention, or the Legislature would ratify it, I want you to clear up whether you consider Re. 0-12-6 per day in Bombay is an adequate wage, considering the little extra cost of living in Bombay as compared with other mofussil towns. Supposing the cost of living in Bombay is 10 to 11 per cent. higher than in the mofussil towns, and supposing the wages for an unskilled worker in a mofussil town are 11 annas or 12 annas, would Re. 0-12-6 be an adequate wage for an unskilled worker in Bombay?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The position is this. We pay this wage of Rs. 22-15-0 a month to our sweepers. They are the lowest paid workers in the mills. Now, you have the evidence of Dr. Sandilands, on page 1817, that the municipal scavengers have to do much harder work, that they have to carry a load of 40 lbs. and walk some miles and so on, and the maximum



they pay is Rs. 23-8-0. Dr. Sandilands was asked "What are the wages of those who work for 8 hours and the wages of those who work for 5½ hours?" The reply is "The wages of those who work for 8 hours are Rs. 23 a month." The Chairman then asked him "No allowance?" and he replied "No. That is a flat rate. The lower class of workers work for less time and get 8 annas more, for they have to do the arduous work of carrying baskets a long distance. They get Rs. 23-8-0." Then he was asked whether males and females got the same wages. His reply was "No. Women sweepers are paid Rs. 19. The women scavengers who carry baskets like men are paid the same rate of Rs. 23-8-0."

THE CHAIRMAN :—You are a bit below the municipal rate, where the man gets a minimum of Rs. 23-8-0, and your rate comes to Rs. 23. You pay a woman sweeper Rs. 18, whereas the municipality give her Rs. 19.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes. As I say, unless and until all these points are cleared up, until we know exactly what the other industries are paying, until we know exactly what is the general condition in other industries, and what is the minimum wage that is fair, unless and until all these points are cleared up, it is very difficult to say one way or the other. The very fact that the question has been taken up by the International Labour Conference shows the importance of the question; it shows that it is an international question, and it has got to be very seriously considered before one side or the other can agree to it.

MR. KAMAT :—You are mixing it up with the International Labour Conference. The point is whether Rs. 13-8-0 is a fair and reasonable wage.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It is fair and reasonable, inasmuch as the same class of people are getting in Bombay the same rate, and even less.

MR. KAMAT :—If you refer to municipal scavengers, they get sometimes certain concessions. For instance, they get food from houses. But they live a very dirty life; they have a very low standard of life. Surely, in the mills you do not expect an ordinary unskilled worker to lead the very low life that a scavenger in Bombay does?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—No. That is quite true. Then there is another difficulty. In discussing this matter with the Labour representatives, we had pointed out one fact. The first fact is that they are already very low paid. I think for males, on an average it is Rs. 11 and for females Rs. 8. Owing to the social custom, you know that the sweepers are looked down upon by the other labourers. If a sweeper is getting Rs. 23 or Rs. 25, and if in the department they are getting the same wage, the argument has been brought at this very table that if even the sweepers get Rs. 23 or Rs. 25, why should the men in the department not get more. Therefore, that is also a difficulty in our way. We would like to advance them, because, after all, they are very few. Perhaps it would be to our own interest if we try to get more work from them and advance them, but, as I say, advancing the sweepers means advancing the scale of others as well. I think that fact was brought out in

our discussion with the Labour representatives. As I said, we have brought them up considerably, as far as we could.

Then, what the minimum wage should be is, I say, a very difficult question to decide. If the Labour representatives had given us an indication as to how they arrive at Rs. 30, then perhaps we might have looked into this question more carefully. For instance, Mr. Bradley admitted that Rs. 50 for a family of 4 he would consider quite adequate. The family budget says it is Rs. 43-4-0, and if they get a little extra, Rs. 50 for a family of 4 would be adequate. If Rs. 50 for a family of 4 is quite adequate, then I do not see how it can be contended that Rs. 23 or Rs. 25 for one member of the family is too low, and I do not see how from that fact you can deduce the figure of Rs. 30. At any rate, as I say, this is a question which requires very careful looking into. We must have a good deal of statistics, and then we can arrive at this figure. Perhaps, it will be of great value to this enquiry if I produce at this stage the Report on Investigations into the conditions of Indian Textile Workers presented to the International Federation of Textile Workers by the Secretary, the Right Hon'ble Thomas Shaw.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We have a copy of the report.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—On page 63 of the report, they give a list of what the wages are, for instance, in an Indian State, and you will find that there the wages are very low compared with the wages we pay. Then there is a special paragraph on page 19 which says :

“ The Delegation had an opportunity of seeing every branch of workers and comparing their conditions with those of the textile workers, and I think it is safe to say that the textile workers in India, in comparison with other workers in that country, have at least as favourable a position as that occupied by the European textile workers when compared with other workers in their own countries. Compared with the European textile workers of course the Indian worker is in a serious position.”

Therefore, I say that the fact that we are not able to at once agree to this demand should not be taken as an indication that we are not prepared to consider it, or that we believe that whatever standard obtains now is a perfect standard. It is, as I say, a very difficult question ; it is a very large question, and since it has already been taken up by the Government of India and taken up by the International Labour Conference, in due course it will come before us ; it will be threshed out, and then we can arrive at some understanding on this question. As regards the conditions, I do not think we have ever maintained that the conditions under which our workers live are quite satisfactory ; certainly not. There is the question of their housing condition, there is the question of their education, and many other questions. What I want to stress is that this condition is, in a great measure, a reflex of the general condition of our people. They are poor also, and we have to consider how far it is a reflex of the general poverty of the country. You cannot simply compare their standard with the English standard or any other higher standard. Of course, the object should be to raise the standard of

living, to bring them up to a higher standard ; certainly that should be the object. I do not think we have taken up the attitude that the condition should not be improved. But it is not by an increase of wages alone that their condition can be improved. There are many other factors ; there are many ways and means by which their condition can be improved, and the ways and means are not in the hands of the millowners alone. If the housing condition is bad, I think as far as the millowners are concerned we have done as much as we could under the circumstances. I think Mr. Tom Shaw also mentions that the dwelling houses provided by the mills are better than the dwelling houses generally provided to these classes. We have also, in our own way, tried to contribute towards their education. We have tried to improve their condition, but as I say, it is not altogether in our hands to improve their condition. It is the state of society, and other parties are responsible as well. The old idea was that employers are not liable for anything whatsoever, that after the operatives have left their factory they have got no concern with them. I think that is not the idea at the back of our minds. We certainly take up certain responsibilities, but that does not mean that the whole responsibility for the unsatisfactory condition of the workers should be laid at our door, and that is what I want to make clear. Because the conditions are unsatisfactory, therefore we should not jump to the conclusion that the employers are unsympathetic. They have their difficulties, and, as I say, the whole responsibility can never be laid at their door. As far as housing is concerned, you know that the industry is made to pay Rs. 10 lakhs to Rs. 12 lakhs by way of this cotton duty. We have to pay a rupee per bale on the cotton that is consumed, and therefore even that contribution is made by us ; and, in spite of that contribution, if the conditions have not improved, I say it should not be laid at our door, and it should not be said that because the owners are unsympathetic or because the employers do not want to improve the conditions, therefore the conditions are what they are at present.

MR. ASAVALE :—The cotton cess is a burden on the seller.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I know something about my own business ; I know on whom the burden falls. I know how I get it, and I know I have to pay it.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We need not enter into that question now ; the Tariff Board have mentioned something about it.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As regards Demand No. 9 regarding forfeiture of wages which remain unclaimed, that has been dealt with, and we are prepared to put it in the rules. As I pointed out, we did not put it in the rules, but the lines on which this matter would be dealt with were indicated in our published statement. Since it is insisted that we should put it in the rules, we are quite prepared to do it.

Demand No. 10 : as regards standardising the conditions of employment, work and payment, that has been done.

As regards the ticket system and the cleaning of machinery, that matter has been fairly well threshed out. But I would again draw your attention to Sir Ness Wadia's first letter, which appears on page 1555. The letter says :—

“ As regards the demand of the Strike Committee No. 11 ever since the starting of our mills, we have strictly observed the rule compelling workmen to drop their tickets at the entrance gate as they come in in the morning. Only during the time between 1918 and 1923 when we were working double shift, in the weaving department this work was allowed to be slackened by our managers for some reason, but at the end of 1923 when we reverted to single shift, we again insisted on the weavers, like all other departmental men, to drop their tickets and this system has been observed both at our Spring and Textile Mills up to the strike time. So, as far as our mills are concerned, it is no new system. In the other mills, I know the weavers are not compelled to put tickets. A great objection where the tickets are not required is that we found that weavers used to send substitutes to the mills and make them work, which has resulted in bad workmanship.....”

It is not so much the practice in the past that should be considered, but as I say, now at a time when we are taking up reforms and trying to put the whole industry on a better footing, the only question is whether what we ask the workers to do is fair and reasonable or not. The objection on the part of the weavers is undoubtedly a sentimental one. They ask “ Why should we be given tickets ? ” Our answer is that their confreres have been accepting the tickets, and there should be no objection to the weavers doing the same. It is not in the textile industry alone that the system obtains ; you have seen it in the municipality and other organisations. There must be some check on the man to see whether he is present on a particular day or not. It is not a new system ; it is a system which obtains at least amongst 60 per cent. of the operatives, or perhaps more. The only argument that can be advanced is, that the practice has not obtained for one reason or other ; it does not matter if it obtains in Sir Ness Wadia’s mill. On page 1779, Mr. Ramsingh Dongarsingh, the manager of the Morarji Goculdas Mill, said : “ While I was in the Kohinoor Mills, I had introduced the big tickets, and they used to put them back in the morning, and get it marked in the evening.” Mr. Bakhale asked him “ Are you in favour of the ticket system for the weavers ? ” The reply was “ Yes.” Again, Mr. Bakhale asked “ You are in favour of the ticket system ? ” The reply was “ Yes, because it is very clear to the workers themselves when they were present, when they were absent, how much salary they get, and what are the deductions on account of fines or absenteeism. Mr. Stones then pointed out that that was another thing altogether, and that Mr. Bakhale was referring to the timekeeper’s ticket. Mr. Bakhale again asked “ Have you got the tickets for the weavers ? ” The reply was “ Yes.” Mr. Bakhale asked “ I am referring to the small ticket that the worker gets when he enters the mills. Does that obtain in the Morarji Goculdas Mills ? ” The reply was “ Yes.” Again, he was asked “ Even to-day ? ” The reply was “ Yes.” Then he was asked “ Even for the weavers ? ”, and he replied “ Yes.” Some weavers have not raised objection. I know that, as far as Sir N. Wadia’s mills are concerned, the weavers have been raising objection. They had taken to it for some time, but they have objected again. The question is whether what we are asking them to do is fair and reasonable or not. I do not see any objection

to it. As I say, 60 per cent. of the operatives have been following this practice for the past 50 years and more. I do not think that there is any serious or reasonable ground for objection on the part of the weavers. Here again I say that in such little matters which generate friction we want the co-operation of the other side. It is no good consulting, and it is no good talking platitudes. As the other side have said, it must be translated into action. Here is an opportunity for them to easily put the case before the workers, that there is nothing in their objection. The objection, as I say, is purely sentimental ; it does not lower the dignity of the weaver one inch.

MR. KAMAT :—It is not only sentiment. The system of *badli* entitles them to some distinction.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The system of *badli* as at present prevailing is also a necessary evil. We have tolerated it so long. We know that the system came into force because at that time we put in more looms ; there were not sufficient weavers, and the mills were not able to provide substitutes ; the weaver found the substitute and he took the responsibility for payment, and so on. Now, although this practice remains nominally, the fact is that it is not the weavers who bring substitutes, but the substitutes come at our very door ; now it is really the weaving masters or jobbers that pick out the men and bring them in. That is why we say that, for the sake of discipline, it would be much better if the weavers were also given tickets, so as to have a uniform practice throughout the mills.

As regards the high price allowances, Mr. Bakhale wants their consolidation, so that no reduction can be made in the allowance, and therefore, of course in the total earnings. That is the point made by Mr. Bradley also. But, on the other hand, Mr. Dange has made it quite clear that, whether it is consolidated or not, it is not going to stop the Millowners from making a cut, if a cut is going to be made, whether it is in the base or in the allowance. If there is no allowance, we can reduce the wages all the same. On page 1519 and page 1520 Mr. Dange says : “ It is impossible for me to understand what this reply means. The standard scheme, or the Millowners’ proposals even before the standard scheme was proposed, were proposals for the reduction of wages as a whole. If they think that if high prices allowances are not consolidated with the original wages, it will facilitate a reduction of wages, then they have done it even without it. I do not know how consolidation of the allowances with the wages can prevent a reduction of wages. Then again, on page 1521 Mr. Dange says : “ This calculation of percentage is difficult for the worker. If his wage is Rs. 20-13-6, for calculating 70 per cent. on that, he has to take the help of more literate people, and this gives room for the clerks and officials of the mill to play mischief. This is also the cause of misunderstanding, and many a time this has led to strikes also. The calculation of the percentage causes some mischief. Then the practice in some mills is (this has been already referred to) not to calculate these allowances on any fraction of a rupee.” Mr. Dange’s protest is more against the method of calculation.

So, Mr. Dange's objection is more against the method of calculation. That objection has been met. We say exactly how calculation is going to be done. The pies in the wages are not neglected. They are added to the high price allowance. In the total if it is less than 5 pies it is taken away. If it is six pies and more one anna is added. This is the common practice in large organisations. Mr. Bakhale still seems to object to it. I forgot to mention yesterday that it is a very difficult matter in the first place to make payment, if actual pies are to be given. There are, as you know, 150,000 workpeople. Suppose we are to make payment up to 12 pies, then we would require 600,000 pies. It is difficult to obtain this from the Currency office every month. As it is the Currency Office raises strenuous objection if we ask for one-anna and two-anna pieces. During holidays we give notice to the Currency Office stating our requirements, because we have got to make payments. If we go before the Currency Office with this proposal it will be turned down. I do not think that the workers will be losers as has been pointed out by Mr. Stones yesterday. I think it is quite a reasonable practice and I do not think Mr. Bakhale will seriously object to it.

MR. KAMAT :—Apart from the question of pies, you used an argument in connection with the ticket system that you should begin with a clean slate when you are revising all the rules. Why should you not do the same with regard to consolidation of the high prices allowance ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I doubt whether the question of consolidation is a question of reform. In the municipality they have consolidated it with regard to old employees ; and knocked it off for the new employees. They may have their own reasons for it. I do not think that it is in the interest of the workers. It is much better that allowances are not consolidated both in the interest of old employees as well as new employees. Then again, Mr. Moberly says that he has consolidated the allowance for the new employees and not for the old ones.

MR. KAMAT :—I gather Mr. Bakhale said that if in future there comes a time for reduction or increase of wages justified purely on the score of cost of living they on the side of labour are prepared to do it. In view of that statement are you still against that ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Only from the workers' point of view consolidation should not take place, because just as we have ground for saying that the allowance must be cut down as the cost of living has gone down they will have very good justification for asking for an increase in the allowance when the cost of living goes up.

MR. BAKHALE :—We say 5 per cent. on that....

MR. SAKLATVALA :—According to Mr. Bradley just as employers would rather attack the allowances than the basic wage so also I say that it would be better for you to attack the allowance itself than the basic wage. If you want the rate as such to be increased you have to adduce other grounds also than the cost of living. If the allowance is separate there is no confusion. If the cost of living has gone up there is some justification for asking for an

increase in the allowance. So, I do not think that it is really in the interest of the workers to consolidate the allowances. At any rate those who have done it may have their own reasons. In England they have not done it. Although standardisation has been in existence for a long time they have kept this allowance separate.

As regards Demand Nos. 13 to 17, I do not think there is anything more to say.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We meet on Friday. Produce other witnesses from other mills with regard to the ticket system.

MR. BAKHALE :—About our procedure for the next week, how are we going to discuss the rationalisation scheme along with spinning ?

THE CHAIRMAN :—So far as it affects spinning you can discuss it. It is a general question entering into both spinning and weaving.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—You take up each argument and say that they can do this much work and not so much and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We do not want to go over the same ground.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What we want is detail.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Go through each page. First take the question of wages and then the amount of work. Refer to evidence on those points.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is no difficulty about it. We did not discuss the rational scheme generally. We simply examined Sir Victor Sassoon and some other witness.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It turned into a general discussion. Before you begin to discuss the spinning department in detail you may give your general views on rationalisation. We want to leave the weaving section as much as possible to itself. It is the most important question.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Has the rationalisation scheme entered into the standardisation scheme ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I think where we have adopted the rationalisation scheme is in the roving frame. <sup>In the Low Room</sup> There we have left it to the option of the men.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—In the ring frame ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Not in our standardisation scheme. I do not know whether the rationalisation scheme has been given to you in detail. I think it will cause confusion if we discuss rationalisation with this. It is apt to be mixed up.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Take the standardisation scheme with regard to the spinning section first. I think it would be better to deal with the two separately.

MR. BAKHALE :—If we are to discuss the standardisation scheme there are still a few statements to be submitted.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We will submit the statement regarding the spinning section to-morrow and the weaving section the day after. As regards the statement with regard to the weaving section I had to go through it very carefully and satisfy myself. That is what has delayed the submission of the statement. The final figures have been given. We have only to table them and average them.

MR. BAKHALE :—There are two more points. We have been given the rates existing at present on the existing varieties and the rates that may be given under the standardisation scheme. That statement deals with two sizes of looms—40" and 44". We have not got figures for the other looms where the reduction is greater.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We will give you the other statement which will give you an idea as to the cut in each mill—the wages in July 1927 and the wages that will be paid under the standardisation scheme.

MR. BAKHALE :—You are giving the wages and not the rates.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The total wages actually paid and what will be paid under the standard scheme. That will give you an idea.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—That will give a general idea of the cut.

MR. BAKHALE :—Will it give us a clear idea about particular looms? That is the point.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Unless you go into full details as to the number of looms and the sorts, you cannot get an idea as to the variations in width.

MR. BAKHALE :—Just as you pick up some current varieties on narrow looms, you can pick up varieties on broad looms, and give us a statement.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—You can make a list of the cloths the particulars of which you want.

THE CHAIRMAN :—If you put down the varieties you want and the widths of the looms, then they can work it out.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is one other point. Can you give us the names of the mills from which these rates have been taken?

MR. KAMAT :—They object to giving out the names.

MR. ASVALE :—At least one or two mills.

MR. RAJAB :—We cannot take their figures as correct.



MR. SAKLATVALA :—You can bring your own figures and say that you do not believe our figures, and you can say which mill it is. We can give the name to the Enquiry Committee.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Practically, you have got all these details for January and July for 1925, 1926 and 1927. Those figures have already been compiled, as a matter of fact. You wanted them for 6 different months in 3 different years. Have you gone through them ?

MR. BAKHALE :—We are trying to go through them, at any rate.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—You pick up any of those, and say what will be your figure.

MR. BAKHALE :—We want to get a general idea about the cut in the wider looms.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—You can ask for the rates on those.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That is why we have prepared this Book of Examples.

MR. BAKHALE :—We want to compare the present rate with the future rate under the standardisation scheme.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We will get the particulars for the whole of the Bombay mills.

MR. BAKHALE :—Our contention is that on broad looms there is a greater cut.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That is a matter of detail. What we say is that the scheme has got to be revised as regards these details. If we find that there is a greater cut on the broad looms, we will bring it up.

MR. BAKHALE :—How are we to convince ourselves about it ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We will give you that information. So far we have given all the information that you yourself asked for.

MR. BRADLEY :—With the names of the mills ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—You have got nothing to do with the names of the mills. If you go on distrusting any statement we make, then of course there is no help. We cannot go on producing statements, for you to say that they are not correct. If you have no confidence in the statements we produce, do not ask us to produce any.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We must do our best ; we cannot be perfect. We are not experts who are going to settle the exact rates.

We will meet on Friday.

The Committee adjourned till 11-15 a.m. on the 25th January 1929.

---

*Friday, 25th January 1929.*

---

Friday, the 25th January 1929.

The Committee met at the Town Hall, Bombay, at 11-15 A. M.

Present :—

THE CHAIRMAN.

MR. KHAREGHAT.

MR. KAMAT.

**Ex.:** MR. SAKLATVALA :—Sir, we have got the statements ready (comparative statements showing the numbers employed and the wages bill departmentally for July 1927 and the numbers which will be employed together with the wages that they will draw according to the standardisation scheme on the same production as for July 1927) both for the spinning section and the weaving section. These give full details as regards each mill also. As regards the other side we have always taken the position that we do not want to give them the names; we shall give them the numbers, only the names will not be there, so that they will know exactly how many mills are included and how many are not included. As regards these statements, on the first page we give the reduction in the number of men. But it must be remembered that we refer to July 1927. Since July 1927 there has already been a reduction in the number of men. In the terms of the agreement also you will notice that we have only agreed to continue the rates and wages of March 1927 and there is a definite clause that the question of musters shall not arise. That means that the reduction which has taken place since will remain. I draw attention to this merely to point out that the reductions shown in the statements will apply only to the muster of July 1927 and not to the present muster. As regards the weaving section, we have made a note there that the cut comes to 12·55, but this includes the Jobbers also. We have already asked for figures, and later on we will get exact figures for the weavers themselves. In warping and beaming of course we have taken the same production. This cut will obtain provided for ten hours' work they will only do the same amount as for 8½ hours, which is of course not likely. In the warping departments we have definitely promised the other day that the wages will be Rs. 52/-. This cut for ten hours will not be there; we have simply put it to show exactly what the amount of the cut would be on the same production.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Does the Finishing Department come in?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes; finishing, folding, calendering and baling.

There is one little point. Day before yesterday, Mr. Asavale raised an important point. He said that the millowners had made a promise, at the time

they withdrew the cut, that they would not reduce the wages after the abolition of the excise duty. Of course that, as I said, is an important point and may change the whole aspect of the enquiry. If the promise was there then we would not be justified in proposing any cut. I have got here the *Bombay Legislative Council Debates* for the year 1927; on 18th July Mr. Asavale himself had asked the following question :—

**“ Millowners’ Association : Undertaking regarding  
Excise Duty.**

“ Will Government be pleased to state—

- (a) Whether any undertaking was given to them by the Millowners’ Association during the last general strike of the textile workers in Bombay in the year 1925 not to cut down the rates of the workers after the cancellation of the excise duty?”

The Honourable Sir Cowasji Jehangir replied :—

“ An assurance was given that if the excise duty was remitted the cut in wages which had been made by the millowners before the strike would be restored. The millowners acted up to this assurance when the excise was abolished. No assurance was given that reductions in wages would never be made in future.”

Mr. Asavale then put this question :—

“ Will the Honourable the General Member say as to how long they have acted, not to cut the wages of the millhands? For how many days?”

The Honourable Sir Cowasji Jehangir replied :—

“ I believe they have acted up to this day. I do not think they have cut the wages up to now.”

That makes it clear that our promise was not such a definite promise that we would never resort to a cut in the future.

MR. KAMAT :—What is meant by a cut in wages; a cut on the basic wage or on the allowance of 70 per cent.?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Any way; a reduction in the earnings of the millhands.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Now, Mr. Joshi can address us; we do not want a full discussion.

MR. S. C. JOSHI :—Sir, I have already explained the position regarding these rules; I will now only refer to two or three points which have been raised.

Standing Order No. 3 says :—

“The decision of the Manager upon any question arising out of, in connection with, or incidental to these Orders shall be final.....”

I have already submitted my remarks regarding this—that it was too vague and would include any question even as regards disputes regarding the occurrence of a catastrophe, accident, or stoppage of power supply, and therefore it was illegal to insert such a clause. Now, it is proposed to amend it in such a way as to make the Manager an arbitrator so that his decision may be binding on the operatives. I submit that any such reference to the Manager as an arbitrator would not serve the purpose, because it will be one-sided. If disputes regarding questions arising out of, in connection with, or incidental to these Orders are to be submitted for arbitration, then there should be an Arbitration Board wherein there will be a representative of the operatives.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Your point is that it would not be fair to refer it to the Manager who is not an independent man?

**MR. JOSHI :—**That is my point. As it stands, it is illegal, as I pointed out on the last occasion. If it is to be amended in the way suggested, then it would be one sided, if the arbitration proposed is not to be undertaken by a Board which would include a representative of the operatives. That is the point that I have to make about Rule No. 3.

Then as regards Rule No. 13, I have observed that you have rightly stated that it should be divided into two parts, the first part being legal and the second part regarding the right to close down the mill because of the state of trade being not legal. I too submit that the second part is illegal : it would be illegal on the part of the management to refuse payment to a worker or to play him off on account of the state of the trade.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Supposing the operative agrees and he has no objection to come back after a short time?

**MR. JOSHI :—**It will not be desirable on the part of the operative to submit to such a rule. We have to frame such rules as would be reasonable ; it would not be proper to frame a rule which would take away the ordinary legal rights of the operative. I submit that the latter part of the rule is unlawful and illegal. As to the first part, I hold it is unnecessary, inasmuch as there is already a provision in Section 56 of the Indian Contract Act whereby when a contract becomes impossible of performance then the rights and liabilities under the contract are discharged.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**You may get a case where the performance may not be impossible, but may be against public health or safety. Take the case of an

epidemic like plague. The mill may be working all right; at the same time it would be against public health and public safety if large bodies of men were allowed to congregate together. In such a case it would be advisable to close the mill but not absolutely necessary.

MR. JOSHI :—Under those circumstances, if it is not desirable in the interest of the workers also to call them together, then that is an impossibility within the meaning of Section 56 of the Indian Contract Act.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Impossibility generally means impossibility in fact. Of course if Government issued an order that in consequence of plague no mill should carry on work, then you could say that it would be impossible. Falling short of that, it would not be an impossibility under Section 56.

MR. JOSHI :—If there is a depression in the trade, the management may take advantage of a mild epidemic to close down the mill, although the epidemic may not be so serious as to warrant the closing down of the mill. The decision of the Manager is being made final as regards disputes of this nature, and therefore it will be a hardship for the employees. I submit that even in the case of an epidemic, the millowners should not be given any rights beyond what is already given in Section 56 of the Contract Act. I submit, therefore, that the clause as it stands should be deleted. There is no necessity to keep the first part; the latter part is illegal.

As regards Rules Nos. 15 and 16, which prescribe the period of notice to be given, I find that it has now been reduced to 14 days for both. I submit that in the case of the workers the period of notice should be shorter. I have looked into the laws of other countries, and I find that in many cases the period of notice in the case of the employees is half, and, in some cases, is even less than half, of what is required in the case of the employers. For example, I may quote some cases from the Legislative Series of the International Labour Office. In the 1920 series, we find Act No. 2112 of Greece, respecting obligatory notice of the termination of the contract of employment of private employees (dated 11th March 1920). In that Act the period of notice prescribed in Section 4 is as follows :—

“ An employee who proposes to terminate his contract of employment with his employer shall likewise give notice in order to terminate it; the period of notice shall amount to one-half of that prescribed for the employer in Section 1.”

Then there is an enactment of Luxembourg, an Act respecting the legal regulation of the contract of service of private employees, dated 31st October 1919. Section

16 and the following sections provide for the dissolution of contract of service, and Section 21 provides for the period of notice to be given by an employer :—

“ 21. The employer shall not dissolve the contract except by written notice subject to the following time limits—

- (1) Two months if the employee has been in the employment for less than 5 years ;
- (2) Four months if the employment has lasted 5 to 10 years ;
- (3) Six months if the employment has lasted 10 years or more.

Then in Section 22 it is stated :—

“ An employee shall give his employer notice in writing. The period of notice on his part shall be half of that required from the employer.”

“ The period of notice shall begin on the 15th or the last day of a calendar month.”

There is similar legislation in Austria, headed as “ Act relating to the Contract of Service of Private Employees (Employees' Act),” dated 11th May 1921. Section 20 deals with notice to leave, and Sub-section (2) of that section reads thus :—

“ (2) In default of an agreement more favourable to the employee, the employer may terminate the employment at the end of any quarter on giving notice in advance. The period of notice shall amount to six weeks, which shall be increased to two months after the completion of two years' service, three months after the completion of five years' service, four months after the completion of fifteen years' service, and five months after the completion of twenty-five year's service.”

Sub-section (4) reads thus :—

“ (4). In default of an agreement more favourable to him, the employee may terminate his employment on the last day of a calendar month, provided that he gives one month's notice. This period of notice may by agreement be extended to a half-year, provided that the notice to be given by the employer shall not be less than the period of notice fixed by agreement with the employee.”

Then, there is legislation in Peru, Act No. 4916, for the benefit of commercial employees, dated 7th February 1924. Section 1 says :—

“ If the duration of the employment or service is not limited to a fixed period by contract, either of the parties may terminate the employment, the employer by giving the employee ninety days' notice in advance and the employee by giving the employer forty days' notice.”

So, that is less than half. Another decree dated the 1st February 1924, respecting the employment of workers, runs :—

“Manufacturers and owners of factories, workshops, etc. who have to dismiss their wage-earning employees for any reason, shall give them fifteen days' notice in advance, or, in default thereof shall pay to such employees compensation equal to the wages which they would have earned during that period.

“When giving notice of dismissal the employers shall inform their wage-earning employees thereof in writing or through the medium of the competent department.....”

There, there is no reference to the period of notice to be given by the employees.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I am aware of such legislation, but the fact remains that it is an indulgence to the workers ; is it not ?

MR. JOSHI :—It is so.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It does not follow that having equal periods of notice on both sides is not fair and reasonable.

MR. JOSHI :—I do not submit it on that ground. It is not on the ground of legality that I am claiming this indulgence to the workers ; what I say is that it will not be unreasonable on the part of the employees to request that the period of notice on their part should be shorter.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is a matter between you and the millowners. It is difficult for us to say that it is not fair and reasonable to have equal periods of notice.

MR. JOSHI :—Some of these rules are one-sided and they give more latitude to the management than to the workers.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You therefore say it would be fair to give the workers a little indulgence in this case.

MR. JOSHI :—Certainly.

I shall also quote an enactment relating to Belgium, Act relating to the contract of employment, dated 7th August 1922.

“12. \* \* \* \* \*

(B) If the employee gives notice, the period fixed under (A) shall be reduced by one-half.”

(A) gives the period of notice to be given by the employer. That is as far as Rules 15 and 16 are concerned.



I now come to the Standing Order regarding search, new Order No. 11. I submit that it is unreasonable to give absolute right to a gateman to search any operative on suspicion.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I understood Mr. Bakhale in his final summing up to say that he did not object to the practice remaining, as they have continued it for some time, but that he did not want it to be put in writing in the rules.

MR. JOSHI :—If a rule is framed like this, it will give immunity to the gatemen from any liability of being prosecuted for an unreasonable search. Therefore, my submission is also the same as that of Mr. Bakhale. If the practice is there, let it continue. I have also submitted in the course of my evidence that it would not be illegal on the part of the gateman to search anybody because in Section 56 of the Criminal Procedure Code a private person has been given authority to arrest a person without a warrant if he sees him in the act of committing a cognisable and non-bailable offence.

THE CHAIRMAN :—He must see the man stealing.

MR. JOSHI :—It is stealing when he thinks that the man is actually taking something in his pocket.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It is not a case falling under Section 56.

MR. JOSHI :—That is so. Anyway, if he has reasonable grounds to believe that the man is taking something, certainly it will not be wrong on his part to ask the man to wait and hand him over to the police officer. If the practice exists, of course it should continue. I also entirely agree with Mr. Bakhale that it is necessary to have a search made. If a gateman makes a search of any operative on reasonable suspicion he will not be prosecuted. As it has been contended that there have not been cases of unreasonable searches made, so also it can be contended that there have not been any cases of a gateman being prosecuted for making a search.

MR. STONES :—Of course that exists in our rules already.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I have looked through some of the mills' rules that I had got, but I could not find any rule about a search. Could you show me one?

MR. STONES :—I will get you one.

MR. JOSHI :—If it exists in the case of some mills only, then to make it universal and to make it applicable in cases where it does not already exist would not be reasonable. I submit that at any rate it is not a reasonable rule and there is no necessity for embodying such a rule in the Standing Orders.

Coming to Standing Order No. 16 about the forfeiture of wages, I submit that to give a right to the management to forfeit the earned wages in lieu of liquidated damages will again be one-sided.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**You have already stated that.

**MR. JOSHI :—**On that ground, I submit that this part should also be deleted. Both parties should be given the same right. If the employee is summarily dismissed without notice, when he is entitled to notice, then he is entitled to claim damages in lieu of notice and he is entitled to file a suit in a court of law. Similarly, if damages are to be recovered from the employee by reason of his leaving the service without notice, then the management should go to a court of law and should recover the amount by obtaining a decree against him.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Can you tell me if that is the rule in England?

**MR. JOSHI :—**In England, I am not aware of any rules, but I had found in some of the cases that there are such rules. In some of the reported cases which I read I found there are such rules of forfeiture in England also. But I do not think it would be reasonable to make such a rule.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**They are Tramway cases?

**MR. JOSHI :—**Yes. They make a deposit, and the deposit is forfeited if the contract is terminated without the employee giving notice.

Coming to Rule 19, Clauses (b) and (c) especially ought to be deleted. They would not be lawful.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Is it the same as No. 17 in the old rules?

**MR. JOSHI :—**Yes.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**About striking?

**MR. JOSHI :—**Yes.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**You say that, supposing a workman has contracted that he will not leave without giving a fortnight's notice, it is perfectly legal for him, in spite of that contract, to stop doing work?

**MR. JOSHI :—**If there is a general strike by the operatives, then he is entitled to join it and to act according to the decision of all the workers.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Although he breaks the contract?

**MR. JOSHI :—**Yes, in spite of the contract.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**To break a contract is what we call illegal in the ordinary civil sense; though it is not a criminal offence. Under Civil Law, he is liable to give damages for breaking the contract without notice.

MR. JOSHI :—A suit for damages cannot lie. I rely on Section 18 of the Indian Trade Unions Act, 1926. Of course, I admit that as the section is worded, it merely says : “ No suit or other legal proceeding shall be maintainable in any Civil Court against any registered Trade Union or any officer or member thereof in respect of any act done in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute to which a member of the Trade Union is a party on the ground only that such act induces some other person to break a contract of employment,.....”

THE CHAIRMAN :—But remember the words “ on the ground only.” You are not bringing a suit against him on the sole ground that he is inducing other persons to break a contract of employment, but on the ground that he has himself broken the contract. Does the section protect him in that case?

MR. JOSHI :—No.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The workman would then be doing an illegal act.

MR. JOSHI :—If he does it in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, he will be exempted. If he alone singly goes on strike and refuses to work, then certainly he is liable for breach of contract.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What is your authority for saying that if he does it in conjunction with others, he is not breaking his contract?

MR. JOSHI :—I say that on the strength of the wording of Section 18 which I have just quoted.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You cannot stretch Section 18 beyond its express wording.

MR. JOSHI :—The wording is “ on the ground only that such act induces some other person to break a contract of employment, or that it is in interference with the trade, business or employment of some other person.”

THE CHAIRMAN :—The workman would not be sued on that ground at all. He would be sued for breach of contract and not because he tried to interfere with the trade of some other person.

MR. JOSHI :—On the ground I have cited, you are not entitled to bring a suit against him and to recover damages for the breach of his contract.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Why is not the employer entitled to bring a suit? It is the ordinary right of a master, if his servant breaks his contract and leaves without notice, to sue the servant.

MR. JOSHI :—Under that section of the Indian Trade Unions Act he will not be entitled to do it.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—But there is that express limitation. He is exempted if he is being sued on a specific ground. It would not be a ground for preventing a master suing his servant for breaking his contract?

**MR. JOSHI** :—That will be defeating the object of the Act.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—The courts prefer to go by the expressed terms of the section.

**MR. JOSHI** :—The management are now trying, by inserting these clauses, to do something which they may not be entitled to do by reason of the provisions of Section 18 of the Trade Unions Act.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—A part from Section 18, the millowner would have the right to sue a workman for breaking his contract, if he left without giving notice.

**MR. CAROE** :—There were some cases after the general strike in England. It was distinctly held there that the men were not covered by the section of the English Act, and the men agreed to pay damages. Sir John Simon, in the House of Commons, distinctly said so.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—I have seen Sir John Simon's speech. He says distinctly that the ordinary right of strike of the workmen is to give notice that they are going to do so, and when that notice expires to stop work.

**MR. CAROE** :—There are one or two cases, and I shall try and get them.

**MR. JOSHI** :—I have also read a case like that.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—The proviso to Section 2 of the Act gives some exceptions.

**MR. JOSHI** :—It does make a provision to the effect that the Act shall not affect any agreement between an employer and those employed by him as to such employment; or any agreement in consideration of the sale of the goodwill, etc. Anyhow, dismissal of an operative on the ground that he has ceased to work, or he has struck work, or has incited others whilst on the premises to strike work is not reasonable, and should be deleted. So also "insubordination" and "disobedience." These are too vague terms. If Rule 3 is allowed to stand, on any question whether an employee was guilty of insubordination or disobedience, the decision of the Manager will be final, and the workman will have no remedy.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—It is subject to appeal to the Managing Agents.

**MR. JOSHI** :—He will have no remedy in a court of law, even if he is not, in his own opinion, guilty of disobedience or insubordination, he has no right to claim damages in a court of law.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—You have argued that he would not be debarred from going to a court of law.

**MR. JOSHI** :—If it is not to be amended in the form in which it is proposed to be amended.

That is all that I have to say.

**MR. CAROE** :—What I understood was that Mr. Joshi was going to deal with the legal aspects. But, except on this question of the right to strike, what Mr. Joshi has done is to submit that most of the rules are unreasonable. There was first the question of the Manager's decision being final. He has practically admitted that if the rule is altered in the sense that I suggested to you the other day, namely, that the question shall be referred to the Mill Manager as an arbitrator under the Indian Arbitration Act, 1899, it would be impossible then to go to court. Mr. Joshi has practically admitted that. He has said that is reasonable.

The next question is the question of the strike, that it should not be permissible for the owner to contract with the workman that the latter should not strike without giving notice.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—It is a little beyond that : he should not be allowed to be dismissed, if he does strike.

**MR. CAROE** :—That is the next stage, to say that he should not be dismissed if he does strike. In the first place, I say it is perfectly legal to make such a contract, because, as was pointed out, the Act clearly exempts agreements, and, quite apart from that, the strike must be for one of the objects mentioned in the Act. It certainly has been held at Home that in what is known as a general strike—which really is the point put by Mr. Joshi—if others go out these men would have to go out, and that would be in any case wrong. But what I say is that it is perfectly permissible for an employer to contract with a workman to say “You shall not strike without giving the proper notice, which you are bound to do before you propose to terminate your contract.” Personally, it does not really seem to be an unreasonable thing to do. There may be something which certainly strikes the workman as a great grievance, and if he is entitled legally to walk out before he really has time to think about it, if somebody gets up and says “Let us strike” and they walk out, once they walk out it is very difficult to get them to consider the situation. If the workman knows that he has no right to walk out for 14 days, it would really give them an opportunity to consider the position and see whether in that fortnight it would not be possible to come to some settlement with regard to that dispute. That is the object of the clause. It is not really to keep the workmen

in a state of servitude, as is rather suggested. Without that, if I may say so, the hot-heads would be entitled to get out everybody, without waiting for the leader to come and try to arrive at a settlement. At home, these matters are referred from one small body to the larger body, and then to the Trade Union, and then the Employers' Federation. That can be done in these 14 days. Otherwise, before the workman has had an opportunity of considering the matter, out he goes. It really is to protect the workmen, to prevent the men being dismissed for going and inciting other people.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**The same will apply to the employers ; they cannot legally lock out without giving notice.

**MR. CAROE :—**The employer is in exactly the same position, because he has to give his workmen 14 days' notice before he can stop work, subject of course to epidemics and things of that sort. The employer could not lock out the men in one mill without giving 14 days' notice, because another mill has a dispute. He could not assist another employer, or a federation of employers could not assist another federation by locking out the men without giving the workers proper notice. Therefore, it really is not so one-sided as is suggested. It is perfectly mutual, and it seems to me really fair and reasonable.

The other question was the question of forfeiture of wages. I think it was again practically admitted that there was nothing unreasonable in it. I cited some authorities last time about the difference between the forfeiture of women's and children's wages, which are certainly apart from other cases, which clearly show that forfeiture is legal and recognised by statute. About the right of search, in my humble opinion, it really makes no difference, as far as the law is concerned, quite apart from any question of the feeling of the workmen, whether you detain a man or search him. It makes no difference in law whatsoever.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**He may say he was assaulted.

**MR. CAROE :—**Exactly. I do not think there is any difference. If a workman is allowed by the rules in the mill to walk out because his time of work is finished, and if the gateman puts his hand in front of this man and tells him "You are not to leave until I fetch a policeman" the gateman has committed an assault, because he has prevented the man from going away, when he is by law entitled to go out. If there was no provision to that effect in the rules, in my opinion, if the workman sued the gateman for illegal restraint, it would be extremely difficult for the gate-keeper to answer the charge, in the absence of such a rule. The section in the Criminal Procedure Code, to which Mr. Joshi has referred, has nothing to do with it, because, you, Sir, pointed out that the offence must be committed in the presence of the man who detains the culprit, and to say that an offence is committed in the eyes of the

gate-keeper by a man hiding in his coat or tiffin carrier a dhoti, is an argument which no court of law would entertain. He may have grave suspicion, and he may have caught the wrong man. I cannot, with respect, quite follow the point of view that it is best to leave these things to custom. I cannot see really any particular reason for that. It seems to me very much more reasonable that the man should have notice before he enters employment what he might suffer, rather than that there should be a sort of custom. These rules are to be there, and if in addition to that there are to be a number of customary practices imported into them, it might be argued by the workmen "Here we have got 25 or 26 Rules, and if you meant a provision that we were to be searched, you could have put it in."

As regards the words "insubordination" and "disobedience," Mr. Joshi said they were vague words. I really do not know, but "disobedience" seems to be a very good old English word. Everybody knows what it means. I do not know how anybody could define "disobedience." It really seems very difficult to suggest.

As regards these other countries, I really do not know what reference they have to the present case. What we really have to consider here is whether it is reasonable or not.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**There are one or two points in regard to Standing Order No. 8, which I want to ask you about. The first sentence of that Order with the amendment I suggested, would read :—

"Any operative who, after presenting his ticket, is found absent from his proper place or places of work without leave or other sufficient excuse, is liable to be treated as absent without leave."

The second sentence is :—

"Any operative who desires to obtain leave of absence must apply previously to the Head of his Department or any officer appointed by the Manager for this purpose."

Standing Order 8 is primarily dealing with the case of a man who is in the mill premises, but is absent from his work?

**MR. CAROE :—**Yes.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**The second sentence is rather a general sentence. It may apply to a man who has not even come to the mill. Would it not be better to put it somewhat as follows :—

"Any operative who desires to leave his work, except for temporary purposes and within the mill premises, must apply previously for leave in accordance with Standing Order No. 17."

Would that express what is intended ?

MR. CAROE :—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Keep this to the case of operatives who are in the mill premises, but who are absent from work. If he wants to leave his work and to leave the mill premises, then he must go and get leave. But otherwise, it does not say practically how he is to get leave in the case of his just wanting to go out for a temporary purpose. I understand that is left rather vague.

MR. STONES :—This Standing Order mainly covers the case of a man who does not turn up, but allows another man to throw in his ticket. In that case, the man would not be found there. Another man may throw in the absent man's ticket, but the absentee will be regarded as being in the mill, but he would not be found ; in which case, he would not be in the mill premises.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Any operative who desires not to go to work or to leave his work ; you want to cover both cases ?

MR. STONES :—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Revised Rule 15: About the services of an operative drawing a monthly wage being terminated by fourteen days' notice, we discussed that question, and decided to have simply one sentence to cover operatives on time wages as well as operatives on daily wages. Would it meet the case if it was drafted in the following way :—

“ The service of any operative may be terminated by fourteen days notice or by payment of 13 days' wages in lieu of notice. If he draws wages on piece rate basis, 13 days' wages shall be paid computed on the average daily earnings of such operative for the previous calendar month.”

MR. STONES :—Yes.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—But the first sentence talks about “monthly wage.”

THE CHAIRMAN :—All that they meant was that he is getting his time wage. We do not want this distinction at all. Even in the case of time wage earners, they are on a daily earning basis really, a month of 26 days ; so that you do not really want to say anything about drawing monthly wages.

MR. STONES :—The clause you have suggested now says explicitly what we intend.

MR. KAMAT :—On the question of lightning strikes, in Rule 19 (b), I should like to ask Mr. Stones as well as Mr. Bakhale, whether it would not be better to provide a set of rules for the settlement of trade disputes, instead of having an indirect rule in the Standing Orders.



MR. STONES :—The Millowners have a meeting at 2-30 p. m. to-day to consider the final form of the Joint Committee, and the rules which will govern strikes. For example, we say that no lock-out or strike shall be declared until certain processes have been gone through. That does not do away with the responsibility of striking work without notice. It is based on the assumption that even notices will not be tendered until a certain procedure has been gone through. This is a different thing altogether.

MR. KAMAT :—You want this in addition to the other rules that you are proposing to frame ?

MR. STONES :—Yes. We have a meeting to-day, and we will send them to you to-morrow.

MR. DANGE :—I just want to draw your attention to the substitute operatives. There is a class of operatives floating inside and outside every mill in Bombay. Their position has not been defined in the standardisation-scheme as regards the manner in which they are to be engaged and paid and their rights when they are employed.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We are asked to consider and report on certain matters referred to in the terms of reference. We cannot go outside the terms of reference.

MR. DANGE :—The other side has promised at the outset that that question will be considered and another set of rules will be framed.

MR. STONES :—I am not aware of any such promise.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I take it that *prima facie* a substitute is an operative under the definition of these rules and that he would be subject to disciplinary and other rules except with regard to giving of notice, as it is recognised that he is there temporarily. Some of the rules will apply in his case.

MR. DANGE :—The other general rules may be applicable but the question with regard to the payment and the date or dates on which the payment should be made has not been made clear.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is for the Millowners' Association to consider. I do not think any difficulty has arisen in the past. Has any difficulty arisen before ?

MR. STONES :—Not that I am aware of. In the bulk of the mills, the weavers pay their own substitutes. On the spinning side, we mark the No. of the operative absent against the name of the substitute and he gets his wage as an ordinary workman.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The substitute is shown in the muster ?

MR. STONES :—In the case of weavers it is a sub-contract and a fixed payment is made by the weaver to his substitute. Some weavers pay their substitutes Rs. 2/-. Others pay Rs. 1-2-0 whereas they actually receive Rs. 2/- as their wages.

MR. DANGE :—There is a system in which if a spinner is absent and if a *budli* is engaged the spinner is marked present on the muster roll. Under these rules is he to be considered as an absentee or a man who is present.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is a conundrum into which we will not go now. I think we must confine ourselves to the terms of reference.

MR. HINCHCLIFF :—This is the ticket book for 1927 for the Textile Mill. I could not find the book for the same year for the Spring Mill.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Your case is that the ticket system was in force for the whole of 1927.

MR. HINCHCLIFF :—The whole of 1927 upto April 1928. After the general strike they refused to drop tickets.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Has the system been in force as in the case of the Spring Mill since 1923?.....

MR. HINCHCLIFF —Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN :—If you want you can see the book.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is nothing there—whether it is the Textile Mill.....

MR. HINCHCLIFF :—Some portions have been eaten by white ants.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We adjourn till Monday for the discussion of the spinning section.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As regards this I know that the programme has been definitely fixed by you for the next two weeks; it was agreed to by us. Since then we have had joint consultations and have come to the conclusion that, if at this particular stage of the inquiry we are permitted to have a conference between ourselves and thrash out the details of the standardisation scheme, we shall be able to arrive at such an understanding that will go much to eliminate the work of the Committee. Not only that but we find that with regard to the differences which at the commencement seemed to be insurmountable the representatives of both sides now feel that an understanding can be arrived at, if time is given for mutual discussion. We feel that there is even a chance of a settlement which is very desirable in the interests of the industry itself and which will greatly expedite your decision

also. The very fact that we are now able to make this application jointly is I think a clear indication that the representatives of both sides believe that such a settlement on several points is not improbable. Now, Sir, we have got rid of the 17 Demands and the Standing Orders. I hope, Sir, you will allow us a week so that at the end of the week we may come and put our case before you. I feel sure that this will expedite the report considerably. If all the points are again to be discussed in your presence I am afraid it will perhaps take much longer time and may perhaps not lead to that understanding which we hope to arrive at. I hope that since both sides are agreeable the committee will have no objection.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What is the view of the other side ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I am speaking on their behalf also.

MR. BAKHALE :—We had consultations yesterday with the other side and we believe that even if we are to thrash out every point from line to line in the standardisation scheme with reference to the oral evidence on them we think we shall not be able to finish in a week's time. If we sit together and try to arrive at an agreement on certain points, those points need not be discussed here. That will save considerable time of the committee and we may be able to place before the committee such points on which we could not come to an agreement. The points on which we agree will also come before you. But at any rate the discussion will be confined to points of disagreement. This will curtail the discussion to a very great extent. If we begin to sit on Monday and go on discussing here, that process will take as much or perhaps longer time than we may take for this conference.

THE CHAIRMAN :—From the spirit in which the discussions have been carried on so far, it does not seem that either side will yield to the other.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The very fact that I am able to make this application not only on behalf of the Millowners' Association but also on behalf of the other side is sufficient indication. Unless there is a great likelihood of an agreement being come to, we would not trouble the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Does Mr. Dange agree ?

MR. DANGE :—Yes, Sir.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We are not a conciliation committee to see whether any settlement could be arrived at, though it would be nice to have a settlement. Our main business is to report whether certain proposals made are fair and reasonable. We are instructed to do it as soon as possible. A week's adjournment would mean that our report would be delayed by that time. If some agree-

ment is arrived at on certain important points, I quite agree that the time we allow for discussion will be saved. What I am afraid of is that you will come at the end of the week and say: "Very sorry we were not able to come to any decision."

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The standardisation scheme is a highly technical subject: and it is very difficult to discuss before the committee all the details. The other side has got an expert adviser and Mr. Dange himself has studied the scheme well. If we sit together and thrash it out from day to day, I am sure we will be able to arrive at an agreement on many points, which will expedite the time of the committee.

MR. KAMAT :—If there is disagreement, we will be losing time.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We have had a full and frank discussion. We believe that there are points that can easily be settled and an understanding arrived at. Anyhow the standardisation scheme is subject to revision and has got to be adjusted; and the committee will say whether that should be on the basis of a 7½ per cent. cut or otherwise. As regards details we feel that many of the differences can be easily eliminated by giving way by one side or the other. That will be done. If details can be got rid of, then there remains the main principle about the cut. Even there perhaps both sides will have a chance to review the matter in the light of part discussions and there may be a discussion on that.

MR. STONES :—We will report to you the progress from day to day. If it comes to nothing than you can say, "Line up."

THE CHAIRMAN :—We may agree to adjourn till Wednesday or Thursday. Then you may come up and if necessary we can take up spinning.

MR. STONES :—If you give us the whole of next week we may be able to finish the discussion of both spinning and weaving. Anyhow the decision of the committee is not binding either on the millowners or employees. We shall have to thrash out the whole thing. If we two combine and come to an agreement it will be to the advantage of the industry and the labours of the committee. After the discussion we had yesterday we feel it is possible to come to an agreement on many points; and that is the only reason for making this application for an adjournment. Anyway we will be reporting to you the progress from day to day. As many members are standing for election, they may not be able to sit for discussion on Tuesday, when the election takes place.

MR. BAKHALE :—We will not be able to discuss on Tuesday.

MR. STONES :—We have got definite figures and proposals to put before them which we feel can be discussed more freely outside the legal atmosphere of this committee.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You can discuss on Sunday and Monday and report the progress on Wednesday.

MR. BAKHALE :—We will come here on Wednesday and report how far we have gone on with our discussion. If we are able to report such progress as will serve a useful purpose then we may be given two days more.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We agree to that.

MR. STONES :—We will discuss on Sunday, and Monday. As Tuesday will be election day there will be no discussion. We will report the progress to the committee on Wednesday at 11-15 A. M.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Adjourned accordingly to 11-15 A. M. on Wednesday.

---

---

*Wednesday, 30th January 1929.*

---

---

Wednesday, the 30th January, 1929.

The Committee met at the Town Hall, Bombay, at 11-15 A. M.

Present :—

THE CHAIRMAN.

MR. KHAREGHAT.

MR. KAMAT.

---

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The postponement which you were kind enough to concede gave us an opportunity during the last two or three days to discuss the details of the standardisation scheme very fully. The Spinning Section was first gone into item by item and certain verbal alterations were agreed to with a view to define more clearly the position in respect of different operatives. Then Sir, in the Mixing Room (page 2) the rate for lattice feeders was increased from Rs. 14/- to Rs. 15/-. Similarly in the Card Room (page 4) the rate for card tenters was increased by mutual agreement from Rs. 13-8-0 to Rs. 14-8-0. In the Speed Frames, the main items of the scheme have been accepted, subject to our proving that the efficiencies we give at page 6 can be reasonably obtained, with the exception of the rate for roving tenters which they wish to discuss before the Committee. In the Ring Frame, an alteration was agreed to after discussion regarding the complement of doffer boys per thousand spindles in counts up to 30s. The number allowed in the scheme has been raised by about 10 per cent. roughly. As to the rates in this department, our friends want the rates for doffer boys and siders up to 300 spindles to be discussed before the Committee, as we have not agreed to put these rates up since they have already been put up and are now higher than the rates that prevailed in 1923 and 1926. Then in the Ring Frame (page 8) special provision was made in the original scheme for the number of hands where doffer boys did the work of tarwallas also, but no detail was given as to the number when particular counts were spun, and these will be provided for. Then, Sir, the extra number of doffer boys will of course reduce the number of men displaced in the Spinning Section, but still the labour representatives wish to discuss before the Committee the question of dealing with the unemployment which will be brought about by such retrenchment.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—That is a general matter.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes ; that is a general question.

MR. BAKHALE :—Generally in relation to the Spinning Section.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As regards Reeling, they want to be satisfied as to the equity of the rates proposed, and it has been arranged to get more detailed information from what are essentially reeling mills ; and that I think we can give them in a day or two.

Then, Sir, we have also discussed the Weaving Section. As to the Winding Department, coloured and grey, it was agreed to try out the present rates for a period of 3 months after the introduction of the standardisation scheme, with a view to ascertain whether the wages in the list can be obtained. The same remarks apply to the sizing department. In the warping department our friends feel that the average wage of Rs. 52/- for ten hours' work is not sufficient looking to the nature of the work. That is a point which has to be argued out before the committee. In the drawing-in department minor alterations were agreed to which are not of very great importance. Then as regards the weavers' rates discussion of details of certain revisions which we suggested are still proceeding and further time is necessary before we can give an indication as to whether we agree.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Is there a likelihood of an agreement being reached ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—So far, we have revised many portions. In the first place the statement which we have given to you is with reference to a particular month, July 1927. That shows that the cut is about 12 per cent. including jobbers. There of course you must have noticed that the average worked out is high—Rs. 52/-. Under the standardisation it is Rs. 46-12-0, so that even there although the cut is 12 per cent. the wage which we say the weaver ought to get under the standardisation scheme has been obtained. Our contention is that the average is Rs. 48/- which we wish to bring down to Rs. 44-8-0. At any rate we have to arrange the scheme in such a manner that the other side feels more or less confident that the cut will not exceed at any rate 7 per cent. With that view we have made certain alterations. There was a good deal of discussion on parity between sorts and sorts. There also on certain sorts we are in perfect agreement ; and we feel that certain allowances have got to be altered. We have now worked out a scheme. What the other side still wants to know is how it will work out in actual practice in some representative mill on the present sorts. We have obtained these figures which we wish to go through.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What is the suggestion now ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The suggestion is that if we are allowed this week we will be able to let you know on Monday whether we should take up one or two items in the spinning section and the question of retrenchment ; and in the weaving section the points on which we could not agree.



MR. STONES :—Within five days we will be able to finish everything.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Mr. Bakhale, what is your opinion?

MR. BAKHALE :—As regards the spinning section I support generally the request of Mr. Saklatvala for further adjournment. From his statement you will see that we have made certain progress, so far as the spinning section is concerned. There are two or three items which we are anxious to go through before the committee, because I think there cannot be any agreement on these points. Also we propose to discuss the question of retrenchment in the spinning section generally and the savings they have been able to make in the total wage bill. Personally I believe that as a result of private negotiation we have been able to eliminate a good deal of discussion before the committee. There are only a few points on which I want to insist before the committee and take their decision.

In the weaving section practically every page so far as weavers are concerned is altered considerably. We are not in the position to judge where we exactly stand in relation to the altered statements that they have given us as regards basic rates on page 13 and the different allowances. Unless we go through this and compare them with the book of examples that we have got, it is very difficult for us to say where we can agree or where we cannot agree. Apart from this question of the standardisation scheme and the different items under it, there is the big question of the cut which the millowners themselves have admitted has been brought down from 12½ per cent. to between 6 and 7 per cent.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It was always understood that the scheme has got to be revised on that basis.

MR. BAKHALE :—Anyway from the latest statement that they gave us, the cut was much more than 7½ per cent. When they found it they so adjusted the statement for weaving as to reduce the cut to between 6 to 7 per cent. We have taken from the beginning the stand that under no circumstances are we agreeable to a cut and we still maintain that position. Although we may go through them item by item and satisfy ourselves that the cut is between 6 and 7 per cent. the main fundamental question remains about the wage cut. I think we shall have to discuss it before the committee.

MR. STONES :—As regards the point of reduction of men in the spinning section it can be discussed before the committee. As to the cut of 7½ per cent. in the weaving section can equally be discussed before the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Sizing and warping?

MR. BAKHALE :—Warping we are going to discuss. As regards sizing and winding, we have decided to give a trial to the system for three months because we have got very little information about these departments.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What about the rationalisation scheme?

MR. BAKHALE :—We have not discussed it for want of time.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The progress have been satisfactory. We agree to an adjournment till Monday next.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—If you disagree as regards the amount of cut, would you be able to settle how the rates are to be adjusted. There might be a general agreement on one or two points.

MR. STONES :—Even if the committee makes its recommendation, we have still to decide that because it is not obligatory on either side to accept the findings of the committee. In the event of any cut arising on that, how is that to be applied we are discussing that too.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Can you agree on the allowances?

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not think we shall be able to agree with regard to all the allowances. For example take the Dhoti allowance. I do not think I am giving out any confidential thing when I say that the allowance under the new scheme has been actually cut down. I cannot be a party to that.

MR. STONES :—As in the spinning section we may not agree on certain items in the weaving section also. If you protest against the dhoti allowance being cut, you can argue it before the committee in relation to the other sorts.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What about the rules regarding the mediation committee?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We have already supplied a copy of the rules to the other side but they have not yet replied to it.

MR. BAKHALE :—We shall be able to put it before the committee on Monday.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We meet here on Monday next at 11-15 A. M. Put up a statement elucidating the points on which an agreement has been reached.

MR. STONES :—The statement showing the points in dispute and the points on which we have agreed will be ready for each member of the Committee and members on the other side also. They are already on record.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—The standardisation scheme with reference to increases in work also enters into the rationalisation scheme. Have you discussed it?

MR. STONES :—We have not touched it. I do not think it will take more than two days. It is a broad question. As soon as we finish with this scheme, we can discuss the rationalisation scheme and place before the committee any alteration or anything that may be necessary. Rationalisation scheme is objected to on very broad grounds.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—There is some rationalisation involved so far as the spinning section of the standardisation scheme is concerned.

MR. STONES :—They will be applied in definite relation to the existing standard scheme.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Will you revise the present wages?

MR. STONES :—We can go through that.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is another small point which I forgot to tell Mr. Saklatvala as regards the pay to be given to a man who will be asked to do double work. For example the lattice feeder. If under the scheme one lattice feeder or hopper feeder is paid Rs. 15/-. Another man minding two lattice feeders or hopper feeders is given Rs. 19/-, which is an increase of Rs. 4/- plus 70 per cent. This is also a general question, as to how much a man should get when he is asked to do double work, which may be discussed under rationalisation.

MR. STONES :—That is so.

MR. DANGE :—What percentage of the saving is to go to the employer and what percentage to the worker is a theoretical question, which will be determined under rationalisation.

MR. BAKHALE :—I need not discuss it now.

MR. STONES :—Standardisation does apply to this, but it is optional to the worker in the blow-room.

MR. KAMAT :—You want to fix it on the basis of percentage rather than piecemeal.

MR. BAKHALE :—We shall have to fix the percentage of the savings to be given to the owners and the workers.

MR. KAMAT :—So much per cent. for the owners and so much per cent. for the workers : you want it on that basis generally, without discussing each and every item specifically?

MR. BAKHALE :—That would be better.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Yes. There is nothing more?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—No.

The Committee adjourned till 11-15 A. M. on the 4th February, 1929.

---

---

*Monday, 4th February 1929.*

---

---

Monday, the 4th February, 1929.

The Committee met at the Town Hall, Bombay, at 11-15 A. M.

Present:—

THE CHAIRMAN.

MR. KHAREGHAT.

MR. KAMAT.

---

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Sir, in the first place I am glad to announce that the rules for mediation which the Millowners' Association had formulated have been accepted by the other side.

MR. BAKHALE :—Not fully.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Of course there are a few points which they want to suggest, but they have accepted the rules. I think, Sir, that these rules undoubtedly laid the foundation of a better understanding, and if these rules are acted upon in future in the same spirit in which they have been accepted to-day I am sure we will see the end of these sporadic strikes which have been a disgraceful feature of the industry for the past five or six years and which have put to loss not only the operatives and the employers concerned in the dispute but even the community as a whole.

MR. BAKHALE :—Sir, I should like to suggest one or two modifications if you do not mind. So far as the principle is concerned we entirely agree with the rules as framed by the Bombay Millowners' Association, as we find that these rules are framed more or less on the Lancashire model. What I would like to suggest is that the number of representatives on each side should be slightly increased. In Rule No. 1 (1) it is stated :—

“Before any notice shall be given by either party to terminate employment for the purpose of a lockout or strike, the dispute shall be brought forthwith before a joint meeting consisting of two or more authorised representatives of the mill or mills concerned and an equal number of representatives of the Trade Union or Unions.....”

I do not know really what they exactly mean by “two or more”—whether half a dozen or a dozen.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Not so many as that; two or three.

MR. BAKHALE :—If it is to be only two or three I should like that number to be increased a bit. At the present time we have got more than one union in this textile industry, and it is rather difficult for us to fix it up between us if

the number is too small. So, I think it would be convenient to us, as also to the millowners I think, if the number is slightly increased wherever necessary.

MR. STONES :—Whatever number you bring, an equal number will be brought by the mills.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—At the same time there should not be too many.

MR. BAKHALE :—I know that ; the smaller the number the better.

MR. STONES :—Why not put “two to six.” The only thing is the mill management can bring only a limited number; there must be a maximum prescribed.

MR. BAKHALE :—Certainly we would not be unreasonable.

MR. KAMAT :—If eventually you form very many unions, would you not wish to have an amalgamated union ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I think we will have to think of that later on.

MR. KAMAT :—A day must come when you will have an amalgamated union.

MR. BAKHALE :—We have to deal with conditions as they are to-day,

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Put it “two to six.”

MR. BAKHALE :—That would be better.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—You can modify that by mutual agreement.

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not think there would be any difficulty if we want to increase the number to 9 or 12 in any particular mill. We may therefore say “joint meeting consisting of not less than two and not more than six.”

MR. KHAREGHAT :—If you like you may add the word “ordinarily.”

MR. STONES :—Six would be the maximum that a mill management could put up.

THE CHAIRMAN :—In exceptional circumstances, you can always increase the number by mutual agreement.

MR. BAKHALE :—I should like to make one addition to these rules, and that is as regards the common complaints of the operatives which generally create irritation and that irritation again leads to a dispute. My suggestion is this ; as they have provided for these committees in order to meet the contingency of a lock-out or strike, they should also lay down that periodical meetings, say monthly meetings, should be held between the representatives of the mills and the representatives of the Trade Unions to deal with complaints of the operatives, so that

there may not be any accumulation of these complaints which generally lead to irritation on the part of the operatives. If this is done, I think these rules will be acceptable to us.

MR. STONES :—That, Sir, is covered by Special Proviso No. 4.

MR. BAKHALE :—Under that proviso you have a condition that an application has to be made first. What I suggest is that there should be a rule providing for periodical meetings to deal with complaints of a somewhat serious character.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You want a Joint Works Committee ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes ; more or less on the same lines.

MR. KAMAT :—You want a standing committee to deal with general complaints ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes ; we should have an opportunity to meet the other side and deal with the complaints if any. I do not think there will be anything lost thereby ; on the other hand, it will eliminate a good deal of discontent if the committee works satisfactorily.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I do not think it is necessary. Very often what happens is, when there are periodical meetings simply because there is going to be a meeting even very trivial complaints are brought up. They have got the right to call a meeting by making an application.

MR. ASVALE :—The complaints will accumulate.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Complaints need not accumulate. Any complaint, can be brought up immediately.

MR. BAKHALE :—I am making this suggestion to you, Mr. Chairman, because I find similar committees working in England, particularly in the Rowntree Cocoa Works. There I find that each department has got its own committee which meets the management periodically, and deals not only with the workers' grievances but also with certain other matters which conduce to the good working of that particular department. I find that those committees work very satisfactorily and that the relations between the management and the workers in that particular factory are extremely satisfactory. Mr. Rowntree himself said that he gained a good deal by instituting these committees in each department. I therefore feel that time will not be lost ; perhaps in the beginning some time may be lost, but it will have its advantages also a little later when the workers begin to realise the importance of these meetings.

MR. STONES :—You want a standing committee for all the mills together ?

MR. BAKHALE —No, no. For each mill.

MR. STONES :—Sir, our experience has been really terrible on this very matter. The Girni Kamgar Union have appointed what they call committees in each department of each of our mills, and the strikes that we have had have been traced to over-zealous representatives without any education or sense of responsibility who think that they do good work for the union by fostering or creating points of disagreement. In every case, since the mills resumed work, we have directly traced the strike to these men, and in no case their union has authorised or asked them to create the trouble. The point raised by Mr. Bakhale is an excellent one, given educated employees with a sense of their responsibility. But unfortunately at the present time, in Bombay we have not got them. It may come later on, but I should certainly strenuously resist it to-day. There is provision made already for dealing with any cause of complaint. The creating of a Works Committee inside each mill will cause trouble and has definitely caused trouble. We have not got enough men with a sense of responsibility towards their own unions apart from their sense of responsibility to the employers.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Could not that question be left over till the Labour Commission comes ?

MR. STONES :—I think such men will come in time, but at present we have not got them.

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not want to discuss this proposal by judging the conduct of the operatives at present, because we are really living in abnormal times at the present moment. But I believe that if these committees are instituted the conduct of the operatives will be improved considerably and they will deal with the employers with consideration and also they will be a little more cautious than they are apt to be at the present time. I quite agree that they are not as educated as they ought to be, but that is exactly the reason why these avenues should be open to them in order to get practical training in their work. The fact that the workers do not come into contact with the managers or with the management is really to a very great extent responsible for the present friction between the management and the workers. So, I want an opportunity to be given to the operatives and the management to come together at least once in a month or so. I think that will lead to good results.

MR. KAMAT :—Are the committees you referred to as existing in England common to all industries, including the textile industry ?

MR. STONES :—They may be anywhere outside the textile industry but not in the textile industry.



MR. BAKHALE :—Whenever there is a small complaint in Lancashire, the Secretary immediately goes to the factory and settles the matter ; when there is a serious trouble the matter is taken to the committee.

MR. STONES :—I do not know the rules, but that is exactly what happens. If there is any little discrepancy, the Secretary is telephoned up ; he sits down with the mill manager and discusses the matter with him. If there is something not provided for by the rules, that is referred to the main body. Otherwise, 99 per cent. of the disputes are small ones and are settled amicably without reference to anybody other than the Secretary of the Union and the management concerned. There is some point in Mr. Bakhale's suggestion, but this is not the right time to appoint such committees. We are in abnormal times, let us have these rules first, and when normal times come it may be possible to have such committees. To-day they will create more unrest.

MR. BAKHALE :—I just place my proposal before the Committee for their serious consideration.

As regards the rest of the Rules, I do not think there is any objection on our part.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That covers both sections of your party, yours as well as Mr. Dange's?

MR. BAKHALE :—I had a talk with Mr. Dange about these rules, and he said that he wanted to suggest one or two modifications ; what those modifications were he did not tell me.

MR. KAMAT :—Is he not coming to-day ?

MR. STONES :—As all the mills have stopped, owing to the kidnapping scare, he may be going about the mill area.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We will now take up the Standardisation Scheme.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—After we dispersed last, we discussed the Weaving List, and we revised our figures as shown in the list supplied to you. Page 13 was the main stumbling block, as there we provide for "all classes of cloth" made in Bombay. However, at last we have come to an agreement on this page; and these figures have now been accepted. I may just mention, Sir, that these figures have been so revised that the other side can have an assurance that the cut will not go over ~~5 or~~  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. We believe the actual cut will be between 6 and 7 per cent. There was also some discussion as regards the parity between sorts and sorts. To meet most of their objections we have revised these figures so that the parity between, say, a narrow loom and a wide loom, as also between sorts and sorts, has now been made more acceptable to them. So, we have agreed on page 13.

Similarly, as regards page 14, we are in complete agreement.

As regards page 15, they want to discuss before the Committee the Weft allowances specially for finer counts. You will notice, Sir, that in the case of 6" lifts and lifts over 6" we stop after 15s. Their contention is that although we have provided very liberal allowances for the lower counts we have not provided sufficient allowances for the higher counts. That is a matter which they wish to bring before the Committee.

MR. BAKHALE :—Deductions also.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes. As regards the last column, they object to the deductions which we have made for universal pirns. They agree to the allowances, but they object to the deductions of 1 to 3 per cent. when counts are over 16s.

MR. BAKHALE :—On page 15, we have got general disagreement with the allowances for finer wefts.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I have said that. You agree as regards the allowances for the lower counts, but you think higher allowances should be provided for in the case of higher counts.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—From 16s to 20s?

MR. BAKHALE :—From 10s generally.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—They agree to the allowances provided for up to the 10s; they think that the other allowances should be raised. We have provided no allowances after 15s, and that they contend that allowances should be made for them also.

Then, as regards page 16, they do not agree to the width allowances, specially for 30s and upwards.

Then, you will notice that we have provided two rates of allowances, one for plain looms and the other for drop box looms. We have taken the allowances originally provided in the case of drop box, and this has been shown in the column. There also, on cloth over 30", they dispute our figure. Again, on page 18, where we have given the Dhoti allowances, they object to the reduction which we have made in column 3. Originally it was 20 per cent., 23 per cent. and so on. We have reduced this to 15 per cent., 18 per cent., 22 per cent., 25 per cent. and 30 per cent. This is due to the fact that in the second column for counts 28s up to 32s warp from Uganda or American cotton, the original allowance started with 10 per cent., and we put here 5 per cent. They are going to dispute the whole of the dhoti allowances. Do you agree to the shaft allowances on dhoties, Mr. Bakhale?

MR. BAKHALE :—We will discuss the whole of the dhoti allowances.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Barring these points, there is agreement in the weaving section. Of course, this is all based on the assumption that there is going to be a  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. cut. They of course want to take up the whole question whether there should be a cut or not, and that point will be reserved. They also want higher allowances as regards two beams (page 17 of the amended standardised rates and wages, weaving section). On the same page, as regards cloth woven on Fast Reed Looms, we have already raised the allowance from 5 per cent. to 10 per cent., to which they have agreed.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What do they object to on page 17?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—They object to two beams allowances. They also object to art silk weft allowance. We provide 10 per cent., but they want more in the case of art silk.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We have got to go through the scheme page by page.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As regards Spinning, we need not go page by page, but we shall take up the points where we have disagreed. We have already indicated the points on which we could not agree.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Take Note No. 1 on the first page which says "All the rates are based on full 10 hours working day for all adult male operatives." Have you come to an agreement on that point?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That has not been dealt with.

MR. BAKHALE :—We did not consider this page at all. But so far as the first clause of the "Notes" is concerned, I think we have made a statement when we were discussing the working hours of the mechanics and fitters; our objection stands even to-day.

MR. STONES :—The only people affected by that section are in the Warehouse Department, the Calendering Department and the Folding Department.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Under No. 1?

MR. STONES :—In the spinning section, there are one or two mills working less hours for departmental fitters but the bulk of them work 10 hours. In weaving, the winders and warpers work varying periods in various mills; any way the warpers work from 9 to 10 hours, and the sizers also work the same.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Had not we better start with the spinning? Regarding allowances, the point arose whether they should be consolidated.

MR. STONES :—That holds good.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Then there was the point about 5 pies and 6 pies. Is that objected to still ?

MR. STONES :—I do not think they object to it now.

MR. BAKHALE :—I agree to that.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—On the first page there is nothing. As I had indicated, we will be more explicit in defining the duties. As regards lattice feeders, we have agreed to mention the distance. We say there "To carry cotton from mixing, feed, clean and oil machines and carry away droppings and fly." The question was raised that they should be made to do this only within a reasonable distance, and we have promised to fix that distance, after satisfying them as to the actual existing conditions.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—That is with respect to one man to look after two lattices ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Is that settled ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes.

MR. BAKHALE :—During the course of our discussion on mixing and blow room departments, Mr. Maloney said that after our agreeing to the wage figures and the duties, all the pages would require re-editing. Take, for example mixing spreaders and bale breaker men ; they are employed in lieu of nowgannies. That means if nowgannies are not employed, mixing spreaders and bale breakers may be employed, and they will be paid Rs. 15/-. As nowgannies are paid Rs. 18/-, there is no reason why the people who are engaged in place of nowgannies should be paid less than Rs. 18. It was pointed out that this should be split up, and there should be two separate designations put separately, *e. g.*, bale breakers Rs. 18/- plus 70 per cent., mixing spreaders Rs. 15/- plus 70 per cent. Here the duties of these people will have to be defined. They have agreed to that. So, I think that generally we agree with the amendments that have been made now, subject to the proviso that, as we have asked for a minimum wage, we feel that these wages are low, as compared with the minimum wage for which we have fought before the Committee. Taking the thing as a whole, we have agreed to the scheme. If the minimum wage question is not settled in our favour, and at the same time we fail in our later discussions about the parity between the wages of the spinners and the wages of the weavers, that is a question we shall discuss when we come to the wage cut. Barring these two exceptions, we have accepted the 1st page "Mixing and Blow Room."

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—When are we likely to get the revised edition ?

**MR. STONES** :—As soon as we have gone through the whole of the spinning section, we will re-edit it and submit it for approval. We will do it some time this week.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—Have they agreed to one man attending to two machines ?

**MR. BAKHALE** :—That is optional. On page 2 also, we have “ Exhaust and Lap Machines or Breaker Scutcher, Intermediate and Finishing Scutchers, Rs. 16/- plus 70/- per cent. This pay to be given to machine men as here designated when one man attends to one machine.” Taking these two things together, it is optional. So, they have decided to put it together, and make the explicit remark that it is optional and not compulsory. We have agreed to the option being retained.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—What about the rates ?

**MR. BAKHALE** :—As regards the rates, if a man is asked to do double the work that he was doing before, how much he should get for that double work is a question which may be discussed under Rationalisation. I am just giving you an illustration to prove that I did not consider this question of extra payment for doing double work. On page 5, you will find the remark “ In the case of mills working or proposing to work 2 Rovings with one Tenter, the earnings of the Tenter from 2 machines to be as follows.” etc. That question really comes under rationalisation.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—Which items remain subject to extra payment ? Let us mark them out together ; otherwise there will be a muddle later.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—That only applies where we leave the option to the men to work two machines,—Exhaust and Breaker Scutcher men, Rs. 21/-, plus 70 per cent.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—The first item is lattice feeders, on page 1 ?

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—They have agreed to the rate of Rs. 19/- here. On the next page, we have agreed to put up the rate from Rs. 14/- to Rs. 15/-, and these rates have been agreed to.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—Is the rate of Rs. 19/- agreed to, if the lattice feeder minds two machines ?

**MR. BAKHALE** :—It is rather difficult for me to say whether I did agree to it or not. I am certain about this point that I agreed to the option being retained. But what the wage should be for a man who does double the work is

really a question which, I thought, would come under Rationalisation. It is exactly for that reason that I did not discuss with the other side this question of roving tenters minding 2 rovings. I am sorry, if I did agree to that. Personally, I do not think that I did, so far as the wage of a man doing double the work is concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Can we take it that you still say that a man who does double the work should get more than the Association wants to give him ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN :—But subject to that objection, the wage might be accepted as fairly reasonable ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That covers pages 1 and 2 ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Page 3 is agreed to.

On page 4, we have raised the rate of card tenters from Rs. 13-8-0 to Rs. 14-8-0, and that was agreed to.

MR. KAMAT :—On page 2, has there been an agreement about Rs. 13-8-0 for Bardan Pickers ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes.

MR. BAKHALE :—Our only objection to that—and that was pointed out in another connection—is that men and women doing the same work should get the same wage. That objection stands. That is a general objection, and we did not consider it then.

THE CHAIRMAN :—On page 4, for Flat Grinders, there is 1 man to 2 flat grinding machines. Is that agreed to ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes. There we have raised the rate of card tenters from Rs. 13-8-0 to Rs. 14-8-0, and that of flat grinders from Rs. 16/- to Rs. 16-8-0. That is the only change made there.

As regards speed Frames, as I pointed out, they want to be satisfied as regards the efficiencies which we have given. We have got the figures from the mills, but unfortunately the mills have not given the figures properly. We are drawing up a form which we shall send to the mills, and on receipt of the particulars we shall satisfy them that the efficiencies which we have taken actually do obtain. Their main point is that as compared with the drawing tenter's rate, the slubbing tenter's rate and the intermediate tenter's rate, the roving tenter's

rate is too low, and they do not agree to the Rs. 32/- per machine. In the final roving, where we give them 30 per cent., 25 per cent., and 20 per cent. extra, it is again a general question. We have also made it clear to them that we do not give the option to work 2 rovings with 1 tenter to the men, but we give it to the mills. We have stated there "In the case of mills working or proposing to work 2 rovings with one tenter, the earnings of the tenter from 2 machines to be as follows," etc. The only proviso is that a mill can compel a man to work two sides only in the case of finer hanks, where the hank roving is 5 to 7 hanks and over.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :— That has to be shown with the proviso?

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—Yes.

As regards the rate of rovers, apart from the fact that we have already raised the rate as compared with the rate in 1923 and 1926, we would point out that in the English List the percentage is in fact lower than what we have proposed, compared with the slubber. On page 216 of the printed evidence, there is an article from 'The Textile Recorder' for July 14th 1928. It says "In order to give English cotton spinners suitable statistics which will enable them to compare the position of the Indian cotton mills with their own, the Cotton Yarn Association has compiled a report which gives some exceedingly useful information about India's cotton spinning and weaving industry," and so on. On page 219 of the printed evidence, they give their rates and go on comparing it with ours. For slubbing frames it is £ 0-12-0 per week, and for roving it is £ 0-7-0 to £ 0-8-0 per week. That means there is a reduction of 33 to 40 per cent. in the case of rovers as compared with slubbers. We propose that where the slubber gets Rs. 38/-, the roving man gets Rs. 32/- which is a reduction of 16 per cent. only. Therefore, we maintain that this reduction is quite justified, quite apart from the fact, as I said, that we have already given them more than in 1923. Even the English List gives a lesser percentage than we give.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—In the 1926 enquiry, the slubber was getting Rs. 1-2-4 time and Rs. 1-4-4 piece, and rovers the same.

**MR. STONES** :—In the Millowners' Standard the slubber is getting Rs. 1-7-4; in 1923 he was getting Rs. 1-5-3, and in 1926 Rs. 1-4-4. The rover is now getting Rs. 1-3-8 against Rs. 1-2-7 in 1923 and 1-4-4 in 1926; but all of them are dumped together.

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—In 1926 the rovers are not separated; (page 7 of Part II of the 1923 enquiry). Naturally the rovers should come out lower than the slubbers and intermediate men.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—When the man looks after 2 rovings, what does the other side want ?

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—There of course they want to raise the general question ; they say that 30 per cent. is not enough.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—What do they want to pay, roughly ?

**MR. BAKHALE** :—In our standardisation scheme we have provided Rs. 38/- for a roving tenter on 160 spindles, the same as a slubbing tenter on 84 spindles.

**MR. STONES** :—In the English Universal Standard List, the rate for a slubber on coarse hank is £ 0-19-0, for an intermediate man on 124 spindles it is £ 0-17-2, and the roving tenter on 160 spindles gets £ 0-13-8, Comparing the rate for the slubber with that of the rover it is 19 to 13, which means a reduction of over 30 per cent. According to the rates in the English list, it would be Rs. 27/- instead of Rs. 32/- for a roving tenter, and the intermediate man would get Rs. 24-4-0 as against Rs. 38/- for the slubber. The slubbing rate is given on page 110, the intermediate rate on page 114 and the roving rate on page 120 of the Year Book for 1925 of the Oldham Master Cotton Spinners Association, Limited.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—You say that the percentage for working two machines is higher than in England ?

**MR. STONES** :—The rates are given on page 121. The rate for one frame fine counts single roving £ 0-11-10 and on two frames £ 0-15-7.

**MR. BAKHALE** :—What is the year of the book ?

**MR. STONES** :—1925.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Is that for any particular count or fine counts.

**MR. STONES** :—Fine counts. From 3½ to 8 hanks the rate is £ 0-12-6 single roving ; double roving £ 0-16-5. Over 8 hanks £ 0-11-10 single roving and £ 0-15-7 for double roving.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—It is less troublesome than slubbing ?

**MR. STONES** :—Much less troublesome than slubbing. The yarn is fine and there is less doffing.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—In the 1922 list the rates are provided for 288 spindles.

**MR. STONES** :—That is phenomenal. The Bombay Standard is 160 spindles and we have taken that as the basis. We pay a higher rate—Rs. 34-8-0.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Is Mr. Bakhale ready to argue this ?



MR. ASAVALE :—I think the number of spindles have been increased.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The rates for varying spindles are given there on the ext page.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You do not get below 5 hanks ?

MR. STONES :—In 75 per cent. of the industry in Bombay it is  $3\frac{1}{2}$  and below.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You provide for two rovings for fine counts ?

MR. STONES :—There are two kinds of system. The new scheme that has been adopted in this book provides for two rovings on all fine counts ; and there is provision made upto five hanks on course counts. This is one section. The other section is optional. This is actually in force in the Swadeshi Mills.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Not after the strike. Prior to the strike we had one to two rovings.

MR. ASAVALE :—There was not a single witness that appeared before the committee who expressed willingness to do the work.

THE CHAIRMAN :—This of course is provided on the assumption that they can get men to do the work.

MR. BAKHALE :—While a slubbing tenter is paid Rs. 38/-, a roving tenter is paid Rs. 32/-. We think that it is not a fair wage for a roving tenter. We think that the roving tenter should get the same wage as a slubber.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Then, why do they make a difference in the Lancashire list ?

MR. BAKHALE :—That is difficult for me to answer. The Lancashire list, so far as I can see, is based somewhat differently from our scheme. There they have fixed the wage according to the spindles in one frame. I do not think we have done it here.

MR. STONES :—Oh, Yes. On page 6 we have provided :—

For 128-142	Spindles	Rs. 30-8-0
„ 144-156	„	„ 31-4-0
„ 158-170	„	„ 32-0-0
„ 172-184	„	„ 33-4-0

We have provided different rates for the different number of spindles according to the number of counts. That is also provided for.

MR. KAMAT :—Don't you think that roving is less troublesome than slubbing ?

MR. BAKHALE :—It may be.

MR. KAMAT :—Therefore, the rate for roving is less than Rs. 38/-.

MR. STONES :—The universal English list tacitly acknowledges this by the fact that they refuse to allow slubbers above 100 spindles to work double. They do not object to the working of intermediate or roving frame double. They provide a rate right through for two frames to operatives in both intermediate and roving sections. Above 100 spindles they insist that slubbing machines should be worked single. It is on page 110.

MR. BAKHALE :—So far as I am concerned, I may tell this much. It is rather difficult for laymen like myself to say whether a roving tenter has less arduous work to do than a slubbing tenter. From what little information we have been able to get from the operatives we have been able to come to the conclusion that the operatives feel that the arduous nature of the work is not such as to deserve a difference of Rs. 6/-. This difference the workers consider too much as compared with the kind of work that the slubbing tenter and roving tenter do.

Moreover we have taken the Lancashire list as our model. Now, it has been the tendency on the part of both sides to cite the authority of the Lancashire List, when the Lancashire List suits us. I have been citing it and the millowners have been doing the same. It is for you to consider whether the whole of the Lancashire List can be applied here and if so to what extent. The other side quotes the Lancashire List whenever it suits it. There are other points like bad spinning, cleaning and several other matters which are to be found in these two lists of Bolton and Oldham which have not been incorporated in the standardisation scheme. So, if we want to consider the drawing and speed frames, we must consider the other clauses also in the Lancashire List, if we are to be fair to our workers. There is no use taking one point and considering it and laying too much stress on it.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Rovers have been getting hitherto less than the slubbers?

MR. STONES :—The slubbers were getting Rs. 1-6-6, the intermediate were getting Rs. 1-2-1 and the rovers Rs. 1-1-4; and their wages have now been increased by 4 as., 3 as. and 2 as. 4 ps. respectively.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Would it not be better to produce before the committee a muster roll of some mill to show the difference in wages between a slubber and a rover.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I can produce the muster roll from one of our mills.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Would you be satisfied, Mr. Bakhale, if a muster roll of some mill is supplied where the wages of the slubbers and rovers are recorded for the past year ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not mind going through the musters.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—That will give us the information whether the slubbers were getting more than the rovers. You can easily supply the figures for the Tata Mills for December 1927 and January 1928.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes ; we will do so.

MR. ASAVALE :—There was dissatisfaction because the rovers were getting less than the slubbers.

MR. STONES :—There was no dissatisfaction.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Was there any strike, because the rovers did not get the same wages as the slubbers ?

MR. ASAVALE :—The Committee have seen with their own eyes when they visited the mills that there was no difference pointed out with reference to the work of a slubber and that of a rover.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is another point with regard to the stoppage of machinery in the roving department. There may not be sufficient work for the operatives. These men are paid on piecework rates. Their wages may go down.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is a general question coming under “playing off.”

MR. STONES :—It is on account of inter-relations and the laying out of the mill and counts spun. It is a general question.

MR. ASAVALE :—As their purpose has been served by the rovers they stop the slubbers.

MR. STONES :—It is not so.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Has the Labour Office collected the figures as regards wages of these operatives ?

MR. MEHRBAN :—Yes.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Will they show us separately the wages of the slubbers and rovers ?

MR. MEHRBAN :—Yes.

**MR. BAKHALE :—**We have agreed to make the sentence on page 5, column 3 more definite. The sentence runs thus :—

“ Pay to be arranged on sliding scale according to length of frame, hank working and efficiency.

**MR. STONES :—**This mainly refers to the sliding scale on the following page. We can put that separately.

**MR. BAKHALE :—**When are we to deal with the efficiency question? Is it coming before the Committee? We feel from our side that the efficiency figures put down here are too high and are not ordinarily obtainable. We feel that in accordance with the efficiency figures put down the workers may not be able to get the wages contained in page 5. Everything depends upon efficiency.

**MR. STONES :—**Some mills say that they get full efficiency and some mills complain that they are too low.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**When shall we get the figures?

**MR. STONES :—**We will try to get them before the week-end.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**If necessary, we can have a meeting on Monday next. We now go on to page 8—ring frame.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**On page 8 in the ring department they do not agree to the rate of doffer boys. According to the rate put down, it is Rs. 12/- plus 70 per cent. They do not agree. As regards piecers on page 9 they do not agree to the rate of Rs. 15-8-0 for a frame containing upto to 300 spindles.

**MR. BAKHALE :—**What we say is that the figure of Rs. 15-3-0 for a sider working upto to 300 spindles is too low and should be increased. We state this and leave it to the Committee. If the Committee thinks that the man working 300 spindles does less work than a man working 360 spindles, certainly the same wage cannot be maintained.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Do you mean to say that it should be Rs. 16/-?

**MR. BAKHALE :—**That is what we mean. We take only the first point and leave the other things in the hands of the Committee.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**The rate for doffer boys in our list works out to Re. 0-12-6 per day. In the 1923 list it comes to Re. 0-11-4 and in the 1926 list it comes to Re. 0-12-1. Therefore there is already a substantial increase.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Do they generally employ boys or girls as doffer boys?

MR. STONES :—Both boys and girls but a majority of them are boys. They commence their career on a low wage and it is open to them to go up to tarwallas, piccers, oilers and jobbers.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What do you say ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Rs. 12/- is too low a wage for anybody in the mill industry. Further I think there is a large number of operatives who work as doffer boys who are really women. Also there are a number of men who are employed as doffer boys. I should like to get statistics from the millowners to prove that they are really boys below a certain age and not men.

MR. ASAVALE :—They are not boys and girls as has been made out. The committee when they visited mills have seen men and women working as doffer boys.

MR. STONES :—They are side boys ; not doffer boys.

MR. ASAVALE :—I specially brought it to their notice during our visit to the mills that they were grown-up men and women.

MR. BAKHALE :—Anyway we should like to have information before we decide about their wage. Most of these operatives are either men or women. There may be a few exceptions to this rule. If that is so I cannot understand why a doffer boy should get Rs. 12/- when a back tenter in the speed frame who is also a learner should get Rs. 13-8-0. The sweeper also has been given Rs. 13-8-0.

MR. STONES :—The big difference is in the one entering with the prospect of employment at a higher wage later on than is at all possible for the other. The sweeper commences at Rs. 12/-, moves up to Rs. 15-8-0 and stops there. The tarwalla commences at Rs. 15-8-0, but has the prospect of being employed on a higher wage. As regards the roving tenter, he has a little more skilled work than the doffer boy in the spinning department.

MR. ASAVALE :—The sweepers are generally old people ; they are generally retired men.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Have you got any statistics about the age of these doffer boys ?

MR. STONES :—The Labour Office had some.

MR. BAKHALE :—Not about their age.

MR. STONES :—They call them boys and big lads.

MR. MEHRBAN :—At first we used those terms, but now we have found that the term 'big lads' is a misnomer, and that those who were termed big lads were really older men, and therefore we have dropped that term now.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Have you got no information in the Millowners' Association?

MR. STONES :—None officially. If we go to a mill and ask the doffer boys and the side boys to line up separately, we shall find that the side boys are often men and women. For the doffer boys, the big thing is nimbleness and quickness of hand.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The Factory Department must have some record about boys in the mills.

MR. STONES :—If you write to them they may be able to give the figures.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It will take time to get from each mill a statement about the number of boys under the age of 18 whom they employ?

MR. STONES :—They may have no records about their age; they can only go round and ask the ages of their employees.

MR. BAKHALE :—You can give surprise visits to a few mills in Bombay and find out yourself, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STONES :—We would welcome that.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Have the doffer boys asked for more pay?

MR. BAKHALE :—You will find that increased wages have been given even to those workers who have not gone on strike. I do not think that the card tenter or the can boy asked for Rs. 14-8-0 which has now been given to them by the Millowners.

MR. STONES :—The can boy is either a man or a grown up woman, but the doffer boys are really boys.

THE CHAIRMAN :—If the doffer boys are really boys, then you have no objection to the rate proposed?

MR. BAKHALE :—Even then, I have objection. I consider Rs. 12/- to be too low for anybody.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Rs. 12/- means more than Rs. 20/- if you add the 70 per cent. to it.

MR. BAKHALE :—I consider that too too low for a worker.

MR. STONES :—Mr. Maloney started as a doffer boy at 5 sh. a week in England. The doffer boy can work up and become a manager.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What about the Ring Piecer ?

MR. BAKHALE :—As regards the ring piecer, I would ask you to compare his wage with the wage of the tarwalla and then decide what his wage should be. The tarwalla will now get Rs. 15-8-0, and the ring piecer also will get Rs. 15-8-0, although he is a more responsible man than the tarwalla and is held responsible for any mistake that may be committed by him in his work.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Is he not the same as the sider ?

MR. STONES :—He is sider to a very small frame.

MR. BAKHALE :—Mr. Stones himself has admitted that a side-piecer is a more responsible man than a tarwalla. I will just read out from page 731 of the record of evidence.

“ MR. JOSHI :—What difference do you make between a sider and a tarwalla in the intensity of work, fatigue, exertion and so on ?.....We have this sort of arrangement so that these men may get promotions. Usually men, but often women, are employed as doffers. They go from doffer to tarwalla and from tarwalla to side boy and from side boy to line jobber and head jobber.”

This clearly shows that there is some distinction between the work of a tarwalla and the work of a side piecer. I therefore submit that the wage of the ring piecer should be increased. The tarwalla is allowed Rs. 15-8-0 and the piecer working in frames up to 300 spindles is given the same wage, Rs. 15-8-0.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—The majority is above 300 spindles.

MR. STONES :—Yes ; only a small proportion are below 300 spindles.

MR. BAKHALE :—So, the millowners do not lose much by increasing their wage by 8 as.

MR. STONES :—Then, according to your argument, the others must get a proportionate increase.

MR. BAKHALE :—That is a commonsense argument.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What have you got to say, Mr. Saklatvala ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The ring piecer is in a way more responsible than the tarwalla ; after all he attends to the machine all the time that the tarwalla merely pieces up the ends. On the other hand, the tarwalla has to move from frame to frame. To a certain extent the sider has got greater responsibility. But our contention is that Rs. 15-8-0 is provided only in the case of smaller frames ;

the major portion of the frames is from 301 to 360 spindles, and there we have provided Rs. 16/- or 8 as. more. Then, again, when there is coarse warp and weft, he gets 8 as. more, which the tarwalla does not get. Compared to 1923, the wages compare as follows: In 1923 the wage of the siders was Rs. 1-0-4; in 1926, it was Rs. 1-0-3. We propose to give them from Rs. 1-0-2 to Rs. 1-2-10. The average wage in the industry is Rs. 15-8-0, and we have provided that as the absolute minimum.

MR. STONES :—The point is, we have raised the wage of the tarwalla from Rs. 14-4-0 to Rs. 15-8-0; we have given the tarwalla the average wage in the industry and the lowest paid side boy gets the average wage of the side boy. They propose to give under the Standardisation Scheme 8 as. more to the lowest paid side boy.

MR. KAMAT :—It is a difference of 8 annas only, according to their demand up to 300 spindles.

MR. STONES :—Then, there will be an argument to raise wages of the others who mind frames above 300 spindles. It would have been quite simple for us to put the tarwalla at Rs. 15/- and still find it well within the average of the industry and above the average of the tarwallas.

The Tarwalla was getting only Rs. 14-4-0. Because we put his wage up to Rs. 15-8-0 and not up to Rs. 15/- we have the complaint now that the lowest paid sider is getting only the same wages as a tarwalla.

MR. BAKHALE :—According to you the ring piecer is more important than the tarwalla.

MR. STONES :—The answer is it is only in a small proportion of cases the ring piecer is given the same wages as a tarwalla. The number of frames with 300 spindles and below is very small. Below 300 spindles there is obviously less work than on 301 to 360 spindles. He has been given the existing average pay; On weft he has 8 annas more on that. That average is only being given to men on warp frames on counts above 8s; on counts below 8s even on twist frames he is given more than the average wage in the industry. Those who work on frames below 300 spindles will be a small minority. When we introduce the rational scheme, we will have to pay 50 per cent. more for these workers, and they will draw a huge wage.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Let us go on to the next point.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—There is nothing on page 16, except that as regards the condenser plant, the wage of the feeder has been raised from Rs. 14-8-0 to Rs. 15/-, because in the case of Blow Room we have raised the wage of the attice feeders from Rs. 14/- to Rs. 15/-.



THE CHAIRMAN :—There is no dispute then ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—There is no dispute.

Then, Sir, we come to page 19 (Reeling). As regards reeling they want to be satisfied that the wages we have given there will give them the wage that we say the reelers will get ; and there also we have asked for particulars from those mills which are essentially reeling mills, leaving aside the other mills. We will get those particulars very soon and we will give them to you as well as to the other side.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Is it not a fact that you have agreed to work these rates for some time and then come to an agreement ?

MR. BAKHALE :—We are not agreeable to work the present rates even for three months unless we are satisfied.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—They want to be satisfied and then give a trial.

There is nothing more, except the <sup>question of</sup> section on retrenchment.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Does it arise in the Spinning Department ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes ; it does.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Retrenchment in the number ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is one point which I forgot to mention when we were dealing with Mixing and Blow Room and other departments, and that is as regards unequal wages for men sweepers and women sweepers. When we pointed that out to the millowners we were told that that was the custom. Anywhere outside India we find that equal wages are given for equal work. Even in the Bombay textile industry we find that doffer boys, whether men or women, are paid the same wages, namely Rs. 12/- plus 70 per cent. We at any rate see no reason why a woman sweeper should not have the same wages as a man-sweeper, viz. Rs. 13-8-0.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As regards what prevails in our industry I pointed out that where we expect the same amount of work and the same amount of production we pay the same wages. Whether it is a man or a woman working on the machine we expect the same kind of work and we expect a certain amount of production, so that both have to work practically in the same way, and when we find that women workers do not turn out the same production we certainly employ male workers. In the case of sweepers it is quite different. The male sweeper will work in his own way ; the female sweeper will work in her own way. We cannot get the same intensive work from a female sweeper as from a male

sweeper. As a matter of fact in certain departments we do not employ women sweepers because we know that they will not be able to cope with the work in those departments. In some departments the work is very easy and it is not strenuous. There it is mostly our own employees who are too old to work or outsiders who cannot work at the machines that are employed. There of course the general custom applies that women are always willing to work for less pay than men. As I say, in that case, it is not the case that both have to do the same amount of work.

MR. KAMAT :—What class of people have you got as sweepers in the mills ; do they belong to the same class as the municipal scavengers, or do they belong to the Maratha class who are of a better class than the scavengers ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As far as the departments are concerned, I think they may be of the better class ; it is in the compounds or other places outside the departments that we employ the scavenger class.

MR. ASAVALE :—Sweeping work is done better by women than by men, because women are habituated to sweeping in their houses.

MR. STONES —For years we have had women on Rs. 8-8-0 and men on Rs. 11/-, and yet we have employed men in some departments. If Mr. Bakhale's contention that women should be paid the same wages as men is to be conceded, then it will lead to the entire elimination of women sweepers from the mills.

MR. BAKHALE :—I am not afraid of this threat ; let it be carried out. I want the principle of the same wage to be accepted.

MR. STONES :—Mr. Bakhale is asking us to do more than we are prepared to do.

MR. ASAVALE :—These women sweepers have got dependents.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We are now going back to the discussion of minimum wage.

MR. KAMAT :—Are you prepared to say that they are invariably old men ?

MR. STONES :—Principally they are old people. These scavengers are old people ; they live in the compound ; the wife works and the husband works.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We have finished with the Spinning Section. We come now to the Weaving Section.

MR. BAKHALE :—As regards Weaving, I think I should be given some more time, in view of the fact that all these allowances and even the basis of the weavers' wage have been changed, and therefore the oral evidence does not help us

much as it would have if the amended list had been before us for discussion. Moreover, we were not quite sure that we would come to an agreement till about Saturday noon; it was only on Saturday noon that we came to know that agreement had been reached. Now the position is this, as the basis is changed and there are considerable modifications made in the width allowances, weft allowances and so on, we must have some time to work out a few sorts to see how the cut now applies to different sorts and to what extent the parity exists between the different sorts. I have asked Mr. Rajab to get a few samples from a few mills, but unfortunately the mills are closed to-day. However, we are making endeavours by going to the houses of weavers to get the necessary information. If you could give me a day, it would be much better. A good deal of discussion has now been eliminated, and we have only to concentrate on a few points. Personally I would like to adjourn now and meet at 2-30 P. M. or 3 P. M. to-morrow when we can start with the discussion on retrenchment in the section.

(After some discussion it was decided that the discussion should proceed in the following order :—

Weaving Section,  
 Cut in wages,  
 The New System, and  
 Retrenchment.)

The Committee adjourned till 2-30 P. M. on Tuesday, the 5th February 1929.

---

---

*Tuesday, 5th February, 1929.*

---

---

THE Committee met at the Town Hall, Bombay, at 2-30 p.m.

*Present.*

THE CHAIRMAN,

MR. KHAREGHAT,

MR. KAMAT.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As regards these charts I had better explain them orally. We have been asked by your Secretary as to what the chart is based upon. This chart is based on the table of our printed evidence on page 35, comparative statement of wages per month. In the Tariff Board Report on page 110 they give a similar table. But this table was based of course after studying many forms. We do not know exactly how many forms there were and which particular forms were used. We could not prove before the Committee that the rise was as stated here. That is to say, from the muster-rolls made available by Sir Ness Wadia's mill we put in this form the rise in wages. This table as far as our present contention goes is more in favour of the other side, because you will see in this particular mill the rise in wages from the blow room upwards, in all the departments, is greater than in the whole industry. In the Tariff Board Report also we have given the figures for 1926. For instance, in the blow room the wage was Rs. 23-10-0, whereas it is Rs. 29 here; in the speed frame it is Rs. 29 against Rs. 27, and in the winding it is Rs. 23 as against Rs. 21-4-0. As regards spinning averages this table gives a higher figure than is actually obtained in this industry. If there is a rise in this particular instance of the Spring Mill in the spinning department, all that we contend is that even taking this table the rise in the case of weavers has been much more than in the case of the other departments.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Figures for what mill ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Spring Mill. The chart is only a graphic description of this table. This table was supplied by Sir Ness Wadia's mill. This statement is based on this. We have taken 1913 as the basis and worked up the average.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—The materials are exactly the same ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN :—They go on in the same proportion ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes.

We can take up the points in weaving. The first item which they disputed was warpers' rate. They agree to the rates we have given but looking to the nature of the work they consider that the average of Rs. 52 is too low. As regards that we have got the evidence of experienced weaving masters. On page 965, Mr. Green was asked :—

"Do you think it is a fair average (regarding warpers) looking to the nature of the work?—Yes. We have always been considered to be paying higher for this work."

On page 1219, Mr. Gardener was asked :—

"You will notice that the standard list provides for piecework average rate of Rs. 52 for 10 hours' working?—Yes.

"The reduction in your mill will of course be big?—Yes.

"Can you justify the high wages you have paid in the past? Is there any particular reason why you should have paid such high wages relatively speaking?—I do not know of any special reason.

"Take the weavers' wage, average Rs. 48. What do you consider a warper should get?—Not more than Rs. 35, because it is not a man's job at all, but a girl's."

Then again on page 1246 in reply to you, sir (Mr. Khareghat), Mr. Gardener said :—

"I think the warping allowance is extremely high. The warping is a woman's job, not a man's, and therefore a reduction is necessary and would be fair."

Again, on page 1262 Mr. Kemp of the Madhowji Dharamsey Mills said :—

"Do you think that Rs. 52 is a reasonable rate compared to the work?—Yes."

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Have you proposed any rate for the warpers?

MR. BAKHALE :—In our standardisation scheme we have not provided any rate for warpers. But after going through the evidence I find that warpers should get from Rs. 58 to Rs. 60. My reasons are these: Hitherto the warpers were working for less than 10 hours in a majority of the mills, and were getting Rs. 57 or Rs. 58 a month. Now, they want to increase the working hours to ten and at the same time they want to reduce the wages from Rs. 57 or 58 to Rs. 52. That means that the warpers are made to work one or one and a half hours more and paid Rs. 5 less. I think this cut is rather heavy and must be adjusted. From the information we have received we find that warpers do not work full 10 hours but they work for  $8\frac{1}{2}$  hours, 9 hours or so in a majority of the mills. We should be clear about that point. We have got the evidence of the weaving master of the Crown Mills on page 1047 where he says that the warpers' wage will be cut down under this scheme from Rs. 54-8-0 to Rs. 52. Mr. Anderson, on page 1179, says that the warpers' wages would be cut down under the scheme from Rs. 60 to Rs. 52. Mr. Gardener, who has been quoted by Mr. Saklatvala, says on page 1219 in reply to a question :—

“ What is the average wage of a warper ?—All for 25 days, the pay earned is as under :—

Rs. 64-2, Rs. 53-9, Rs. 69-14, Rs. 65-12, Rs. 61-14, Rs. 71-0, Rs. 69-0  
Rs. 61-0 and Rs. 69-0.

“ So that the average is well over Rs. 60 ?—Yes.

“ For 8½ hours' work ?—Yes.”

• This gives an idea as to the cut in Mr. Gardener's mill. Mr. Green also in his evidence says that the wage of a warper is Rs. 60 for nine hours. This is to be found on page 965.

Mr. Desai, on page 1100, was asked a question :—

“ Under the standardisation scheme you will have to pay them (warpers) Rs. 52. So you will be paying them more there also? The answer was—According to the standardisation scheme the figure practically comes to less for the warpers than under the present system.”

Mr. Godbole, in his evidence, on page 1261-62, says that the warpers in his mill get Rs. 68 for nine hours work. It is therefore clear that there is a very heavy cut in the wages of the warpers, and the cut is also accompanied by an increase in the working hours.

THE CHAIRMAN :—They have always been on piece rates ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes. We, therefore, say that there is no justification for such a heavy cut in the case of the warpers. Taking into consideration the fact that they have now been asked to work full 10 hours they should get between Rs. 58 and Rs. 60 a month.

MR. STONES :—In 1926 the average pay for 24 days a month is put down as Rs. 52-8-10. Taking the average for a month of full-time work it comes to Rs. 57-2-7. You will note that there are about 3 or 4 mills that pay phenomenally high wages. For instance, the Tata Mill pays a phenomenally high wage. We admit the increase in hours. In many cases we admit the reduction in wage. But we say that Rs. 52 is a very good pay for this class of work even for 10 hours. In relation to the weaver's wages in other countries, it is very high. In most countries the warper is paid less than the weaver.

THE CHAIRMAN :—How does this warping rate correspond with the ordinary present wage ?

MR. STONES :—This is entirely a new system. The old method was to pay on the weight turned out. Now, warping is divided into two different operations. The first is creeling and the next is running the beam. We have now split and follow the English system. One payment is made in the shape of beam allowance and for every beam taken out he gets a fixed pay.

As regards running of the beam, the machine runs at the same speed, so that there is no difference whether the yarn is coarse or fine. We pay allowance on the length plus allowance for pattern beams. There is a creel boy provided for two machines.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Where is it in the English list ?

MR. STONES :—It is on page 107.\* We have followed that system with variations to suit the Bombay conditions. We pay up to 380 ends 6 annas per 10,000 yards and we move up by  $\frac{1}{4}$  anna per 20 ends. We give 2 annas per beam whereas in the English list it is  $4\frac{1}{2}d$ . We go a little further than the English list in our allowance for pattern beams.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—They do it in England also.

MR. STONES :—In England there is very little in the system of preparation. In the mill at home of which I was in charge there was very little of it and I cannot use it as an argument. There the method is entirely different. In fact our method is an improvement over the English system. The allowance provided here should be so adjusted as to give the warper a wage of Rs. 52 in the light of experience. If the warpers get Rs. 52 for 26 days a month for ten hours' work they are better paid than an average weaver.

MR. KAMAT :—Who requires greater skill ?

MR. STONES :—The weaver undoubtedly. He has got tremendous operations to look after. I do not know of any country where a warper gets more than a weaver. Warping is more a woman's work. In the *International Cotton Bulletin* (November issue), a copy of which I have handed to the Committee, you will find that girls mind two or three machines. Here it is one machine with the help of a creel boy.

MR. BAKHALE :—I have placed my case before you. I feel that the figure we have suggested is reasonable. The only argument from the other side is that the wages these people are getting are phenomenal and therefore they should be reduced. In the case of the weavers they say that they cannot afford to pay such a wage and therefore it should be reduced. They further say that because there is a disparity between the wages of the spinners and the weavers, the wages of the spinners should be levelled up. I do not accept their position that the wages both with regard to weaving and warping are phenomenal. If they are phenomenal why do we find those wages in almost all the mills in Bombay? There may be some mills better managed than other mills. In those mills there are technical experts like Mr. Stones. And yet they have been paying these wages to the warpers. I cannot understand the argument that the wages were phenomenally high. Adjustments had taken place several times in the past, and still the warpers' wages had been retained at the figure at which they are to be found to-day. Now, they want to cut the wages down, and at the same time increase the working hours. I therefore feel that their argument is not such as would be acceptable to us. We say that a warper, in view of the fact that he is asked to work 10 hours, should get Rs. 58 to Rs. 60 per month.



THE CHAIRMAN :—I suppose that a man with special skill can turn out more work ?

MR. STONES :—Yes. There are some men with special skill. Therefore, not only from mill to mill but in the same mill we get a big variation. On page 13 of Part II of the Labour Office Enquiry regarding 19 mills in July 1926, you will find that in one mill it comes to as much as Rs. 82-15-1, and in another it comes to Rs. 44-4-6. That shows the enormous variation.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It is the average for 23 working days ?

MR. STONES :—The last column there is " Average monthly earnings of full-time workers. " One mill, No. 10, has not had anybody working for the full month ; so also No. 19. In the mill where the earning is Rs. 82-15-1, 4 out of 10 workers worked a full month. This figure is evidently for exceptionally skilled men.

MR. KAMAT :—Do you think these 19 mills were not representative, and therefore gave phenomenally high rates ?

MR. STONES :—I say, you will find there phenomenally low rates also. For instance, Rs. 44-4-6 is a phenomenally low rate.

MR. KAMAT :—Supposing we take some other 19 mills, do you think we shall find the average less than Rs. 57 ?

MR. STONES :—I hardly think so. If you do that, you may have one or two more mills with high rates, or one or two more mills with particularly low rates. What I want to point out is that there is that variation even in these 19 mills. In the case of mill No. 5, out of 28 men there are 13 who have worked full time and they get Rs. 44-4-6 ; in mill No. 8, out of 10, there are 4 who have worked full time, and they get Rs. 82-15-1 ; and in the case of mill No. 16, there are 9 out of 14 who have worked full time, and they get Rs. 74-10-0.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What is the ordinary payment ?

MR. STONES :—It varies from 6 annas to 10 annas. In the mill with the earning of Rs. 82-15-0 (the Kohinoor), on the rates that we propose they will still get high rates. This is the mill with regard to which evidence was led that they were paying lower rates for 30s warp yarn spun from Uganda cotton. The yarn would never break, and the production will therefore be greater. On the Rs. 52 basis, if you had to schedule these out, you will find they would still be getting Rs. 58-6-0.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—The average is Rs. 57.

MR. STONES :—It is Rs. 57 for all the men who have earned a full month's wage. There is a cut in the wage, but there is an increase in time.

THE CHAIRMAN :—How do you work out the average ?

MR. STONES :—It is done in the same way as for Winding (page 2 of the standard list). We have stated there “ In arriving at the average wage the lowest one-fourth wage earners should be eliminated.” So, we take three-fourths of the warpers.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You intend after some months to go again into the question ?

MR. STONES :—Yes. We propose, after three months, to again tackle these lists, because we are now going on an entirely new system.

MR. BAKHALE :—I have to say something about the jobber, in the warping department. His pay is put down at Rs. 35 plus 70 per cent. According to the 1926 census of the Labour Office, I find that the assistant jobbers in this department were getting Rs. 63-12-0 a month. There is therefore a definite reduction in his pay, to which we are not agreeable.

MR. STONES :—This is one of the departments where so many varying conditions exist. Some mills combine Warping and Sizing departments so far as jobbers are concerned, and we have made a note, viz., “ Where mills have one Head Jobber for Warping and Sizing Departments, combined wages to be Rs. 75 plus 70 per cent.” On page 3 of Part I of the Labour Office Enquiry for 1926, you will find there are 11 head jobbers with an average monthly earning of Rs. 76-2-5 and 4 assistant jobbers with an average monthly earning of Rs. 63-12-0, working full time.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Rs. 35 is a little lower than what a jobber ordinarily gets.

MR. STONES :—This jobber is of the type of a line jobber or doffer jobber in the ring room. It is not a very big department, if he has got warping alone. A 2,000-loom mill will have about 20 warpers.

MR. BAKHALE :—Will this man be required to do practically the same kind of work which an assistant jobber is asked to do ?

MR. STONES :—His work will be the same as the work of the assistant jobber, where the head jobber is in charge of two departments, say warping and sizing, and the assistant is in charge of sizing. We have allowed the option here. If a jobber is in charge of the warping department only, for a mill with 2,000 looms, he has 20 men and about 20 creel boys to look after. But if two departments are combined, there we get a head jobber. An ordinary jobber for the warping department only will get Rs. 35 plus 70 per cent.

MR. BAKHALE :—Will he do the same work that an assistant jobber does ?

MR. STONES :—It depends.

MR. BAKHALE :—Have you got an assistant jobber now ?

MR. STONES :—No.

MR. WATTS :—It all depends on the size of the weaving shed. If there are only 400 to 500 looms, then the warping and sizing are combined.

MR. BAKHALE :—What is the criterion you adopt in fixing the wage at Rs. 35 ?

MR. STONES :—The criterion is that the man is to be in charge of warping alone. When it is combined with sizing, the head jobber gets Rs. 75.

THE CHAIRMAN :—In the sizing department, when a jobber is alone in charge of it, he gets Rs. 60. What is the difference between him and the warping jobber ?

MR. STONES :—The sizing department is a very responsible department, whereas the jobber in charge of warping machines has much less responsibility. The head jobber in the sizing will have charge of the sizing and mixing materials.

MR. BAKHALE :—What does the head jobber in the warping department get at present ?

MR. STONES :—I cannot give the figure, because it varies from mill to mill. On the average, he looks after the winding department also ; in some cases he looks after sizing, but principally he looks after winding also.

MR. BAKHALE :—Supposing there is a head jobber for both winding and warping ?

MR. STONES :—I have never come across a mill like that, where they have head jobbers for winding and warping.

MR. BAKHALE :—Then there may be a jobber in the warping department.—What does he do ?

MR. STONES :—He simply takes charge of anywhere from 5 to 25 warping machines.

MR. BAKHALE :—He will be doing practically the same work which an assistant jobber, wherever he exists, is doing at present ; and the assistant jobber is getting something like a little over Rs. 63-12-0, according to the 1926 census. Now you are giving him Rs. 35 plus 70 per cent., that is, Rs. 59-8-0. Will not the system change now ?

MR. STONES :—No. There are two options there. The head jobbers in the warping are combined head jobbers, with a wage of Rs. 70 on time and Rs. 77-10-0 on piece work.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I gather you fix Rs. 35 having regard to the nature of the duty ?

MR. STONES :—That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN :—In the drawing-in department also it has been fixed at Rs. 35 up to 1,000 looms ?

MR. STONES :—Yes ; just as we do with line jobbers in spinning.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The mill would have discretion to give more under the scheme ?

MR. STONES :—Yes, if they combine the departments, they can have an assistant for whichever department they choose. This applies only to head jobbers, and in order to meet Mr. Bakhale's objection, we will bring him outside the list.

MR. BAKHALE :—It is not a question of meeting my objection ; it is a question of the wage of the man.

MR. STONES :—Let us leave it at that. We consider that the wage of Rs. 35 plus 70 per cent. is ample for the work that he is doing. Four men out of 19 got Rs. 63 in a full month's time. This man is getting Rs. 59-8-0 now.

MR. BAKHALE :—Then we come to the creel boys. Does he mind one or two machines now ?

MR. STONES :—He does not mind any machines. When a creel is finished, he ties new bobbins.

MR. BAKHALE :—But the work that will be given to him will be the work that he is doing at present ? There is no increase in the work ?

MR. STONES :—No.

MR. BAKHALE :—His wage is Rs. 12. Here also, the same objection as in the case of doffer boys in the spinning section applies. Mr. Gardener, in his oral evidence (page 1220) said that in his mill creel boys are paid Rs. 13 for 8½ hours' work. He was asked "Creel boys are paid at Rs. 13 as against our rate of Rs. 12 ?" His reply was "Yes." Again he was asked "They work 8½ hours instead of 10 hours like the warpers ?" His reply was "Yes." So, I want this figure of Rs. 12 to be raised.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What were they getting in 1923 ?

MR. STONES :—In the 1923 list they got 13 annas per day.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Have all these people been working 8½ to 9 hours at present ?

MR. STONES :—Some mills work 10, some 9, and some 8½ hours. There are very few mills working for 8½ hours ; usually they work 9 hours or a little over 9 hours.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That has been going on, at any rate, since 1920 ?

MR. STONES :—Yes.

*Drawing-in Department.*

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As regards the piecework rates for drawing-in, we have increased the plain and twill from 20 pies to 21 pies, and we have also added dhoties under the list of plain and twill, including plain dhoties with borders up to 2" width.

MR. BAKHALE :—As regards that portion, we have decided to meet the Millowners. It is a compromise. What Mr. Saklatvala said just now was with regard to our compromise, that a minor alteration was agreed to in the drawing-in department. We are not going to raise any objection to that portion of the rates. But there are one or two other points on which I think I can legitimately raise some discussion. One is as regards the pay of the jobber. We did not consider that when we met in the private conference. Here the jobber's pay is up to 1,000 looms Rs. 35 plus 70 per cent. 1,000 looms to 2,000 looms Rs. 40 plus 70 per cent., and over 2,000 looms Rs. 45 plus 70 per cent. I should like to draw your attention to the evidence of Mr. Anderson in which he has stated that in his mills at any rate the pay of the jobber is Rs. 73 consolidated.

MR. STONES :—Mr. Anderson's mill has 3,300 looms, and Rs. 45 plus 70 per cent. means that the man will get a rise in pay.

THE CHAIRMAN :—He gets Rs. 76 ?

MR. STONES :—Yes.

MR. BAKHALE :—I should also like to draw attention to the evidence of Mr. Fernandez, on page 1707. In his written statement Mr. Fernandez said " Jobber's salary may be raised from Rs. 35 to Rs. 40 because he has more intelligent work to do than the jobbers in the warping department." Mr. Stones asked him " In what way is it more intelligent work ? " The reply was " To pick up reeds, give the counts. They have to get a little more salary." Besides, there seems to be a cut in the wage of the jobber. As a matter of fact, in the whole of the drawing-in department there is a very heavy cut, and I think that it is necessary to raise the wage of the jobber in the drawing-in department.

MR. STONES :—For the drawing-in jobber we have adjusted the wage to varying sizes of sheds, and we have fixed a wage which we think is compatible with the amount of work to be done and the intelligence to be shown.

THE CHAIRMAN :—There is not much difference in the responsibility between 1,000 and 2,000 looms ?

MR. STONES :—There is a little more chasing round to do, but the jobber has charge of the reeds and healds, and he has to know where they are

kept, and the possibility is that with 2,000 looms he has a little more work to do than with 1,000, because he will have a bigger number of looms and a bigger proportion of fancy looms to look after.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The Strike Committee's Standardisation Scheme proposed that he should be paid the same pay up to 2,000 looms ?

MR. STONES :—Up to 1,000 looms Rs. 35.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The Strike Committee suggests Rs. 40 for anything up to 2,000 looms.

MR. STONES :—In a small shed, I do not think Rs. 35 is at all bad pay. In Lancashire in a shed of 1,000 looms the jobber would get 5 shillings extra over his piece-work rate ; he will have to give a little time to arranging the healds and the stock. He certainly would not have a full-time man for that work, but for a 2,000-loom shed, a full-time man would be provided.

MR. BAKHALE :—Then, I should like to draw your attention to these shaft allowances on the same page. We think that these allowances should be raised. This is the evidence of Mr. Anderson (page 1182 of the volumes of oral evidence) :—

“ How does the piecework rate given for drawing-in work out in your case ?—5 shafts, 30 pies per 1,000 ends ; 6 shafts, 35 pies per 1,000 ends ; 7 to 12 shafts, 48 pies per 1,000 ends ; 13 to 16 shafts, 78 pies per 1,000 ends.”

I wish to draw your attention only to the shaft allowances and not to the figures of the rates which have been agreed to between us. Then, a worker, Mahadev Gopal, at page 2102 gives the evidence which I shall read out presently :—

“ MR. DANGE :—Do you work 5 shafts for allover patterns ? On page 12 of the Amended Standardized Rates of Wages, Weaving Section, he gets 24 pies, and I want to ask what he is getting against that ?—From 5 to 11 shafts it is 48 pies.

“ That is for the second column ? That is doobby ?—There is a flat rate of 48 pies from 5 to 11 shafts.

“ Do you work on dhotie border ?—Yes.

“ What is the rate for 8, 9 and 10 shafts ?—30 pies.

“ THE CHAIRMAN :—What column does it correspond to ?

“ MR. DANGE :—The third column.”

Then, there is the evidence of another worker, Dhondu Ganu, at page 2118 :—

“ What is the rate for 5 shafts ?—5 to 6 shafts, 30 pies ; 7 to 12 shafts, 48 pies ”

THE CHAIRMAN :—Are there lower rates than these in other mills ?

MR. STONES :—I would protest here. We were under the definite understanding that the piece-work rates had been passed, and I thought that we agreed on these allowances. That was our impression, and therefore we have not looked up the evidence on this point. But I can say that there are mills with lower rates than these. Only three days ago I had a visit from Mr. Tinker of the Industrial Mills where they were paying much less wage than these. I was under the impression that all these rates had been agreed to.

MR. BAKHALE :—I thought from the remark made by Mr. Saklatvala that only a minor alteration was agreed to in the drawing-in department.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The whole department was agreed to.

MR. BAKHALE :—That was not what I understood.

MR. STONES :—There is some misunderstanding.

MR. BAKHALE :—If it is a misunderstanding, I am sorry.

In our Standardization Scheme we have proposed shaft allowances at these rates :—

5 shafts	..	..	..	30 pies.
6 shafts	..	..	..	30 pies.
7 to 12 shafts	..	..	..	48 pies.
12 to 16 shafts	..	..	..	60 pies.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Your objection is only about the first column ?

MR. BAKHALE :—We have not divided it into columns as they have done.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Have you got any evidence to show what wages your rates will give ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I am afraid I cannot show any evidence.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Would it not be better then to leave it to experience? After three months you can see how the rates work out.

MR. BAKHALE :—That is rather difficult for me to say. If Mr. Rajab had been here I would have consulted him and given you an answer, but as he is engaged in the troubled area at Madanpura, I am not in a position to commit the Joint Strike Committee to anything. So, I had better give my point to you and leave it to your decision.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Can you not give an answer to-morrow ?

MR. STONES :—It will also give us an opportunity to look up the evidence.

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Any other points ?

MR. BAKHALE :—We have agreed to the slider heading allowances being raised to 20 per cent.

As regards page 13 there is nothing which I have to say, because we have completely agreed to the figures that have been put down here. We had a considerable amount of discussion and we were nearly on the breaking point, but the Millowners' Association agreed to meet us half-way and we also gave up the position that we had taken up both in the Standardisation Scheme and in the evidence of Mr. Rajab. Mr. Rajab wanted to replace the figure " 1·02 " in the second column by " 1·07 " and the third column by " 1·16." We have agreed to stick to the compromise that has been arrived at and we are quite prepared to work the scheme for three months so far as this page is concerned.

Then, as regards page 14 also there is nothing that I need say, because they have increased the shaft allowances and brought them to the level of the Lancashire basis. As regards splits we had agreed from the beginning. We had a small objection as regards the reeds standard but we have decided to waive that objection and to give a trial to the figures that have been put down in the revised list.

Then, coming to weft, width, dhotie and heading allowances, I requested you yesterday to give me time in order that I may be able to prepare myself better by working out a few samples to see how these figures stand in respect of wages. Unfortunately, after we went home, we came to know of the very serious situation in the Parel area, and instead of working on these figures we had to spend a considerable time there. Mr. Rajab also was there yesterday, and even this morning he was there and therefore could not come. There is serious tension in the Madanpura locality where we have got a large membership ; there is very bad feeling between Hindu workers and Mahomedan workers. We would not have gone there if we had thought that the position would not be more serious than what it was yesterday afternoon, but unfortunately the position did become very serious and we had to go there in the interest of the workers and also to avoid, as far as possible, conflicts between the Mahomedans and the Hindus. So, we could not find time to consider the weft, width and dhotie allowances in the light of the new standard that the Millowners' Association have prepared. Personally I am unable to deal with these headings at any rate to-day.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Will you be able to deal with them to-morrow ?



MR. BAKHALE :—I hope so. I am trying my best to expedite the work, but these are the most contentious points in the whole scheme, and unless I have the help of Mr. Rajab, layman as I am, it is very difficult for me to place the views of the Joint Strike Committee before you. If you and Mr. Saklatvala have no objection, we can take up to-day page 17, which is not so contentious as the other pages.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Very well.

MR. BAKHALE :—The contentious point as regards these heading allowances is as regards the shuttle changes. I wish to invite your attention to Mr. Rajab's criticism which appears at page 2107 of the volumes of oral evidence. In paragraph 3 of the Millowners' Standardisation Scheme it is stated :—

“By simple heading is meant a heading that requires not more than 8 shuttle changes.”

Mr. Rajab wants to replace the figure “8” by “5.” These are the allowances that he has suggested for more than 5 shuttle changes :—

When shuttle changes are from 5 to 8	..	2 per cent.
When shuttle changes are from 9 to 16	..	3 per cent.
When shuttle changes are from 17 to 23	..	5 per cent.
When shuttle changes are 24 and above	..	6 per cent.

That means, we suggest an addition of 2 per cent. for 5 to 8 shuttle changes ; for 9 to 16 shuttle changes, our rates are the same ; for 17 to 23 shuttle changes, we suggest 1 per cent. more. From 24 and above we have suggested 6 per cent. instead of the 5 per cent. proposed by the Millowners.

MR. STONES :—The only alteration you suggested in your original list of standardisation was 2 per cent. addition for 5 to 8 shuttle changes.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Do you stick to your original scheme or not ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Mr. Rajab has suggested a slight increase for 24 shuttle changes and over, but I can safely say on behalf of the Strike Committee that we stick to the original standardisation scheme proposed by us.

MR. STONES :—The only addition they want to make is 2 per cent. for 5 shuttle changes to 8 shuttle changes. If we concede this, it would mean 2 per cent. allowance for practically every cloth we make. We are allowing extra wages for shuttle changes above 8. I submit that 8 shuttle changes is very simple indeed. If we concede their demand, even for three bar changes we will have to give allowances. They do not bother about 3 bar changes ; they simply put it in the ordinary course.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Have you got anything in the Lancashire list ?

MR. STONES :—It is a very complicated one, but it makes no allowance for these ordinary headings. The ordinary plain heads that we have here would not carry any allowance in the Lancashire list.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Is there any difficulty about preparing these headings ?

MR. STONES :—Three bar changes will give no difficulty. In complicated headings we do give allowances.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—You say that three bar is simple ?

MR. STONES :—Yes.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Is it a very common practice ?

MR. STONES :—Yes. Eight headings will mean a four-bar change. Above that we have provided allowances.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Even four is common ?

MR. STONES :—Yes. You have two bars for two different colours.

MR. BAKHALE :—Then, about Coloured Weft on the same page, they have decided to make an addition of these words :—

“ Cotton dyed, Cashmere and McCrindle. . 5 per cent.”

They have given an allowance of 5 per cent. for this. We suggest that the allowance should be 10 per cent.

MR. STONES :—What you wanted was a higher allowance for art silk. The point at dispute in this page is art silk weft allowance and two-beam allowance.

MR. BAKHALE :—In that case, I withdraw my objection. I cannot remember, but I am prepared to accept Mr. Stones' correction.

They have provided 10 per cent. allowance for artificial silk weft, but we suggest that the allowance for artificial silk weft should be 20 per cent.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Have they 20 per cent. in the Lancashire list ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes.

The oral evidence does not give us any help as regards this allowance. Mr. Pennington said that he had no experience so far as artificial silk weft was concerned. I wish to draw your attention to the fact that in Lancashire (page 23 of the 1924 list) the rate was

When used in looms up to and including 45 inches 30 % extra.

In looms over 45 inches .. .. . 35 % extra.

That was the allowance given originally. But they amended it in 1925, on the 25th of September. They have expunged the original clause and added a new clause altogether, under which they provide 20 per cent. extra for all counts in any width of loom. Mr. Stones' objection was that 20 per cent. was too high even in Lancashire. The point I want to make is this: that artificial silk weft allowance was higher than 20 per cent. in Lancashire before 1925, but as they found that that allowance was really high they came to an agreement that 20 per cent. would be reasonable. I do not think therefore that we can now say that even 20 per cent. is higher. The Lancashire list was amended as recently as 1925, and the allowances were brought down to 20 per cent. from 30 to 35 per cent.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You want the same rates as in Lancashire ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes.

MR. STONES :—Our answer to that is in Lancashire they found that they had overstated their allowances and they brought it down to 20 per cent. in 1925. To-day we find that even 10 per cent. is quite as much as ought to be allowed. Even since 1925 wonderful improvements have been made in the machinery for handling artificial silk, and to-day with the improvements that we have in vogue in Bombay in winding and weaving artificial silk, there is very little difference indeed between artificial silk and ordinary yarn. When this business was first started even 30 per cent. was a poor allowance ; in 1902 I would not have worked on a loom with art silk weft even with 100 per cent. allowance with the sort of material then provided. But to-day, every week new machines are being invented for handling art silk ; wonderful improvements have already been effected, and to-day art silk weft is as good as ordinary yarn. We have special shuttles, special winding machines and special bobbins for art silk.

MR. BAKHALE :—Are your improvements better than the improvements in Lancashire ?

MR. STONES :—Improvements have been made also in Lancashire since 1925, and in our opinion these allowances will be brought down still further. We feel that we ought not to make the same mistake as they made in Lancashire.

MR. BAKHALE :—Mr. Stones admits that improvements have been made also in Lancashire. If a reduction is made in Lancashire, then we can think of reducing our rates also. We are now proposing a Board to deal with any points of dispute that may arise in future and that Board can reduce these rates when they reduce the rates in Lancashire. At present, I maintain that what is given in Lancashire should be given here.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What are the present rates in the mills ?

MR. STONES :—We pay nothing, but there are complaints. We consider 10 per cent. to be quite ample for art silk. It is splendid material now. The Bombay mills have already to face competition. I fear 20 per cent. will be killing the business outright.

MR. BAKHALE :—The next is about two beams. The cloth in which two top beams are used is added to the list. We say that the allowance should be increased to 5 per cent. as is done in Lancashire. I do not know whether Mr. Stones will say that even on this point the Lancashire people have made a mistake in keeping the allowance at 5 per cent. But I do feel that this allowance should be increased to 5 per cent.

THE CHAIRMAN :—In your scheme you mention  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

MR. BAKHALE :—I think we can make modification in our scheme as they have done.

MR. STONES :—It is perfectly correct that the Lancashire list contains 5 per cent. In Lancashire it is essential that owing to the greater number of looms for two beams an allowance of 5 per cent. should be given. Here it is easier work, as it is only a case of two looms. More important than that is that two beams are running on silk stripes. I think the weaver getting  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. extra for two beams will suffer if it is put to 5 per cent. We have few cases where two beams are necessary. The bulk of the work is easier.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You had no evidence about this.

MR. BAKHALE :—Absolutely no evidence about this. I should like to make a suggestion, if Mr. Saklatvala does not mind, instead of top beams two beams should be put in.

MR. STONES :—That is very different. Two beams are kept together for wide looms. That is equivalent to one beam. If top beams are used, one is superimposed above the other. In one case the two beams are running side by side and there is no difference. In the other case the one is placed above the other and it is apt to interfere with the handling of the yarn.

MR. BAKHALE :—I know it myself. I know that two beams are used side by side on wider looms. They do it in Lancashire.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Why should they give an extra allowance ?

MR. STONES :—It comes under a separate clause.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is another small point which appeared in the oral evidence of Mr. Rajab. I am sorry we failed to bring it to the notice of Mr. Saklatvala and Mr. Stones. This is as regards the sentence that appears under coloured weft :—

“ Ring and Universal pirns, 5 per cent. to be added. Artificial silk, 10 per cent. to be added. This note does not apply to Drop Box sorts.”

Mr. Rajab has stated in his oral evidence on page 2016 :—

“ With regard to this page, I would like to take objection to this note. ”

He then reads the note and says :—

“ We can never accept these deductions . . . . ”

MR. STONES :—It is not in relation to this. It comes under weft allowance.

MR. BAKHALE :—For cloth woven on fine reed looms the allowance should be 10 per cent. They have agreed to change it to 10 per cent.

MR. STONES :—We have agreed, sir.

MR. BAKHALE :—Then we come to dhoti allowance.

MR. STONES :—This is the real battle-ground.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We had better adjourn till 2-30 p.m. to-morrow.

After the public sitting was over, Messrs. Stones and Saklatvala on behalf of the Millowners and Messrs. Bakhale and Asavale on behalf of the Joint Strike Committee had a private consultation with the Chairman and requested him, in view of the serious situation in the city, that the proceedings of the Committee should be adjourned till 11-15 a.m. on Thursday the 7th February. The Chairman granted the adjournment asked for and it was decided to proceed with the discussion on rationalisation.

---

---

---

*Thursday, 7th February, 1929.*

---

---

THE Committee met at 11-15 A.M. at the Town Hall, Bombay.

*Present :*

THE CHAIRMAN,  
MR. KHAREGHAT,  
MR. KAMAT.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Before we proceed, I want to make one thing clear. Day before yesterday, I made a mistake in referring to a table in the Report of the Tariff Board. When we were discussing the chart, I had said that the chart was based on the table on page 110 of the Report of the Tariff Board. It is page 113 of the Tariff Board Report.

*Rationalisation.*

MR. STONES :—In the Mixing and Blow Room, the first system mentioned in the Millowners' standard is the system adopted under the rationalisation scheme, or the new scheme. The only difference between the Millowners' Standard and the mills in our group and the Finlay group being that in our group and the Finlay group it is compulsory and not optional. That is to say, 1 lattice feeder has to mind 2 machines and get Rs. 19 plus 70 per cent. Similarly, the Exhaust and Breaker Scutcher men have each to mind 2 machines; Intermediate and Finisher Scutcher men also 1 man to 2 machines, on a pay of Rs. 21; that is compared with the former rate in our mills of Rs. 14-8-0. There has been no difficulty in carrying this out. It has been running now for nearly 4 years. We have had no trouble. It is running in our David Mill for at least 15 years, on the same pay, or without any increase in pay. It has been running in Delhi since the Delhi Cloth Mill started about 1906, without any increase in pay. This is the department that has been most easily converted to the new system. In England, they look after 3 and 4 machines; in America 1 man looks after 4 machines. Here we expect 1 man to look after 2 machines.

The next difference is in the Card Room. Here an entirely different system altogether is started. We have here adopted practically the English system with very minor modifications. Hitherto the work has been done split up, and a great deal of very unskilled labour employed. Can minders, for example, were employed on Rs. 12-8-0. We have now the team system. We have a front jobber and a back jobber, who take charge of 30 cards. With them is a lap carrier and fly gatherer. He does both the lap carrying and fly gathering. He also assists in the stripping and grinding. For 30 cards we have 2 can minders, and 1 lap carrier and fly gatherer whose duties are combined; he carries the laps and gathers the fly from 30 cards. He has a dual duty there. The idea is to attract a better type of labour—to start with unskilled labour, to make it semi-skilled and finally skilled labour, instead of the ordinary type of worker that exists to-day. Usually now the work is done by an unskilled Pardeshi, and if he starts as a can minder, he remains a can minder all his life. We have raised the can minders to Rs. 15-8-0.

THE CHAIRMAN :—In your statement you put it at Rs. 23-8-0.

MR. STONES :—In the statement a can minder gets Rs. 14, front and back jobbers Rs. 26, lap carrier and fly gatherer Rs. 16; the can minder's Rs. 14 has now been increased to Rs. 15-8-0.

THE CHAIRMAN :—How does this fit in with the statement ?

MR. STONES :—That has been altered since. The can minder has been raised from Rs. 14-8-0 to Rs. 15-8-0. He moves up from can minder to lap carrier and fly gatherer and then he becomes a front or back jobber. These men do the sweeping also ; there are no sweepers. They look after their own section of 30 cards, and they are fully responsible for that. Instead of it being absolutely water-tight compartments for work, 30 cards are set aside for a team of 5 men ; they do the sweeping, the oiling, the cleaning, the grinding, the stripping and fly gathering. The whole of the work in that section of 30 cards is done by 5 men, with the exception of the setting up of the cards, which is done by the assistant jobber.

THE CHAIRMAN :—How long has that been working ?

MR. STONES :—Since 1926. We started the Manchester Mill on that, and extended it to various mills in the group. There is a resume of the duties in various mills in the list already submitted to you on the previous occasion.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Is the new system for Mixing and Blow Room obtaining in the Finlay group also ?

In the Mixing and Blow Room, it is absolutely the first system there ; it is compulsory. The difference between this and the Millowners' standard is that the first section is compulsory under this system, while in the Millowners' scheme it is optional to the worker.

I should like to mention in passing that in the Millowners' standard list the flat grinder is raised to Rs. 16-8-0 ; I do not think I mentioned it the other day. It is the same in the rational scheme. In the rational scheme the Blow Room and Mixing Room are absolutely on par with the Standard list, but without option to the worker. In the Card Room we have a new team in which we entirely eliminate grinders and strippers as such. The duties are interchangeable, and we raise their pay up to Rs. 26 plus 70 %.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Does it prevail in the Finlay group ?

MR. STONES :—No. They have a slightly different system, but the principle is the same. As a matter of fact, they have adopted the American system, and we have adopted the English system, and we are watching the position with a view to seeing which is the better system and adopting it afterwards,



In the Drawing and Speed Frame Departments, the differences are on the drawing frame and the roving frame only. The slubbing and intermediate frames remain the same. On the drawing frame we put 2 men to 3 heads, where formerly we had 3 men to 3 heads, as against the English system of 1 man to 3 heads. Here each man is given a 25% increase over the standard rate of Rs. 33-4-0. In the roving frames, 1 roving tenter looks after 2 roving frames. In this connection, I have prepared a list, taking the Oldham list as a basis, showing what would have been paid if we had followed the English list, and what we are paying in Bombay, and I hand it in for the information of the Committee. We have paid roughly 50 per cent. more than the former rates, but this amount varies because certain mills were very low and certain other mills were high; it varies from about 30 per cent. to 60 per cent. In any case, it now becomes 50 per cent. extra, that is to say, the men draw half the wage extra on the additional frame and the mill takes the other half. It is set down in the list. It is up to 2.5 hank roving Standard rate single roving; that is to say, on counts 10s and below, we maintain the same system as is maintained by the Millowners' Standard list. Over 2.5 to 4 hank roving we are giving 50 per cent. extra. Over 4 to 4.9 hank roving, we are giving 40 per cent. extra; over 5 to 7 hank roving 30 per cent. extra; over 7 to 8 hank roving 25 per cent. extra, and over 8 and upwards 20 per cent. extra, the last 3 following the Millowners' list; the difference comes in up to 5 hank roving. You will notice from the list I have just handed in that according to the list Rs. 38 for a slubber (single) is taken as the basis, and then the rates are given for hank over 3 to  $3\frac{1}{2}$ , above  $3\frac{1}{2}$  to 8, and above 8. Had the English list been followed, for hank up to 3, taking the Slubber at Rs. 38, the Inter (single) would get Rs. 34-8-0, the Roving (single) would get Rs. 27-4-0, and Roving (pairs) Rs. 36. The Bombay list gives the Slubber Rs. 38, the Inter Rs. 35 and Roving (single) Rs. 32, which is the rate in the Millowners' standard list. For hank over 2.5 to 4 we pay Rs. 38 Slubber, Rs. 35 Inter, Rs. 32 Roving (single) and Rs. 48 Roving (pair). According to the English list, it would be Rs. 36-4-0 for Slubber (single), Rs. 32-8-0 for Inter (single), Rs. 26-2-0 for Roving (single) and Rs. 34-2-0 for Roving (pairs). For hank over  $3\frac{1}{2}$  to 8, according to the English list the rates would be Rs. 34-6-0 for Slubber (single), Rs. 31-2-0 for Inter (single), Rs. 25 for Roving (single) and Rs. 32-10-0 for Roving (pairs). For hank over 7 to 8, the rates in the Bombay list are Rs. 38 for Slubber, Rs. 35 for Inter, and Rs. 40 for Roving (pair). In each case, the increase which we give for the extra work is much higher than it exists in the English list.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What about the single rover ?

MR. STONES :—Where single roving is worked, it is higher, and it follows the Millowners' Standard list. It will be Rs. 32 for a rover, where the English list is Rs. 27-4-0, Rs. 26-2-0 and Rs. 25; the Millowners' list provides Rs. 32 for all 3, so that the rate is higher for the single roving. For double roving, we have given far more increases than are given in the English list. We have provided uniform rates for Slubber and Inter irrespective of the fineness of the hank, but in roving we have a graduated scale.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Why is that ?

MR. STONES :—In theory, as far as possible, we really ought to have a graduated scale from Rs. 38. But as the system stands at present we have

not chosen to put a lower rate for the finer counts. In other words, we are handicapping the spinning of fine counts in this country to a certain extent. The correct way would have been to give Rs. 38 for Slubber for Hank up to 2.5, and to go on lowering the rate for the finer counts in proportion, because there is undoubtedly less work there. But we have made so many violent changes that this has been kept in favour of the worker.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—You say 2.5 hank corresponds to counts 10s yarn ?

MR. STONES :—Yes. There is a tremendous amount of doffing to be done there. We have left it to the worker to decide whether he would go on to two sides. In some cases they have exercised the option. In many cases to-day they have and requested us not to spin 10s, so that everybody can go on to two sides.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The wages you are giving is based on a sliding scale ?

MR. STONES :—We give a standard rate per hank ; it is on a sliding scale so far as the counts are concerned.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Even for double side you pay the same rates ?

MR. STONES :—For double side in the Roving, we pay 50 per cent. more over 2.5 hank roving : it is definitely stated in the list :—

" Up to 2.5 hank roving, standard rate single roving.			
Over 2.5 to 4.0 hank roving, standard rate plus	50%		
Over 4.0 to 4.9 " " "	40%		
Over 5.50 to 7 " " "	30%		

MR. KHAREGHAT :—That is the proposal for the rationalisation scheme ?

MR. STONES :—Yes. At present we are paying 50 per cent. all through.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What are the rates at present ?

MR. STONES :—They vary with the counts. All the same they earn Rs. 50 per pair of roving frames.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—You give them one and a half times as much ?

MR. STONES :—Yes, all through.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What is the wage laid down in the Oldham list ?

MR. STONES :—Pages 110-125. Single slubber, 84 spindles, coarse, below 3 hank preparation, 19s. Our rate for the slubber is Rs. 38. Merely

by multiplying the Oldham rate of shillings by " 2 " and calling it " rupees " you get our rates. For coarse, 84 spindles, Slubber (single).

					<i>Oldham.</i>		<i>New System.</i>		
					<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>R. a. p.</i>		
Below 3 hank	..	..	..	..	19	0	38	0	0
Over 3 to 3½	..	..	..	..	18	2	36	4	0
Above 3½ to 8	..	..	..	..	17	4	34	6	0
Above 8	..	..	..	..	16	5	32	7	0

Similarly in Inter (Single) :—

					<i>Oldham.</i>		<i>New System.</i>		
					<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>Rs. a. p.</i>		
Below 3 hank	..	..	..	..	17	2	34	4	0
Over 3 to 3½	..	..	..	..	16	4	32	8	0
Above 3½ to 8	..	..	..	..	15	7	31	2	0
Above 8	..	..	..	..	14	9	29	2	0

In Roving, 160 spindles (Single) :—

					<i>Oldham.</i>		<i>New System.</i>		
					<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>Rs. a. p.</i>		
Below 3 hank	..	..	..	..	13	8	27	4	0
Over 3 to 3½	..	..	..	..	13	1	26	2	0
Above 3½ to 8	..	..	..	..	12	6	25	0	0
Above 8	..	..	..	..	11	10	23	12	0

The double in each case being (Roving, pairs) :—

					<i>Oldham.</i>		<i>New System.</i>		
					<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>	<i>Rs. a. p.</i>		
Below 3 hank	..	..	..	..	18	0	36	0	0
Over 3 to 3½	..	..	..	..	17	1	34	2	0
Above 3½ to 8	..	..	..	..	16	4	32	10	0
Above 8	..	..	..	..	15	7	31	0	0

The remainder of the department is as in the standard list.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—How do you calculate the wages when you give 50 per cent. ?

MR. STONES :—We take the hanks on both frames ; supposing we paid 16 pies before, we pay 24 pies, or rather 12 pies for all the hanks on both frames.

THE CHAIRMAN :—There has been no difficulty in calculating ?

MR. STONES :—No difficulty whatever.

In the Ring Department, the head jobber is paid Rs. 90, and the assistant jobber Rs. 55, as against Rs. 75 and Rs. 40 on the Millowners' Standard list. The Doffer Jobber is paid Rs. 32 and the Oiler and Bander

Rs. 26. We have had to put this up because we have raised the wage of the side boy to an extent that means that there would be very little advance if we adopted the Millowners' Standard list. The Oiler and the Bander in the ordinary list is paid Rs. 20, and we have put this up to Rs. 26, because we are already paying the side boy anywhere between Rs. 37 to Rs. 39.

The double siders are paid :—

	<i>Spindles.</i>					<i>Twist.</i>			<i>Weft.</i>		
						<i>Rs.</i>	<i>a.</i>	<i>p.</i>	<i>Rs.</i>	<i>a.</i>	<i>p.</i>
Up to 300	..	..	..	..	..	22	8	0	23	0	0
301 to 360	..	..	..	..	..	23	0	0	23	8	0
361 to 420	..	..	..	..	..	23	8	0	24	0	0
Over 420	..	..	..	..	..	24	0	0	24	8	0

Where we work single siders, we follow the Standard List.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—The two sides make up the 300 spindles ?

MR. STONES :—The term is really "Spindles in frame." In the Millowners' Standard List that is the term used. In our list also it should be "spindles in frame." In the Millowners' List he minds up to 150 ; and in ours he minds 300, for which he gets 50 per cent.

Tarwallas and Doffer Boys are exactly as in the Standard List ; there is no change either in the number or in wage.

That, sir, is the difference that exists between the New System and the Millowners' Standard List, as far as Spinning is concerned. In the Weaving Section, there is no alteration in their duty. The only alteration in Spinning is in the Side Boys' work. They mind 300 spindles instead of 150. In Weaving it follows the Standard List in its entirety, except in two mills where we have gone in under special conditions for three looms and we pay 82 per cent. of the total earnings of the three looms, the total earnings being computed on the basis of the Millowners' Standard List.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Is that 82 per cent. on the rates as proposed in the list ?

MR. STONES :—82 per cent. of whatever is adopted by mutual agreement. At present we are paying on the rates which previously existed.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—How do you calculate ?

MR. STONES :—We compute the total wages on the three looms and give the man 82 per cent. That means 50 per cent. of the wage on the third loom is divided between the mill and the operative. That is the only difference, except of course that one jobber has to take care of 60 looms in the Standard List and we provide that a jobber with one spare weaver will take care of two sections. That is only as regards these plain sorts. We do not scheme to put up this arrangement in all our mills. Unless special arrangements are made it is impossible. In addition to providing a spare

weaver, we provide men to bring the cloth from the looms, and we provide men to take the weft to the looms.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Are their wages provided for in any way ?

**MR. STONES** :—No ; they will be provided for. I shall have to think it over, but we will fix them up. I will send the actual rates and the numbers later on. This is of course apart from any extra charges in the way of cotton and things of that nature.

Now, then, I would like to point out the difference between our system and the Finlay system. In the Blow Room the same system is followed. We have supplied you with two systems, Efficiency System A and Efficiency System B ; B is the Finlay system and A is the E. D. Sassoon system. In the Card Room we employ an Assistant Jobber on Rs. 40 plus 70 per cent., who is directly responsible for setting the cards, one Assistant Jobber being responsible for 70 to 80 cards. In the Finlay system, the work of setting the cards is done by the Grinder himself as an additional duty. The Finlay system has 5 men per 22 to 23 cards, with different designations and wages. Where we employ a Grinder on Rs. 16 and a Front and Back Jobber on Rs. 26, the Finlay employ a Grinder on Rs. 32 and a Stripper on Rs. 20. Their lap carriers and fly gatherers are paid Rs. 18, with one Card Tenter only on Rs. 16. The Lap Carriers and Fly Gatherers will assist in minding the cans when other work is not available.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—They provide a Lap Carrier and a Fly Gatherer for a set of 22 to 23 cards, whereas you provide a Lap Carrier and Fly Gatherer for a set of 30 cards.

**MR. STONES** :—In the Finlay system they have the additional duty of setting the cards, whereas we provide a man separately for that work and they have no responsibility in that direction.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—Which is your man ?

**MR. STONES** :—The Assistant Jobber ; he is there especially for that work, he has no other duty.

**MR. KHAREGHAT** :—How does the cost compare as between your system and their system ?

**MR. STONES** :—Working it out for 180 cards, they have one Head Jobber, and 8 sets of 5 men, on Rs. 32, Rs. 20, Rs. 18, Rs. 18 and Rs. 16 and we have one Head Jobber per 140 to 169 cards, with 2 Assistant Jobbers on Rs. 40 ; and five sets of 5 men, one Front Jobber on Rs. 26, one Back Jobber on Rs. 26, one Lap Carrier and Fly Gatherer on Rs. 16, one Can Minder Rs. 15-8-0.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—Why does the Grinder in the Finlay system get Rs. 32, much more than in your system ?

MR. STONES :—That is due to different points of view. Mr. Taylor thinks that the Grinder is a better skilled man than the Stripper ; I say both do the same work. We have never gone into this from the point of view of saving one way or another ; we have only looked at it from the technicality of the work. Points of view differ as to which is a better method. Our system is undoubtedly much cheaper than their system. We should pay Rs. 754 plus 70 per cent., and they would pay Rs. 910 plus 50 per cent.

MR. KAMAT :—Rs. 910 for 22 cards ?

MR. STONES :—No. For 180 cards.

We have two assistant jobbers extra.

Then, in Drawing and Speed Frames both the systems are practically the same. The difference comes in the Ring Frame. In the Ring Frame the difference comes merely on the system of Tarwallas and Doffer Boys. In our system it is laid down : " Tarwallas and Doffer Boys : Number and rates of pay as per Standard List." In the Finlay group they say : " Helpers in lieu of Tarwallas and Doffer Boys, Rs. 16 plus 70 per cent." They put in helpers instead of raw labour. We are a large group and if we do not take earnings somewhere we should be in trouble. So we have followed the Standard List. We have got the same number of doffer boys and the same number of tarwallas. In the Finlay system they call them helpers and they pay them Rs. 16 plus 70 per cent.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What is the difference in number ?

MR. STONES :—I do not know. Unfortunately Mr. Taylor, the Superintendent, is leaving for England in a hurry. We adopt the number and wages of tarwallas and doffer boys as laid down in the Standard List. The Finlays pay for what they call helpers a higher rate and they have a less number. The exact number I cannot give, but we will get it for you.

I should like to deal with the written statement of the Joint Strike Committee with regard to the 3-loom and 2-frame systems. There are one or two misapprehensions or misstatements of facts in the written statement of the Joint Strike Committee on the 3-loom and 2-frame system. On page 2 it is stated that the recommendations of the Tariff Board were being taken up, but we wish to point out that for a long period before the Tariff Board sat or was even appointed, we had been doing experiments in connection with the new system. A little lower down the page it is stated that the strike ended in a compromise which gave an option to the workers to work two or three looms. The strike lasted one month, not two, and there never was nor ever has been any option to the workers as far as the mills in the E. D. Sassoon group are concerned.

The wages are again incorrect. The rate for 3 looms is based on the payment of 82 per cent. of the total earnings on 3 looms worked out at the rate of pay existing for 2 looms ; the existing rate is pies per pound and not per yard.

MR. BAKHALE :—If I remember correct these figures were supplied by Sassoons.

MR. STONES :—The figures are approximately correct, but the wages are calculated as per yard and not as stated in the statement as per pound.

On page 3 the statement is made “an increase of 50 per cent.” whereas these varied as a certain amount of standardisation occurred between mill and mill.

Much is made on page 4 of the tendency in Indian mills to spin higher counts of yarn from cotton than the quality of cotton warrants. We emphatically state that we have done the reverse, namely, that we are spinning counts from mixings which would readily spin finer counts, in fact the provision of better cotton is one of the fundamentals for the success of the new scheme and is our most costly item of increased expenditure in connection with the scheme.

MR. BAKHALE :—Do you say with regard to Sassoons?

MR. STONES :—Yes.

We emphatically state that we supply cotton of good quality and we have received no complaint at any time anywhere in our group of mills, since we started the scheme.

They state lower down on page 5 :—

“ Again, it must be noted that the Tariff Board had recommended, as a commencement, experiments on frames used for the spinning of higher counts.”

Our experiments were made on frames used for the spinning of higher counts and it was decided that for the present it certainly should be optional to the worker to keep to one side on counts 10s and below.

On page 7 it is stated that it takes half a day for each beam to be properly arranged on the loom and set to work. We would first point out that the weaver has nothing to do with putting the beam on the loom or setting it to work. This is done by the line jobber and assistants provided to do the work and instead of taking half a day, takes about fifteen minutes.

On the lower portion of page 7 it is stated that no weaver can hope to run the additional three looms during the absence of a fellow worker. Incidentally I might mention that we have on many occasions found weavers tending 6 looms during the absence of a worker without any apparent ill effect. We claim to have eased the position for the weaver by the provision of better material supplied to the looms in better form and are convinced that under conditions such as we provide in the Manchester and Apollo Mills a capable weaver can mind 6 looms.

The next point I wish to deal with is the division of the profits from the system. Trade Union officials seem to think that the only two people concerned are the operative and the mills. We ourselves feel that four parties are concerned—the worker, capital, the consumer and management—and we contend that the proportions we have given to the worker are far too high in comparison with the increased work done, when it is remembered that one of the chief points for the inception of this system is to reduce costs so that the price of goods produced may be cheaper to the consumer. Capital must have its share, firstly, to pay for the costs of improvements, and secondly, to assure a reasonable return on the money invested in the industry. In the commencement finance must be ultra-conservative as ample provision must be made for re-equipment, improvement of plant and the cost of experiments with the endless range of new equipments that post-war developments have provided to the cotton textile industry. In this connection I would like to quote an extract from the *International Cotton Bulletin* of November 1928, page 12 :—

“ We have the evidence of the cotton manufacturers who, after the advice of these specialists, increased the number of looms from 10 to 28, 72" to 108" reed space looms, and from 24 to 50 for the 40" reed space looms and who only pay 10 per cent. increase in wages ; this is evidently the standard increase in all mills which have adopted this multiple system.”

That is what Mr. Barnes says dealing with the conditions in America.

From Mr. Sasakura's evidence of conditions as they exist in Japan to-day as compared with the report of the British Trade Commissioner in Japan, the increase there has only been approximately 12½ per cent. although the number of looms tended has moved up from an average of 2½ to 6. These wages are also too high and it would not have been too much for us to have asked labour to tend 3 looms on plain cloth at a 10 per cent. increase in total wage. I would here like to quote the following extract from a report of a United States Trade Commissioner with reference to Pisa, Italy :

“ Effective April 30th. Textile operatives in the province of Pisa, Italy, accepted a 10 per cent. wage reduction. It is agreed, however, that the wage shall not fall below the following minimum rates :—

“ Piece-work rates must be on a scale to allow a weaver operating two looms to earn an average daily wage of 7.80 lira and a winder of normal capacity 7.20 lira per day. Loom setters-up 16 lira per day. Warpings 7.50 lira per day. Overtime work will be paid with 10 per cent. increase over usual wage.”

Taking the 48-hour week as normal in Italy and averaging the above into rupees per month of 26 days of 10 hours and allowing 10 per cent. increase over usual wage for 2 hours extra daily, these figures are as below :—

Loom jobbers	..	..	..	..	Rs. 76.4 per month.
Winders (9-hour day)	..	..	..	..	„ 30.6 „ „
Warpings (10-hour day)	..	..	..	..	„ 35.8 „ „
2-loom weavers	..	..	..	..	„ 37.2 „ „



All the above are female labour with the exception of loom jobbers. It will be seen that even allowing overtime rates, the wages in Bombay offered by the new standardised lists are far higher than Italy is now paying with the exception of winders. In Bombay this is female labour, while the remainder of the employees are male workers.

We have the evidence of Mr. Ramsingh, the manager of the Morarji Goculdas Mills, who informs us that their mills have been working with one man to two sides of a ring frame of 340 spindles since 1914, at a wage several rupees below the wage paid by our group of mills. Fourteen years' work on two sides, I think, is sufficient evidence to show that the work is not too arduous, particularly when we have put in better mixings on the counts where this system is in force. Frankly, our worry at most of our mills is not whether two sides can be tended by one side boy, but how many sides above six could we reasonably expect them to look after. We tested this the other day and we found that a side boy tending 2 sides had to do three piecings in 2 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN :—How long ?

MR. STONES :—Throughout the day ; minding two portions of the bobbin.

THE CHAIRMAN :—How many spindles ?

MR. STONES :—420 ring spindles.

Many questions were asked to the various workpeople who gave evidence with reference to the new system, but all these questions turned on the weaving section. In numerous cases weavers were asked " could they tend three looms " and the reply invariably was ' No '. I do not know the conditions existing in the mills sufficiently well to be able to dogmatise, but I can assure this Committee that with the mixed varieties produced by Bombay mills, I do not think it would be possible to put men on to 3 or 4 looms. We have done this only where we have been able to adjust conditions to permit its successful application. We have provided good humidity, extra strong yarn from superior mixings, bigger supplies of weft, special sizing, help to the weaver in the shape of assistance in taking weft to the loom and bringing cloth from the loom and other minor improvements which, when combined with the fact that only standard plain cloths are produced, make it possible for a skilled weaver to mind not 3 but up to 6 looms. We agree that this is impossible under conditions existing in the majority of weaving sheds in Bombay, but with the advent of intense specialisation, there is no reason why more looms should not be tended. In Bombay generally they change very often the sorts. We produce one sort and that continuously. We supply everything to assist the weaver who has to work only as a weaver joining the ends of the breaks and replacing the shuttle. The shuttles run three to four times quicker for 20 or 25 minutes. We are giving test on the yarn from 150 to 160 pounds in the Manchester Mill. By the application of various ingredients we got the test of 150 pounds.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—How is that test to be taken ?

MR. STONES :—We adopted the Lee test by putting the weight on 40 threads.

I now propose to deal with the relations of Labour, as represented by existing trade unions in Bombay, with the new system. In the formation of the suggested Joint Mediation Committee, the Lancashire system has been suggested for adoption. The consensus of opinion in the cotton trade of Lancashire is that much of the present difficulty is the inability to adjust the standards of English Trade Unionism to the standards set by American Trade Unions. Competition from nations like Japan and America in mass production goods will compel Lancashire to adopt the American Trade Union methods, or to go under in the struggle for the world's trade in these goods. Incidentally this means higher wages and a higher standard of living for operatives and a lower cost of production with increased consumption causing extension of trade and reabsorption of temporary unemployment.

Trade unionism in Bombay is in its infancy and unless wisely guided will wittingly and unwittingly cause trouble to employer and employee alike. Might we suggest that the present position affords an excellent opportunity for amalgamating all that is best in both systems in the relations between employer and employee for the present crystallised in the Joint Mediation Committee. This could be done by combining the present rules with a declaration similar to the one quoted on page 45 of the *International Cotton Bulletin* of November 1928. This we consider so all-important to the future of the industry that I have no hesitation in quoting same *in extenso* :—

“ The following copy of a trade union agreement in force in one of the cotton mills in New England shows the attitude which the unions take up on the point of improved machinery and on the loyalty between masters and men.

The agreement reads as follows :—

“ Agreement by and between the United Textile Workers of America, through its legally qualified officers, party of the first part, and the.... Cotton Spinning Company, through its legally qualified officers, party of the second part, with the object of removing, as far as possible, all causes for misunderstanding and friction and of promoting to the greatest possible degree the mutual helpfulness of the two organizations.

“First. The party of the second part agrees to a cordial and full membership recognition of the *bona fide* trade unions of its employees known as party of the first part as their proper agents in matters affecting their welfare, and further agrees that these trade unions are acceptable. It recognises them as desirable, not in regard to the welfare and protection of their members, but also desirably to the management, inasmuch as the co-operation of their members is essential to the continued and successful operation of the mills.

“Second. The party of the first part agrees to promote in every legitimate way the distribution and sale of the mills' products, and other

products of the party of the second part, and pledges its support in a constructive and responsible way to the end that quantity and quality of production may be maintained.....”

I would emphasise the last words. It further proceeds:—

“...and further pledges its co-operation in effecting such economies in manufacturing as may be brought by the introduction of improved machinery.”

MR. BAKHALE :—What is the name of the company?

MR. STONES :—It is not mentioned here. Mr. Barnes, who is well known to me and who is absolutely reliable, quotes the agreement here.

The joint general declaration of the General Federation of Trade Unions and the organisations of salaried employees and officials is as follows:

“Rationalisation is necessary. It is a task both for separate concerns and whole industries. Its aim must be a reduction in the costs of production and lower prices together with a simultaneous increase in wages. Only by means of an increase in mass purchasing power created in this way can the workless become re-employed. The method, often practised at present, of rationalising without simultaneous lowering of prices and raising of wages must produce a crisis of over-production.

The most effective Trade Union action would, therefore, be directed to persistent effort to accelerate the development of the schemes, to enlarge their scope and purpose, and to bring about the national co-ordination which is essential to success.”

We claim to have carried out this policy, but in the process of doing so it is to be admitted that fully 2,000 men will be displaced over the Millowners' standard in our group alone, and this standard reduced a further 2,000 from the old list. In the weaving slightly less than 1,000 men are displaced—in all a total of 5,100 men out of a former muster of roughly 27,000 men have become unemployed during the last 3 years.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Is it for the Sassoon group?

MR. STONES :—It is for the Sassoon group.

I would now like to touch on the question of unemployment, which in my opinion, is the only serious objection which can be raised by labour. In my opinion, the basic factor causing the general strike was the fear of unemployment. The handling of displaced labour is a national and not a local problem. As far as the local industry is concerned, we claim that the adoption of the new system will reduce costs of manufacture with subsequent decrease in cost to consumer and therefore increased consumption. This increase of consumption will mean the starting up of mills now stopped or the adoption of two shifts both of which will absorb temporary unemployment later and this, at a higher scale of wages with, in many cases, easier work and a higher standard of living.....

THE CHAIRMAN :—Two shifts ?

MR. STONES :—As far as local industry is concerned we claim that the introduction of the new system will reduce costs. The cheaper the cost the greater will be the consumption ; and we will be able to meet Japanese competition. I can give the instance of the Manchester Mill with regard to sheeting market. Under the old system we could not compete with the Japanese in respect of sheetings. With the adoption of the new system and new machinery, we are able to compete with Japan and earn a small profit. The Manchester Mill produces only sheetings under the new system.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Do you compete with the Japanese sheetings in the Indian market or in foreign markets also ?

MR. STONES :—We sold during the last 6 months 2,000 bales of sheetings in Egypt.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Is it a new market ?

MR. STONES :—Yes ; Mr. Maloney when he went on his recent tour with the Meek Committee to Egypt, wrote to us that the cloth was approved and they wanted it at Re. 1 less. At that time the Japanese put up the price of their sheetings in anticipation of their adopting the Washington agreement in July next. As it was a question of competition we agreed to sell sheetings at that rate even for a small profit.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The Japanese have had some trouble.

MR. STONES :—Nothing except minor troubles.

THE CHAIRMAN :—They had a serious financial trouble.

MR. STONES :—There are only five big people in Japan who are gradually absorbing all the little mills. One group is making only this cloth.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Some of them have to go on short time.

MR. STONES :—They have gone on short time and that will be automatic in July next. It is why they put up the price of the sheetings. We can compete with Japan only in this cloth and not in others. Their competition is on these specialised lines. As far as our mills are concerned if we can increase the consumption by reducing the cost, and if workpeople are agreeable, we can put the Manchester Mill on two shifts day and night. It would absorb some more people, and I have no doubt that if people saw the industry paying, such mills as the Jivraj Balu Mill, which have stopped work for the past so many months, will be taken up, reorganised, and work started.

As far as the national aspect of unemployment is concerned, it may be dealt with by one of the many methods known now. I do not want to go into them. There may be a Board of Labour Transference, or a Clearing

House of information, or Government may modify the business cycle by regulating Government expenditure, particularly with reference to construction work, so that these may be done when the cycle of unemployment is at its highest. The Millowners cannot take that up. It will be a national problem, which will take its place in the competition with other countries who are adopting these methods.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—You say there is no local obligation to try and help ?

**MR. STONES** :—We have offered our local reply that we can go on to two shifts, if labour co-operates. I am positive that the mills that are now lying derelict in Bombay would be purchased and reorganised, and thus find employment for people. Apart from any displacement of labour through the adoption of the Millowners' Standard List, we have the displacement of labour due to mills being closed. Quite a number of mills in Bombay are closed, and very little extension is going on. I have plans down and foundations put in for at least 3,000 looms to be added to the Bombay industry ; but, although the foundations have been laid and the plans passed, we have bought mills up-country. We cannot go on extending here on account of the labour cost. If labour co-operates on the lines that we have laid down, there would be more work for them. In the case of our own firm, it has become a question whether putting in new machinery will pay. The mills here are in such a bad condition through fear of strikes and inability to put in modern machinery, that it is a question whether it is worth while putting in new machinery, and whether it would not be better to build entirely new mills up-country. That is absolutely within the scope of practical politics to-day, as far as our own mills are concerned. We have got mills up-country, and we have put in modern machinery. We have plans ready to modernise every part of the machinery in our mills in Bombay, but it is doubtful whether it would pay us to do so, with the prospects ahead of the industry. We see that, as a matter of fact, the problem is national. However, there has been no satisfactory universal plan for the relief of unemployment by any nation. Anything that has been done provides only a palliative, and offers no fundamental cure.

To finally sum up, we maintain that we have provided conditions essential to the success of the new system. We maintain that the work we have called upon our operatives to do is well within their capacity. In fact, in many cases, it can be increased still further without our being charged in any way with "sweating" our labour.

We think that the true solution to the troubles of the industry can be met by the adoption of this system to the ultimate benefit of the Worker, Capital, the Consumer and Management. We do not claim that it is immediately applicable to all mills in Bombay, but we do feel that in the spinning section it could very quickly be adopted by all mills who would devote the necessary attention. In the weaving, it can only be adopted where drastic re-organisation and specialisation have taken place and this we claim to have done in the case of our Apollo and Manchester Mills—the only mills now running on this system.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Would it not involve some sort of amalgamation of the mills—to arrange that one mill should devote itself to one particular kind of cloth, and another to another kind ?

MR. STONES :—It would need something of that kind. Alternatively, we get two classes in Bombay in the way of trade. We get, what is now on, the bleaching season and the light goods season, preparatory for summer wear. About July, we go full tilt into the heavier goods for winter wear, when *khadi* comes in enormous demand, and fancy coloured goods. The trouble comes in in the adoption of some system by which a mill could be switched over to grey shirtings for the first portion of the year, and to coloured goods for the last portion of the year. With the modern development of coloured goods, there is no reason why even in certain lines of coloured goods, they should not be woven in 3 out of 4 looms. It must be certain specialised lines, for example striped drills ; those are just as easy to run as grey goods and are the only goods of a fancy character that the Japanese have been able to do successfully. It would have to be thought out. We could do it as a group, because we have so many mills. The Jacob Sassoon Mill makes nothing but Government specialities and shirtings ; the Apollo Mills make nothing but longcloth ; the Manchester nothing but sheeting, and the Rachel Mills make every sort that can be made in checks, and the E. D. Sassoon Mills do the same. Three of the mills in our group have specialised in one cloth and one only, the others making a variety of styles. That means we cut prices ; it means competition with the other mills ; we will worry the other mills. There must be this specialisation. We cannot get business unless we cut down the price to suit the consumer, and it has got to be at the consumer's doorsteps. The Cawnpore mills can do that, as they have facilities in the way of a supply of cotton and cheap labour. In the course of my tours in South India recently, I found in certain mills the side boys were getting 7. I thought it was 7 annas, but when I enquired I was told it was 7 *chakrams*, there being 28 *chakrams* to a rupee. That comes to 4 annas a day for a side boy. They are in the heart of the cotton growing districts, with thousands of handloom weavers in the vicinity, and we are up against that. We do not want to bring prices down ; we do not want to put down the wage, or lower the standard of living. If the industry in Bombay is to continue, it can only be done by the adoption of this system. We have had a busy time since we started after the General Strike ; we have filled the vacuum of six months' stoppage already, and signs are not wanting to-day that in another 4 months' time the Bombay mills will be in the same position as they were when the strike first commenced, when looms were stopping by the hundred per day, causing unemployment. That position is arising, and, in my opinion, unless something phenomenal happens, we shall be in the same condition as we were in, before another six months are over.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I gather that the Bombay mills supply roughly half of the ordinary Indian consumption.

MR. STONES :—The trouble with the Bombay mills has been that the up-country mills are overlapping more and more on our ability to supply the Indian market. The potential market for India is simply enormous. The whole of the foreign market that the Meek Commission said that we might

supply would only keep a couple of the Bombay mills going. If they got all the foreign market that was available to them, it would only keep another couple of mills going. If they get the Indian market, every mill in Bombay could be kept going, and it is for the Indian market that Bombay has got to specialise.

**THE CHAIRMAN** :—With more amalgamation, many mills may have their value reduced ?

**MR. STONES** :—Yes. The solution to the problem is the same as the one that they were forced to adopt at home. They are doing that sort of thing. They simply say to the mill " You come into this scheme on such and such a basis," and they have got to come in or go under. Just as we are writing down our capital in most mills to-day ; since we put our figures in, two more mills have gone into liquidation, and another mill has reduced its capital severely.

Finally, we appeal for the co-operation of labour in assisting us to bring the industry and incidentally Bombay back to prosperity. In so far as lies in our power, we are prepared to meet the problem of unemployment by the adoption of double shifts, and other people will undoubtedly take up mills now stopped, if they see that the industry can give a fair and settled return to capital.

By this system we claim to do more to raise the standard of living than has been done by any Government action, and if we are to continue the industry, it is the only solution possible.

In conclusion, I would ask permission to bring forward a note that I forwarded to the Secretary for perusal. You will notice that we had mentioned before the Tariff Board that the condition in New Bedford and New England States was analogous to the conditions existing in Bombay. Since then they have followed absolutely parallel lines. The New Bedford mills went after cutting wages ; they have lost their business to the Southern mills. The conditions in the Southern mills in America are even worse than in Japan. There are no restrictions in many States to the employment of women and children at night, and in many States there is limitation as to hours of work. This hit the New England States, particularly Massachusetts, which has the most advanced labour laws in America, with the exception of California and Columbia. They have this unfair competition from within, and they have external competition in the very super class of goods, namely, voiles and finer classes of goods, because England is able to sell them in America cheaper than America can make them. They had a six months' strike, but they settled it with, I believe, a 5 per cent. all-round cut in wages. I do not propose to read the whole of the article, but substitute the word " Bombay " for " New Bedford " and " the New System " for " Labour Specialisation," and you have the true position of Bombay.

I would appeal to the other side, in the interests of Bombay, to take up the attitude that this must be the line of solution. It does not reduce the cost of living ; it does not reduce wages. Although it may bring about a

certain amount of unemployment in the beginning, it will in the long run find work for the unemployed.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The only question common to the two systems is that of retrenchment, and of course the retrenchment is in the spinning section. I only want to say that, as far as spinning is concerned, we were obliged to take this matter up, because the Tariff Board have pointed out that not only as compared with other countries, were we employing more men in the spinning department, but even compared with Ahmedabad. This is discussed on page 122 of the printed evidence, where we had quoted page 136 of the Tariff Board Report. You, sir, asked "The average number of operatives for 1,000 spindles in Bombay is higher than in Ahmedabad but lower than other up-country centres outside?" Mr. Stones said "Yes." Mr. Dange said "Because the overhead charges are lower, it cannot be made out that the number of operatives are low." Mr. Stones said "The Tariff Board says :—'Our examination of the costs of production, however, shows that the average number of operatives per 1,000 spindles in Bombay is considerably higher than in Ahmedabad and that Ahmedabad has already a clear advantage in this respect even allowing for the higher counts spun in the latter centre.'" You, sir, remarked "It is a definite statement." That was the reason why we had to resort to retrenchment in the spinning section. I might just point out that, as regards the extent of the retrenchment, in the statement that we have submitted we have shown that about 8,000 men will be reduced; 58,000 will be brought down to 50,000. But I might point out that that statement of course refers to July 1927, since when retrenchment has already taken place.

And this will be made clear by Mr. Gennings' evidence at page 148 of the printed evidence :—

"MR. JOSHI :—Mr. Gennings said that the agreement does not mean that the millowners would be under an obligation to employ the same number of men as were employed in March 1927 or March 1928. . . ."

"MR. GENNINGS :—No, not altogether. What I understood was, quite apart from the working of three looms or the two-frame system, that there had been material changes in the numbers of men employed in other departments since March 1927, and that, in order that there should be no difficulty in that matter, it was agreed that the question of musters should not arise. That is to say, the question of the number of men to be taken back into employment when the mills resumed should not be a matter at issue. . . ."

THE CHAIRMAN :—Is there anything to show how much retrenchment has taken place?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Mr. Dange himself has given an estimate, and I think I confirmed it. The evidence appears at page 204 of the printed volume of evidence :—

"MR. KHAREGHAT :—How many would be displaced?"



" MR. DANGE :—About 2,000, sir, if not 3,000."

Later on I confirmed that. At page 212, you will find my remarks :—

" Mr. Dange again touched on the point of unemployment. He said if we put our amended scheme into force about 2,000 men would be disengaged. It is true that in the spinning section 2,000 or even 2,500 men might be disengaged, but I have already told you that it is not the actual workers who will be affected as much as the casual workers."

As regards the men disengaged, it is mostly the doffer boys. In our joint conference we have agreed to increase the number of doffer boys by about 10 per cent., and I believe it will reduce the number of unemployed. It is very difficult to say exactly to what extent, but there are 10,000 doffer boys in the industry and 10 per cent. of that would be 1,000. So that even this 2,500 will be considerably reduced as we have agreed to put up the number of doffer boys.

The question of retrenchment is a general question. As Mr. Stones has pointed out, all that we can do is that if our industry is put on a sounder basis and is made to pay, certainly we will expand in such a manner that all the unemployed can be absorbed. In India the position is this, that we are not providing the masses with their requirements fully. In England and Japan, what happens is that they over-produce and have therefore to find markets for their surplus production. In India it is just the opposite; we have ample scope for extension. We are not providing for more than half the quantity, including the handloom goods. Therefore, as I say, there is ample scope for expansion and if the industry improves,—there is no reason why it should not improve even in Bombay,—then we can absorb the unemployed men.

As regards the question of unemployment insurance, that of course is a very large question. . . .

MR. BAKHALE :—It is a national question !

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It is a national question. . . .

MR. BAKHALE :—And may be dealt with nationally.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—And may be dealt with in that light.

MR. KAMAT :—What about the feasibility of specialization ; do you think it is possible ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I do not think, sir, because we have already got a large variety of looms specially ordered out for different kinds of cloth. We turn out an immense variety of cloths, and we have looms from 28" to 90". We have got so many dobbies, jacquards and so on, that unless something on the lines of Lancashire is done I do not think it is easy to standardise as regards the varieties. It has gone on for such a long time in Bombay and the

varieties are so many, that it would be very difficult to reorganise the industry in such a way that particular mills can take up looms of a particular width. That can only be done if there is amalgamation.

MR. STONES :—There is one difference between the E. D. Sassoon United Mills and other groups of mills. Although many mill agents have a number of mills under their management, the mills under them are separate entities, whereas the United group have five mills which are owned by the same company. The Currimbhoys and the Tatas cannot interchange machinery from one mill to another because the mills under their management are owned by separate companies. I have not been able to carry out my scheme for all the mills under the Sassoon management, because some of them are separate entities.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What are those which are owned by the same company ?

MR. STONES :—The Manchester, E. D. Sassoon, Alexandra, Rachael, Jacob.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Is it the David Sassoon that is being wound up ?

MR. STONES :—The David Sassoon have three mills, the Sassoon Spinning, which is reducing its capital, the Union Mill, which has been wound up, and the Sassoon and Alliance Silk, which is fairly prosperous.

MR. KAMAT :—If you want to go in for standardisation, would you require help from banks ?

MR. STONES :—There are two things, one is help from banks and the other is a period of protection for a short period to give that opportunity for adjustments.

MR. KAMAT :—Can help from banks be easily had ?

MR. STONES :—It is tremendously difficult.

MR. BAKHALE :—Is it a fact that in Lancashire they are going to combine ?

MR. STONES :—They are compelled to. When I was at home, I was offered 12 mills. There was no question of price. They said : " Take them up and give us a 20 years' debenture." I would have taken them up as a matter of fact but for the income-tax trouble. You will work and get nothing.

MR. BAKHALE :—Are they giving protection to this combination in Lancashire ?

MR. STONES :—No, but the Bank of England has put up £2,000,000.

MR. KAMAT :—As regards money from the banks, cannot that be done even here ?

MR. STONES :—No, because most of the banks are exchange banks ; the Imperial Bank is rather tied. The Globe Mill a few weeks ago was sold for Rs. 12 lakhs. You could not have the wall, the chimney and the buildings for that amount. That is gambling on the future of the industry.

THE CHAIRMAN :—How did they get the money in England ?

MR. STONES :—Because the banks were mortgagees, and they could have taken the mills in liquidation. The Bank of England, which is a semi-Government institution, went to their help.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The banks are mortgagees in possession ?

MR. STONES :—Yes. One mill the sale of which had been negotiated for £700,000, was sold for £40,000 within five years.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is the difference between boom time and time of depression.

MR. STONES :—Yes.

MR. BAKHALE :—Before dealing with the question of Rationalisation and the Efficiency Scheme, I should like to deal with one or two points which Mr. Stones raised during the course of his statement. He referred to Italy, and the wages that are obtaining there at the present time. Sir, from our point of view Italy is not a country which we can copy.

THE CHAIRMAN :—It has got a Labour Charter.

MR. BAKHALE :—That is a Labour Charter given by the capitalist dictatorship, and therefore I am not prepared to accept any figures coming from Italy just as the other side will not be prepared to accept any figures from Russia because in Russia there is a proletarian dictatorship.

MR. STONES :—I simply mentioned it in passing. Italy is competing with us ; I have not enough facts myself to be able to understand it ; I merely made a bald statement.

MR. BAKHALE :—It is of course in America also. There is not that much freedom for a trade union in a protectionist country as is to be found in a country like England or Germany which are more or less free trade countries. Further, we do not know the real complexion of the trade union referred to in the agreement. There are one or two interesting points in this agreement itself which I may refer to for your information. The fourth article says :—

“ The party of the second part appreciating the advantage of a spirit of co-operation and loyalty inspiring the personnel of its employees, and desiring to further cement the feeling of friendly and sympathetic understanding, agree to use every effort to maintain good working conditions, fair wages and continuity of employment.”

I should like to emphasise the continuity of employment, a thing which has been agreed to by the employers. I wonder whether the other side is going to agree to provide continuity of employment for their operatives. We have got in the first place the 'playing off' rule and also the question of retrenchment. Then there is the fifth article which says and which is also rather important from our point of view :—

“ Representatives of the party of the first part shall meet with the representatives of the second part at regular intervals, preferably once a month, or as often as necessity may require, for the discussion of any questions that may arise and for the further extension of a spirit of loyalty, helpfulness and co-operation.”

This is exactly the rule which I suggested to the Committee the other day, which was vehemently opposed by the other side. There is another question which deserves the notice of the Committee. The fifth article says :—

“ This co-operative agreement is binding upon both parties in spirit as well as in letter, and shall be changed only by mutual agreement, after notification in writing, served by either party upon the other at least 60 days before such change is to become effective.”

I lay emphasis on the words “only by mutual agreement.” We had considerable discussion about the point whether the millowners should or should not consult the operatives before any changes are made in the rules. There was some discussion also on the point whether it should be consultation or consent. Here it is evidently stated.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Agreement is mutual.

MR. BAKHALE :—The point is recognised that even for the sake of agreement mutual consultation and approval is necessary between the parties. I wonder whether we have got it here.

MR. STONES :—Of course I did not read all the articles. I recommended the agreement for both parties and not for one party. I recommend the whole of it to the consideration of the Committee.

MR. BAKHALE :—I shall now take up the question of rationalisation and deal with it as it is understood at present. We have the evidence of Sir Victor Sassoon on this point and he emphatically denied that the efficiency system was the same as the rational scheme. He stated that he wished to reduce the cost of production, increase the efficiency of the operatives, cut out the waste and get a bigger return for a given amount of effort. That is really what he said in his oral evidence. He further pointed out that in rationalisation much emphasis was not laid on elimination of waste, combination for selling products and purchasing raw material and so on. On that very day I referred to an extract from the World Economic Conference Final Report. I will just read a portion of it :—

“ The Conference considers that one of the principal means of increasing output, improving conditions of labour and reducing costs of production is to be found in the rational organisation of production and distribution.”

Sir Victor stated that his object was to cut down waste which is also the object of the rationalisation scheme. I have got a copy of the report of the World Economic Conference Report which definitely stated on page 41 with regard to the rationalisation scheme :—

“ The first of these problems is that of rationalisation, by which we understand the methods of technique and of organisation designed to secure the minimum waste of either effort or material. It includes the scientific organisation of labour, standardisation both of material and of products, simplification of processes and improvements in the system of transport and marketing.”

He did not want to deal with the other problems, because he did not want to accept that rationalisation scheme and efficiency methods are one and the same. Towards the end he did agree by saying: “ I am going part of the way.” That is to say he is going to accept the preliminary part of the rationalisation scheme as it is at present understood all over Europe. So, from our point of view we personally believe that the so-called efficiency system, either of the Sassoons or of the Finlays, is only a beginning towards the rationalisation scheme. We also pointed out at that time that it was a world problem and that it was being considered by almost all the industrialised countries and that the experience of Germany proved that it was not possible without combination on the part of employers, because if rationalisation was really meant to reduce cost of production that cost of production could not be reduced unless there was a combination of the employers. Germany, for example, has got a higher combination among the employers than England. England is now making efforts to bring about combination among the Lancashire employers. Combination among the employers really means monopoly. It is the experience of the countries or trades that the cost of production or the prices do not necessarily go down. In a monopoly there is always a tendency for the prices to go up.

THE CHAIRMAN :—In a place which has to meet very considerable outside competition.

MR. BAKHALE :—It is exactly in that respect that rationalisation may be an advantage to the other side. Prices may be reduced. Rationalisation may be good under certain conditions to the employers. The other day I quoted the example of a country where the prices have gone up as a result of rationalisation instead of coming down.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Where ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I have not brought that cutting. I can give it tomorrow.

Further, we state that in order that the rationalisation scheme should become effective, useful and profitable, economy must not be one-sided. What we are doing to-day is that we are reducing the labour costs. But efforts in the direction of reducing the costs have not been so great as they ought to be. Further, there is the question of uncertainty of employment and also the question of unemployment. Considering the whole problem in all its aspects we feel that rationalisation under the capitalistic system is really a scheme to level down the standard of living of the operatives. It is nothing else. But at the same time we do feel that rationalisation is inevitable under the existing conditions. Although we may not like it, we have to face it and we have to find out remedies for the evils which may arise out of the rationalisation scheme. In Russia, for example, rationalisation scheme has been used on a very large scale. There the cost of production has considerably gone down.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Has the result been satisfactory ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Here is a cutting which I am giving you for your perusal.

MR. MALONEY :—Is that the latest ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes. I myself saw some of the mills in Leningrad and Moscow. Rationalisation is much more successful in Russia under State control than anywhere else. There is of course unemployment even in Russia but they have met it by unemployment insurance. It is really the industry that pays the whole cost of insurance. The worker does not pay a pie for the insurance.

Then, there is the big question of concentration of production.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—How many looms and frames do they work in Russia ?

MR. BAKHALE :—From the point of view of cost of production and greater total production the rationalisation scheme is successful in Russia.

MR. STONES :—May I give a reply to Mr. Khareghat's question ? Our agent in Russia in a communication to us recently states that a girl works 600 spindles and a girl attends 3 to 4 looms.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is not much difference between the working in Bombay and that in Russia. There the weaver does not mind more than two looms.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What is the nature of their rationalisation ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I can give you this cutting for your information.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—There must be some definite meaning.

THE CHAIRMAN :—They have night shifts.

MR. BAKHALE :—In some factories they have 2 shifts, and in others 3 shifts. So far as the working conditions in Russia are concerned, they are very bad, and I do not want to bring them up here. But as regards the question of efficiency and the cost of production, I can say this much, that they have succeeded where other countries have failed, by introducing the system of rationalisation with State control thereon, with their syndicates, with their agreements, with the co-operative societies, and other things.

THE CHAIRMAN :—But they do not find that the workman puts his back into it. He has not got quite the same inducement to put himself into it to produce more than a certain amount ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I cannot say that.

On the question of concentration of production, Mr. Stones said, on page 1351 of the proceedings : " The whole organisation is subordinated to producing this one type of cloth and producing it well. Naturally that kind of cloth must be in demand by the rest of the world in increasing quantities. This particular kind of cloth is known as three-yard sheeting. The reason for this designation is that it is 36" wide, 30 yards long and 10 lbs. in weight, that is to say, 3 square yards to the pound. To-day it is made in other lengths, and in recent years in different widths also." Further on, he says : " This was previously made by American manufacturers. They developed this cloth by absolute concentration. The Japanese buy the cotton, they arrange rebates with the shipping companies for the amount of cotton shipped, they control the mills and control the disposal of the finished product. They also take a keen interest in the exploitation of the markets." You will therefore see that for a rationalisation scheme to be effective, there are so many factors which must be considered before taking a step in that direction. What is being done at present is that, say, two groups of mills are doing something under the name of efficiency, and are bringing in evils which are really the results of rationalisation, and at the same time they do not take the trouble to provide against the risks which are incidental to such a scheme. That is really the tragedy of the whole situation. We are, therefore, of opinion that rationalisation cannot be successful without State control. The industry must be nationalised, and if after that you make an effort towards rationalisation, there is some chance of the improvements getting in. Otherwise, it is bound to fail. Secondly, we believe that there must be a combination amongst the employers, so as to make the scheme of rationalisation as successful as possible. In the third place, there must be concentration of production in the industry. Otherwise, some mills may reduce their cost of production, and others may not. But when the others find that some mills have reduced their cost of production by adopting this method, they will do the same, and that will lead to greater unemployment. I am referring, so far as this question is concerned, not only to the internal competition between the Bombay mills themselves, but also to the mills outside Bombay, because the cost of production in the up-country mills is lower than the cost of production here ; the wages there are lower than they are in Bombay. The point, therefore, I want to emphasise is that rationalisation to be successful must have all these factors dealt with very carefully. Otherwise, what will happen is that the workers' conditions will be worsened to a very

great extent, and at the same time the scheme will not give even the employers the benefit which they aim at.

Lastly, there is the question of uncertainty of employment. That is inevitable. This has been agreed to by the World Economic Conference, and they have definitely stated in their resolution that provision should be made for the temporary unemployment that may be caused by adopting the system of rationalisation. The question is how to meet this unemployment. One method is the absorption of the displaced labour in the same industry, and another is that if such absorption is not possible in that industry, it should take place as far as possible in other industries, and even if that may not be possible, provision should be made for unemployment insurance. We have got the evidence of Sir Victor Sassoon on that point. But his replies were evasive to a very great extent. He said "Give us so many conditions, and then I shall tell you whether labour can be absorbed or not." But ultimately I think he said that so long as the cost of production would not go down, it was not possible to absorb a very large number of displaced labourers in Bombay. Mr. Dongarsingh, in the course of his evidence (page 1775) said that absorption was not possible in the Bombay textile industry. The result clearly will be that if you are bent upon introducing the rationalisation scheme firstly in a group of mills, or in two groups of mills, that scheme is bound to go to other mills as soon as they find that these two groups had succeeded in reducing their cost of production. At the same time, the Millowners are not going to make any provision for the labour that may be displaced by the scheme. They say that it is a national problem. I agree that it is a national problem. But if it is going to be solved nationally, let the industry which is responsible for bringing about this problem be also nationalised. Whenever there is trouble in the industry, you can point it out to the Government and ask them to give protection. Whenever the workers are in difficulties and place before the Millowners questions like unemployment insurance, sickness insurance, or minimum wage, they always say that these are big national problems, and cannot be solved by one single industry. It may be that one industry may not be able to solve such a problem, and therefore I say, let the industry be nationalised, and then we shall certainly be able to solve this problem. For the purpose of profits, they want to keep the industry a private concern. When there is prosperity, they want to take the profits to themselves and for those who invest in the industry. It is only when they find it difficult to deal with labour that they have to give them certain increases in their wages. But when they themselves get into difficulties on account of depression or on account of the new machinery that may be introduced in the textile industry, they approach Government and say "Give us protection, and if there is unemployment, let that problem be considered nationally." It is the most unfair way of dealing with the working classes in Bombay. The workers are quite prepared to treat this question of unemployment as a national problem, and they will make every endeavour to see that that question is pressed before the Government of India. But I should like to know from the Millowners whether they have not got some interest in this question of unemployment. Have they ever raised a little finger to press this question on the Government? Never, so far as I know. For that they want to depend on others. They want Government to take the initiative, but for purposes of improvement



they do not wait whether Government suggests anything or not, but they take the initiative and go on in their way, without caring for the workers who may be displaced, or for their wages which may be reduced. We are therefore not willing to accept at all the efficiency system or the rational system, by whichever name it may be called. We want all these conditions to be fulfilled first.

In the Tariff Board Report they have recommended certain items, before any improvements could be made. They had asked for the training of jobbers. We have the evidence of Mr. Babaji, manager of a mill in the Sassoon group, who told us definitely that, so far as he knew, no efforts were made to train the jobber; and the Tariff Board laid considerable emphasis on the training of the jobber before making any attempt to increase the efficiency of the operatives. Mr. Stones and a few others from the other side always point to the Textile Institute of the Social Service League and say, "Here is an institute which is intended for increasing the efficiency of the jobbers and the workers, and yet that institute has not yet been able to do much." While we are grateful to such of the millowners as have supplied us machinery to build up that institute, we have found to our cost, during the last few years, that it was a difficult job to induce workers and jobbers to come at night to receive training and become efficient, because it is our experience that, after 10 hours of hard work in the mill, it is not possible, under the existing climatic and other conditions such as housing and others, for the workers to spend and concentrate for two more hours over training and make an endeavour to become more efficient. So, it is no use pointing to our institute, and then telling us that it is a failure.

There is another paragraph in the Tariff Board Report about improvements in the raw material, and so on. I wonder whether the Millowners' Association has done much, if anything, in this direction.

Then there is the particular question of the division of the savings that may be effected owing to the introduction of this system. Our view in that regard is that the worker is entitled to get the full wage for the extra work that he may be getting, if the employer does not spend a farthing in improving the machinery or in any other direction. Take, for example, the Blow Room. There double work has been given to lattice feeders and exhaust and breaker scutcher men on an optional basis. Now, I got it ascertained from the other side whether they did require to make any change in the machinery and to spend extra money for that change. The reply was that it was not at all necessary to invest any money and to make any improvement, under the existing circumstances; the present arrangement was quite satisfactory, and the men could do the double work that they have been asked to do.

MR. BAKHALE :—On this question my view is that if the millowners do not invest any money on account of these improvements, certainly the workers who are asked to do double work, should get wages in proportion to the extra work they do, because it is owing to their labour that the extra production is got. Where of course money is invested on the improvement, on replacing old machinery with new machinery, certainly we shall have to

take that factor into consideration. Where the workers are responsible for the increased production, which reduces cost, they are entitled to get much more than the millowners are at present prepared to give them.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—How will the cost be reduced ?

MR. BAKHALE :—When labour is displaced, there is saving.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—If instead of one loom he minds two looms you want his wages to be doubled ; where then is the saving in the cost of production ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I would not say that the worker should get exactly double, but much more than what they are paying to-day. In this connection I should like to refer to the evidence of Mr. Bradley at pages 1915-1917 :—

“ THE CHAIRMAN :—Do you oppose any improvements in factories that involve a reduction of workers, or any improvements in machinery that would lead to increased production ?—No, if an equivalent increase in the standard of the workers is given.

You say the whole amount of the savings of the mills should be given to the other workmen ?—Equivalent to the increased output and the results the workers should have.

The whole of it ?—Yes.

You would not give 50 per cent. to the workmen and 50 per cent. to the owners ?—No ; not until the worker reaches a decent standard of living.”

I do not propose to go into detail as regards the three-loom system and the double-frame system, because Mr. Stones has already done it, and I have given you our general objections. As regards the three-loom system Mr. Dongarsingh, who is manager of a big mill, said during the course of his evidence at page 1775 (the questions were asked by me) :—

“ What are your objections to the three-loom system ?—There will be one-loom in one place and two-loom in another place. So, the man will have to walk more to reach down many times. Besides this, there are so many breakages that I do not think a weaver can attend to three-loom.

“ Breakages are due more or less to bad raw materials ?—It is not defective raw material only ; it is defective humidification also. In Bombay I think there are only two or three mills which have been fitted up with up-to-date humidifying arrangements.

“ You have seen the Lancashire mills ?—Yes.

“ And you have seen the lay-out of the looms there in the weaving shed ?—Yes.

“ Does it differ very much from the lay-out of the looms in the Bombay mills?—It does not.

“ There a weaver works 4 looms?—It is easy to work 4 looms. There is another thing, that the warp works very well there, and they work with fine weft, and so it requires less shuttling; also the humidifying arrangement is very nice in Lancashire.”

Then, Mr. Sutaria of the Swadeshi Mills laid considerable emphasis upon having superior cotton, greater length on the beams, ample provision for humidification and ventilation, before the three-loom system is introduced. On the whole, I have pointed out that we are not agreeable to this efficiency system on principle so long as the other side is not willing to make the improvements that are absolutely necessary in the interests of the industry as well as in the interests of the workers and so long as no provision is made for the people that may be displaced by this system.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What provision would you recommend; can you make concrete proposals about unemployment?

MR. BAKHALE :—I am in favour of an unemployment insurance scheme.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Would the workmen contribute?

MR. BAKHALE :—Well, both may contribute, and in addition, I think the State also will have to contribute their mite. Otherwise there is no solution to this problem. We are getting industrialised more and more every day; new machinery is coming in very rapidly and there is bound to be greater and greater displacement of labour.

THE CHAIRMAN :—In the World Economic Conference they said that rationalisation involving unemployment should be introduced with care. What exactly did they mean by that?

MR. BAKHALE :—They say “ It must be applied with the care that is necessary in order, while at the same time continuing the process of rationalisation, not to injure the legitimate interest of the workers, and suitable measures should be provided for cases where during the first stage of this rationalisation it may result in loss of employment and more arduous work.”

THE CHAIRMAN :—What is the suitable measure now?

MR. BAKHALE :—So far as I understand, “ suitable measures ” really mean some scheme to provide against unemployment by way of unemployment insurance, labour exchange or absorption if not in the same industry at least in other industries. What we mean is that the worker should not starve by our increasing the efficiency not only of the workers but also of the whole industry. It has now been internationally recognised that the State must provide for those people who are unemployed. It is an international agreement more or less, and I think it is time now for us to accept that and do something in the direction of introducing this very necessary scheme. •

MR. KAMAT :—Would you say that until there is an unemployment insurance scheme and also possibly labour exchanges, this rational system should not be further extended ?

MR. BAKHALE :—That is what I mean.

MR. KAMAT :—Do you know that the displaced weavers cannot be absorbed in the handloom industry ?

MR. BAKHALE :—There is very little information as regards the handloom industry, and I cannot tell you whether the displaced weavers can be absorbed in the handloom industry.

MR. KAMAT :—The handloom industry turns out a very considerable amount of cloth.

MR. BAKHALE :—It does.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The man who is displaced as weaver is ordinarily a weaver by trade ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes ; that is particularly the case with the Mahomedans.

MR. STONES :—During the strike many of them were weaving in their own looms.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Do they have a loom of their own ?

MR. STONES :—Oh, yes. It is not very costly ; it is supplied by the Salvation Army at a price of Rs. 17.

MR. KAMAT :—Has there been a tendency for an influx of weavers into Bombay from up-country ?

MR. STONES :—There has been a big expansion in the weaving side in the last few years ; the expansion has been on the weaving side and there have been more men taking to the weaving side, particularly Maratha.

MR. KAMAT :—Compared to what it was ten years ago, has there been a surplus population of weavers in Bombay ?

MR. STONES :—I do not think there has been much difference between ten years ago and now. In 1920 the Spring and Textile Mills were working two shifts ; the stoppage of that system must have thrown out a small surplus but that has been absorbed by the additional looms put up since then.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is only one point more which I should like to touch before I close, and that is as regards the saving in the wages of the spinners. From the statement that the Millowners have supplied, comparing the July 1927 wage with the standardisation wage we find that there is, in addition to the reduction in the number of workers to the extent of 8,000,

a saving in the actual wages bill to the extent of Rs. 1,89,000 per month in spinning only. The wage bill in 1927 was Rs. 15,76,000 and under the standardisation scheme it will come to Rs. 13,86,000. Now, Mr. Saklatvala has pointed out that five to six thousand people have already been retrenched, and now, owing to the agreement that we have reached as regards the number of doffer boys, there may be a slight increase to the extent of about Rs. 20,000. Still there will be considerable saving, a little over a lakh of rupees. The view I take with regard to this is this, that while you are retrenching men you should at least make provision for those people who will be in the industry, a provision which will enable them to increase their standard of life.

The plea that the Millowners have put forward for the reduction of weavers' wages is the disparity between the weavers' wages and the spinners' wages, because there is not a large difference between the wages of the spinners and the weavers in Lancashire. In Japan the spinners are getting something more. Here the disparity has been very great; and they want to bring it down as far as possible. They are bringing it down in two ways. They are reducing the weaver's wage and increasing the wage of the spinner. The increase in the spinner's wage is very small indeed. The point I want to lay emphasis on is this: while you are reducing the workers in the spinning section there should be no saving in the wage bill at any rate. Whatever saving you may have, distribute it in such a way that the disparity between the spinners' and the weavers' wages may disappear. Firstly, if the spinners get much more than they would get under the scheme, they would increase their standard of life, and their efficiency also will be increased to a very great extent. They will become much more skilful than they are to-day. If you ensure your efficiency in the preparatory department, you are sure to have efficiency in the weaving department. If you begin to increase efficiency at the bottom I am sure the industry will be on a much more efficient basis than it is to-day. For this reason I am not in favour of reduction in the total wage bill. It should be divided among the workers who will be employed under the standardisation scheme.

There is only one point regarding the efficiency system A of the Sassoons and the B efficiency system of the Finlays. There is a great deal of difference in wages paid to the fly gatherers and lap carriers in the two systems. The Finlays are paying Rs. 18 plus 70 per cent. and the Sassoons are paying Rs. 16 plus 70 per cent. Then again, Mr. Stones pointed out that on the basis of 180 cards the wage bill of the Sassoons comes to Rs. 754, while the wage bill of the Finlays on the basis of 154 cards comes to Rs. 910. Although both the systems are intended to increase the efficiency of the operatives and at the same time to reduce the cost of production, look at the disparity between the two. I think that the wages in the Sassoons' scheme require revision.

I should like also to draw your attention to the wages of the head jobber and the line jobber and to his duties both under the standardisation scheme and the rationalisation scheme. In the standardisation scheme the head jobber is asked to mind 20,000 to 25,000 spindles and is paid Rs. 75. Under the efficiency scheme he is asked to mind 40,000 to 45,000 spindles and is paid Rs. 15 more. The work is practically doubled and the pay is increased

by only Rs. 15. The same is the case with the line jobber. In the card room under the standardisation scheme the jobber is to look after 100 to 120 cards and is paid Rs. 17 plus 70 per cent. Under the efficiency scheme he is to look after 140 to 160 cards and is paid Rs. 10 more plus 70 per cent. Similar is the case with the assistant jobber. I do not want to go into the details but on principle I am opposed to it. I have pointed out that the main objection lay in the increased work and disproportionate wages that are proposed to be given. I think I have finished.

MR. STONES :—Most of the items that have been raised by Mr. Bakhale have already been dealt with in my statement. I want to point out that the economy is not one-sided. In the chart I put in in opening the original discussion you will find that enormous amount of economy in every available direction in the stores, in sizing and so on has been effected since 1923 even before the introduction of the rational system. Mr. Bakhale made a point of the fact that in the purchase of cotton and other directions the rationalisation scheme should be introduced right through. We buy cotton in the cheapest market. We buy cotton up-country . . . . .

MR. BAKHALE :—Is it Sassoons ?

MR. STONES :—Yes : Sassoons. From the purchase of raw material to the disposal of the finished product the whole thing is under our control.

With reference to jobbers, their wages have not been increased. We have as a matter of fact cut down the number of head jobbers and line jobbers, because we are working for their elimination and replacing them by trained men who have served a term of apprenticeship course at the Victoria Jubilee Technical Institute. We have got men under training who will ultimately take the place of the head jobber under a different designation.

Mr. Bakhale pointed out that in the blow room we have not spent any money and that we should distribute the saving that we make there. There are two factors which ought to be taken into consideration : We have to invest big sums of money in purchasing improved quality of cotton and the scheme is mainly devised to benefit the consumer. Therefore we cannot give a greater portion of the saving to the operative. Even if we have not spent money we have to spend money in the supply of good quality of cotton and to provide for the consumer with cheaper article. Mr. Bakhale quoted Mr. Ramsingh's evidence. I should like to quote from Mr. Ramsingh's evidence. On page 1148, he was asked :—

“ . . . And suppose the weaver, instead of bringing his weft from the loom to the warehouse, has not got to do that ; and suppose the weaver has only one count of weft in all his looms and has only one pick in all his looms, and it is the same cloth year in and year out, and all the weft is delivered to the loom to him, do you not think it is possible for him to mind even more than 3 looms ?—Yes, if the conditions were ideal, as you mention them, then I think the weaver can work 3 looms.

Would you tell the Committee whether you have seen the 4 looms being worked by one man, and whether it is possible?—Under the circumstances that you mention, I think it is quite possible. When you give ideal yarn and ideal humidifying arrangements, and universal pirns, with no change in the picks, the reed or the counts of warp or weft, then I think it is possible.

In addition we provide a helper to the men?—Then it is possible. I would do it if I got those conditions.”

With regard to the bulk of the mills in Bombay, they will require a good deal of reorganisation before rationalisation in the weaving section can be introduced. With regard to spinning very little organisation is necessary to introduce the rationalisation scheme in all the mills in Bombay. That is the method whereby the wages of the spinner can be brought up to the level of the wages of the weaver. In our group of mills the spinners are drawing very near the wages of a two-loom weaver.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What remains is the cut in the weavers' wages.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I do not think the question regarding the weft allowance and drawing-in allowance will come in the way of our general summing up. If we sum up our case generally in the afternoon, Mr. Bakhale can go into those details on these points while summing up his case.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Have you any objection?

MR. BAKHALE :—I have no objection.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Before we rise for lunch, can you tell us how are these fitters who are now working  $8\frac{1}{2}$  hours affected?

MR. STONES :—The bulk of them are in the mechanic shop and are not affected by this scheme. There are fitters in the sizing and folding departments.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—They work  $8\frac{1}{2}$  hours.

MR STONES :—In some mills they work 9 hours and in some for ten hours.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Can you put up a statement showing how they are affected under the standardisation scheme with regard to hours of work?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Is it necessary to standardise that section also?

MR. STONES :—We have yet two or three points like the blanket weaving which we have to discuss with them.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We adjourn till 3-15 p.m.

(After Lunch.)

*Drawing-in Wages.*

MR. MALONEY :—In our list we have laid down the rate of 21 pies for drawing-in plain and twill. We have also laid down the rates that will be paid for shaft work of different types, but the justification for these rates has been questioned, I think, by Mr. Bakhale. They say that the rates provided for shaft work are not sufficiently high, as compared with the rate for grey. I have worked out some rough figures from the English list, showing the proportion that is paid in England for the same class of work. I will bring them up-to-date and send in a fair copy. The list shows in regard to our rates for allover patterns : straight, point or vandyke drafts (page 12 of the Standard List, weaving section) that our rates are proportionately higher than those in the Blackburn list for drawing-in. For instance, their basis for plain grey is 5½d. for 1,000 ends, and our basis is 21 pies for plain and twill, which corresponds to that. For 5 shafts we have put down 24 pies, for 6 shafts 26 pies, for 7 shafts 28 pies ; the Blackburn list gives 28 pies for 5, 6, and 7 shafts, any number of shafts above receive smaller increases than the Millowners' Standard List gives. Therefore, anything above 7 shafts is here paid at a proportionately higher rate than it would be in England. I have also made a comparison for Spaced Drafts, which shows that for 5 shafts the English list will be slightly higher, for 6 shafts the English list is 30 against our 30, for 7 shafts 30 against 32 of ours, for 8 shafts 34 against our 34, for 9 shafts 34 against our 36, for 10 shafts 34 against our 38, for 11 shafts 34 against our 40 and so on. So, in Spaced Drafts our rates are proportionately higher. For dobby sorts and border styles the method of payment in England is slightly different. They pay separately for the border, and for that comparison is not possible, but it may be taken that our rate for plain dhoties is higher. We pay 22 pies for plains, whereas in England they pay a little bit more for 2" border and the rest the same rate as for grey ; we give extra 22 pies for the whole width of the cloth.

MR. KAMAT :—What consideration led you to provide better rates here than in England ?

MR. MALONEY :—Taking that our basis for grey is correct, the rate for shaft work that we pay is higher than it would be in England. For instance, they pay 5½d. which corresponds to our 21 pies. For allover patterns, for 5 shafts the English rate is 28 against our 24. Thereafter, the English list increases up to 38 pies for 16 shafts whereas ours goes up, viz., for 7 shafts 28 pies, for 8 shafts 30 pies, for 9 shafts 32 pies, for 10 shafts 34 pies, for 11 shafts 36 pies, for 12 shafts 38 pies, for 13 shafts 40 pies, for 14 shafts 42 pies, for 15 shafts 44 pies, and so on ; it increases as the number of shafts increases and for 16 shafts the rate is 46.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Where is it ?

MR. MALONEY :—Blackburn List, 1924, page 86, for Drawing-in.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Where do you get shafts ?



MR. MALONEY :—Page 90, Stave work, not drawn.

Then for doobby dhoties, you go back to page 89, at the top "Mail Healds."

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As regards the Standardisation Scheme itself, I do not think I need detail you as to the Spinning Section. As an agreement has been arrived at on most points it is unnecessary to go into details. Generally speaking there is an increase in the average earnings, whilst on the other hand we have reduced the number of men. As the question of retrenchment has also been discussed, I do not think it is necessary to deal with it, except to point out that there would be no meaning in retrenchment if a saving was not to be effected thereby. I do not propose to go into the evidence as regards this section.

Now, coming to the Weaving Section, the scheme is not only a highly technical one, but also involves more than one issue. In the course of the long arguments which we have had and also in the evidence on this subject, these issues have been very much confused. Therefore, I think it is necessary to explain—of course very briefly—what the scheme as put before you is really intended to carry out.

First, it has got to remove variations from mill to mill in the weavers' rates in Bombay. There is no difference of opinion on that. The variations at present are enormous, and in carrying out even this elementary principle wages in some instances must necessarily show a very heavy reduction. Of course in other instances there should be a like increase also.

Secondly, if it is to be really a scientific scheme, and our friends have always insisted that the scheme should be scientific, it cannot simply be based on a mere process of averaging but should remove anomalies which create unfair conditions between weaver and weaver. If, sir, when we collect our facts and figures, we find that in the past owing to various reasons rates between sorts and sorts have not been based on the amount of work to be done or the nature of the work, but merely on temporary exigencies of trade, or, sometimes, on the desire to attract labour from district to district, then opportunity must be taken to remove such anomalies and to base the whole scheme on a proper footing. After all, this is going to be a standardisation scheme, and it is but right that it should be based on a proper standard. Such standard must of course be fair and reasonable, but obviously it must also be more accurate than the existing one.

The third issue arises from the fact that the Tariff Board definitely recommended to the Millowners' Association to put such a scheme through—of course in consultation with labour organisations. The Tariff Board with equal emphasis also pointed out that in Bombay there was a great disparity between the wages of spinners and weavers, which did not exist elsewhere. This morning we had some discussion on this point. The simple remedy, perhaps as the other side might contend, is to raise the spinners' rates to the level of the weavers. Even if the state of the industry permitted of our doing so, such a method could not be adopted without doing an injustice to

the weavers who after all are a more skilled class of operatives and would therefore naturally demand a corresponding rise too, unless the spinners' work was considerably increased. The only reasonable course under the circumstances is to slightly increase the average earnings of the one and slightly decrease the average earnings of the other. Now, to what extent this can be done or should be done really depends (of course within reasonable limits) on the state of the industry at the time the scheme is framed.

This brings us to really the most important issue, the state of the industry at the time the scheme is framed and on which the justification for a cut is mainly based. Out of this issue arises the question as to the extent of the cut in the industry and the manner in which it is proposed to bring this about. We have made it quite plain that the cut is limited to  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. in the average earnings of the weavers in the whole industry. We have also made it plain that in our scheme, as far as possible, we have tried to bring about this cut and that the whole scheme after trial should be revised on this definite basis. If the estimated cut of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. on the average was not brought about the details must be adjusted to bring about this result.

I think, sir, that it is very essential to keep all these issues clearly and separately in our minds in order to appreciate the evidence brought forward and come to a decision whether the scheme is fair and reasonable.

Now, taking the first issue, let us assume that a scheme was prepared which was intended merely to remove variations from mill to mill and was based on a mere averaging process. There is no question of cut ; there is no argument about the nature of the work ; there is no question of a different standard. We have furnished to you a statement showing the highest, the lowest and the average rates prevalent in Bombay. From this statement, sir, you will see that there will be big cuts ranging from 9% to 40%. I have worked out these figures (they are not worked out in your list). I am referring to the columns showing the highest and then the average. If you look at these columns, for instance in the first sort, the highest is  $8\frac{1}{2}$ , the average is  $7\frac{1}{2}$  ; that means a difference of 11.7%. Then it comes to 30%, 12%, 27%, 35%, 17%, 13%, and so on. In one case it is 39% : it is in plain khadi. In Patti dhoties, it is 37% and in doobby chaddars even 40%. Supposing we adopted the average rate in the industry, now, those weavers who were getting  $10\frac{3}{4}$  pies when the average in the third item is  $7\frac{1}{2}$  pies it would mean that even by averaging those weavers who were getting  $10\frac{3}{4}$  pies, would be getting 30% less. Indeed, sir, such a scheme which the other side considers better would be manifestly unfair ; it would give no scope to adjust, so that heavy cuts could be reduced and smaller cuts increased. There is ample evidence, specially from the workers, that in particular mills and particular sorts there are heavy cuts under our scheme. This evidence, no doubt, at first sight might lead one to think that such cuts are due to a defect in the scheme itself. So, what I want to point out to you is, that owing to the existing variations such cuts cannot be avoided ; at best they can be mitigated. Indeed, our scheme is such that cuts will be equalised to a far greater extent than is possible now, and our scheme is also elastic enough to admit of

adjustments later on in the light of experience. When we talk of cuts, it should be remembered that, at present, when the rate in one mill is 10 pies and in another 7½ pies, the weavers in the latter mill are accepting a 25 % cut to-day.

Next, sir, if we are to have a fairer and more scientific scheme, as I said, it is clear that we should not base the scheme on existing conditions which are admittedly unsatisfactory, but on a more accurate standard. Now, what is that standard to be. I submit there cannot be a fairer standard than that adopted at the time of framing our scheme—a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. The Sub-Committee's reports which were of course never intended to be made public—they were made by the Sub-Committee as a recommendation to the main Committee—these reports are at pages 59-61 of our written statement. They clearly show the line adopted. It may be a matter for argument whether the allowances made in a particular instance are commensurate with the extra work involved or extra skill involved, but the principle at any rate is certainly right and just.

We have also followed the English list as the basis which cannot be said to be unfair or unreasonable. I have said that the weaver is after all a skilled operative and should be paid more. The question is how much more. At the very commencement of the enquiry this point was raised. On page 9 of our printed evidence we explain that the weaver justifiably got Rs. 9 more but owing to this extra allowance he got a gift of another Rs. 9. We say :—

“ At the end of 1920, when we raised the allowance further, we finally made it for fixed wage earners 70 per cent. and for pieceworkers 80 per cent. The result was, as we have pointed out on page 11 of our statement, that whereas the spinner was getting about Rs. 16 before January 1920, and when he got 70 per cent. advance his wages came to about Rs. 27 or Rs. 28; the weaver was already getting Rs. 25 or Rs. 9 more and with 80 per cent. allowance got Rs. 45. The disparity thus increased further. The weaver, in my opinion, was getting Rs. 8 or Rs. 9 more, but then he got another gift of Rs. 9.”

In another place on the same page I have stated in answer to a question by Mr. Kamat :—

“ Yes, to the extent of about 30 per cent. or 40 per cent. not more. That is why he was being paid Rs. 7 or Rs. 8 more than the spinner originally, but he is now being paid about Rs. 20 more.”

Sir, I must make one point clear, when I say 30 or 40 per cent. more it refers to the present conditions, so that this argument may not be flung upon us later on if conditions change. It is only under existing conditions that this applies. Mr. Hunt, on page 1663, in reply to a question stated that he would give ordinarily even 50 per cent. more. The average for spinning according to the Labour Office figures for 1923 is Rs. 26-8-8 and for 1926 it is Rs. 26-6-6. Taking the average wage of a spinner as Rs. 27 the weaver's wage would work out to Rs. 35 and Rs. 38 and even at 50 per cent., Rs. 40-8-0

or, say, Rs. 41. Our scheme proposes that the average should be Rs. 44-8-0 or  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. less than the present average of Rs. 48. The weaver may get even more under the scheme on better sorts. I do not wish to labour this point. I submit that this is a fair basis. I would just refer you to the table on page 35 of our printed proceedings and also to the chart we supplied to you, on which the chart is based. This chart makes it clear how the increase has gone on in the various departments. If you take the spinning department you will see that the spinners had got an increase in the year 1920 at the end of that year. Then it went up to 28 or 29 rupees in 1920. Since then it remained steady. In the speed frame department where the wages are Rs. 36 or Rs. 37 you will see that during 1920 they had an increase and then the line goes straight on. As regards the weavers, in 1920 they had an increase and then again in 1921 there was an increase. This was due to the fact that in 1920 it was a boom year and we were making very high profits—exceptional profits—in fact the profits on a bale of cloth in those days were nearly as high as the cost of the bale itself at present of some sorts. Therefore we had increased the basic rates during this period and the weavers' wages were higher in 1921 than in 1920. Of course during the boom time the wages were increased which then the industry could very well bear. Now, sir, we come to the crux of the whole question. Is the state of industry really such that employers are constrained to resort to any cut at all? Mr. Joshi has himself admitted the reasonableness of basing the justification for a cut on the state of industry; on page 201 of our printed proceedings, he says:—

“ There are only two attitudes which the millowners can take; they can ask for a wage cut basing their justification for a wage cut upon the state of the industry. That is one thing. It is understandable and we are prepared to deal with it. The other attitude which they can take is that the wages which they are paying at present to the workers in Bombay are quite sufficient for them to live in a decent manner.”

Of course neither Mr. Joshi nor his colleagues were convinced that the state of the industry was so bad. Even with regard to the figures we supplied Mr. Joshi went so far as to say that they were faked (p. 54). I submit that we have now given them sufficient details to convince them of the enormous losses during 1923 and 1927. Mr. Whitby's evidence makes it clear how carefully our figures were compiled. The figures up to 1926 were all scrutinised by the Tariff Board also. The Tariff Board would not have given even that small measure of protection, had it not been convinced of the seriousness of the situation. There is a summary on page 394 of our printed proceedings which shows the loss during the years 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926 and 1927—the colossal figure of Rs. 8,61,00,000. There is no questioning the fact that the cotton industry in Bombay finds itself in a very difficult position. These figures tell their own tale, and more eloquent than these figures is the statement we gave you as regards the mills that had recently been forced into liquidation. Even recently two more mills, the Globe and the Union, have been taken into liquidation and the capital of the Sassoon Spinning and Weaving Company has been reduced from Rs. 22,50,000 to Rs. 2,25,000.

MR. KAMAT :—Was Mr. Bakhale convinced during the private conference about the state of the industry?

MR. BAKHALE :—We did not have any talk about the condition of the industry.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—An old established industry would not have gone to ask for protection had it not found itself in a really precarious condition.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The condition is improving a bit now.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It has improved a little. It is mainly due to the fact that there has been such a long period without production. Some of our main sorts during the strike period were sold off and that is the only improvement we have been able to see. What the state would have been if the production had gone on we cannot say.

THE CHAIRMAN :—So the strike has proved beneficial.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—In a way. Really I am not exaggerating when I say that the cotton mills in Bombay have really to fight for their very existence. I hope the fact is now realised by Mr. Bakhale. Mr. Joshi only wanted proof of this fact that the industry was really in a bad way. It is on page 93.

On page 93 of the printed proceedings, Mr. Joshi said: "The millowners' argument for the cut is not that the workers are paid lower in other industries. Their argument is that the industry is in a bad condition, and therefore wages must be cut down. That has to be proved." I submit that in this direction there is abundant proof. In fact, Mr. Bakhale himself does not deny that the industry is in a depressed state. On page 1509, when we were discussing the question of minimum wage, it was pointed out that that perhaps is a question which cannot be brought up at a time when the industry is in a depressed condition, and Mr. Bakhale said "In the days of prosperity very little, if any, was done to increase the efficiency of the workers. That period has gone and depression has set in. If now we are to say that nothing could be done unless the industry becomes prosperous, I do not know the day when we shall be in a position to put the industry on a sound footing." I read in it that Mr. Bakhale at any rate realises better than Mr. Joshi that the industry is really in a difficult position. Of course, I do not forget that Mr. Joshi had also suggested other remedies, and Mr. Bakhale this morning referred to that point also. On page 73 of the printed proceedings, Mr. Joshi gives some suggestions, and on page 137 he gives the whole list of the points which he thinks should be tackled by the Millowners before they talk of reduction in the wage. A complete answer to this has been given by Mr. Sasakura on page 276 of the printed proceedings. He says, "Mr. Joshi pointed out many directions in which mill management could be made more efficient. But I regret to say that, in spite of the fact that almost everything possible was done in my mills, we are not making money." Mr. Sasakura's mill is an ideal mill from Mr. Joshi's point of view. Mr. Sasakura buys cotton in the Japanese way, which Mr. Joshi believes is much better than our way. Then he does not charge any commission; there is no mukadamage; there is no brokerage on cotton, there is no brokerage as regards sales of cloth. He has no office in the Fort, which point also Mr. Joshi insisted on, and still

Mr. Sasakura said he had made a loss of Rs. 60,000 during the six months that he had worked fully. I might also point out that Mr. Sasakura has also gone more or less on the rationalisation scheme. As far as weaving is concerned, he makes only one or two sorts. He is engaged on mass production ; there is no commission and no office charges. In spite of that, he too has made a loss. This, I think, clearly shows the state of the industry. Now, if the state of the industry is really such, are we not justified in exploring all avenues of retrenchment? There is no doubt that, as pointed out by the Tariff Board, labour charges form a very large part of the cost of production. As to the efforts made in reducing charges in other directions, there is the formal evidence of Mr. Mantri and myself, and exhibit 'Y' in the printed proceedings, which is our reply to the Government of India, also shows what efforts we had made as regards various recommendations of the Tariff Board before we tackled this question of a wage cut.

Then, our friend Mr. Bakhale and his colleagues know very well what efforts were made to secure protection from the Government of India. Had we succeeded then, there would have been no necessity for a cut ; we intend taking up this question again ; we have not given it up.

MR. BAKHALE :—Do you mean to say that you were making efforts in the direction of securing more protection? If that protection is given, are you going to restore the cut?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That depends on the extent of the protection.

MR. BAKHALE :—Not upon the state of the industry? To the extent to which you will get protection, to that extent you will reduce the cut, if there be any?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I cannot make any definite statement. All I say is that we are trying to take this question up, and if we get protection, certainly the question can be reconsidered.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—The standard rates will not be in force for all time. They can be increased. That is what happens in Lancashire also ; they go on increasing or reducing according to circumstances.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The circumstances being such, and, chiefly considering the wages paid by our competitors—and on that point also Mr. Sasakura's evidence is very important—our Association, I submit, is certainly justified in asking for a 7½ per cent. cut in the weaving section. Whether a cut of 7½ per cent. or whether a cut of only 3½ per cent.—which at any rate our friends were at one time prepared to accept—is justifiable is of course a matter for the Committee's decision. I do not wish to ignore the question of cost of living, but I certainly stress the point that the state of the industry must be taken into account as well. The operatives were given a yearly bonus, not on the ground that the cost of living at that time in Bombay was too high, but on the ground that the industry was in a very prosperous condition then. As regards the extent and nature of the cut itself, I think enough has been said, and I do not want to repeat any argument, but I want to clear up one or two points, so as to leave no doubt in our minds as to what was really intended.

I said that the proposed cut was limited to  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. No scheme in the first instance, could be prepared, which would exactly bring about this result. It is for this reason that we had emphasised from the very beginning that the scheme should be tried and revised on the basis of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. reduction in the average earnings of the weaver in the whole industry. At the very commencement of the enquiry we had made this quite clear (page 4 of the printed proceedings). In answer to a question by the Chairman, I said ". . . . in the spinning department there is no cut, on the other hand some spinning rates have been definitely advanced. In the weaving section, our standardisation scheme has been so revised that as far as possible we believe that it will give a cut on an average of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. in the weavers' wages. Taking the average for 1926-27 at Rs. 48, the weaver's wage will come to about Rs. 3-8-0 less than Rs. 48, that is to say, Rs. 44-8-0 or thereabouts. But, I might make it clear that when we say that this is the cut, we certainly did not (at any rate I am not prepared to say on oath) mean to say that our standardisation scheme would actually bring about exactly this cut and not more than  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. or not less than  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. cut. The scheme has got to be tried." Then again, on page 21, I said, "The whole spirit of this standardisation scheme is that it must be given a fair trial, and then revised on a definite basis. The basis is that a  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. cut must be made. We said that that  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. cut is to be on the pre-strike wages," and so on. You yourself, sir, had summarised the position (page 60 of the printed proceedings), when Mr. Joshi was speaking about the cut in the industry, and you said, "You say there is a proposal that there should be a large wage reduction in Bombay. I could understand your argument being based on that point if there was a proposal that there should be a ten per cent. reduction of all wages in Bombay. The other side says that the reduction only affects a certain number of weavers who will have a small cut in their wages and that the reduction will not go beyond a certain point." Evidence has been produced that there are varying cuts, and increases also sometimes. But I submit that the weight of evidence shows that in grey and plain sorts, which form the bulk of our production, the cut actually works out at 5 to 7 per cent.

The manager of the Swadeshi Mills, who was the first witness, at page 897, states, in answer to the question, "On plain and grey cloth, how much will the cut be?"—"About 5 or 6 per cent. on plain cloths and about 12 per cent. on fancy cloths."

Then, sir, take the evidence of the manager of the Crown Mills. In the Crown Mills they make plain sorts mainly; I think over 90 per cent. of their production is plain cloth. This is the evidence at page 1051:—

"Do you work plain cloth or dobbies?—All plain. We have a few dobbies but we do not work them.

"What is your present wage bill in the whole of the weaving section per month?—Rs. 26,000, Rs. 27,000, Rs. 28,000 per month, according to production and according to working days."

Before that he was asked: "That means that your mill on the whole make some savings?" and he said:—

"I have already said that in the weaving the savings will be 5 to 7 per cent. and that too mostly in looms."

Therefore, on plain cloths the cut is 5 to 7 per cent.

Then, sir, take Mr. Pennington's evidence. Mr. Pennington is manager of the Textile Mills. He also says it is 5 to 7 per cent. so far as plain and grey cloths are concerned. It is at page 1072 :—

"Could you give me some further information about the cut on plain cloth, dobbies and fancies?—The greatest cut is on fancy cloth.

"How much is that?—On plain cloth, the cut might be 5 or 6 per cent., not more. On fancies, dobby cloths and grey fancies such as striped drills, the cut is rather heavy.

"How much?—It varies from 18 to 30 per cent. on different sorts."

But in the plain sorts, he says "the cut might be 5 or 6 per cent."

Mr. Sobhani of the Prahlad Mill gives this evidence at page 1152 :—

"As to reduction in wages?—Generally the reduction will be 6½ per cent. In some cases it will be 3 per cent."

He gives this average for the whole shed, which contains 471 weavers and nearly 900 looms.

Then, sir, Mr. Anderson of the Century Mill, at page 1183 :—

"What is the average for the whole shed? Will there be a cut or an increase?—We have a cut of 6.99 per cent., or say 7 per cent.

"Compared with our scheme there will be a saving to you of about 7 per cent.?—Yes.

"How does it work on plain cloth?—5.4 per cent."

Then, again, Mr. Gardner of the Kohinoor Mills, at page 1307, says that there will be no cut in his mill, but if he works more dhoties there will be an increase :—

"If we put the whole of our looms on these Calcutta dhoties, we should be paying an average of 10 per cent. increase....."

Otherwise, he says there will be no cut. He will have to pay more if he works more dhoties. I think he has made it more clear at pages 1227-28 where he talks about dhoties. Although in the fancies the cut is no doubt heavier, as I said, it is due to the difference in the existing rates. Even there, there is the evidence of Mr. Green of the Fazulbhoy Mill that he will have to pay 8 per cent. more under the scheme although he is making 90 per cent. fancy varieties. That is on page 968. He says :—



" MR. STONES :—What is the percentage of looms running on plain and colour ?—Ninety per cent. of our looms are fancies.

" MR. SAKLATVALA :—You do little plain work ?—Very little.

" If you are having more fancies than plains, you will have to pay more according to the standardisation scheme ?—Considerably higher.

" How much more ? Have you worked it out ?—It comes to 8 per cent. more on the whole, on the sorts at present working.

" Although in the case of plain cloths you will have to pay less ?—Yes.

" On the whole, the average will be 8 per cent. more ?—Yes.

" According to you, the allowances which we have made for doobby sorts and dhoties are on the liberal side ?—They are too liberal for my liking, especially for checks also ; it means a bigger wage bill for us."

Well, sir, all that I am trying to do is to point out that it is difficult to estimate the exact percentage of cut under any scheme unless it is fully tried out. Hence, all along we have pleaded for a trial to be given to our scheme, so that it may be revised on an agreed basis. We have given you a complete statement for July 1927 and the cut which the scheme will effect on the figures for that month. That cut works out to 12½ per cent. including jobbers. I know perhaps this might be instanced as a proof that our scheme is unfair. But I would point out in the first place that this result is for a particular month, whereas our scheme was worked on the basis of a reduction on a yearly average of Rs. 48. However, the main point to remember is that the scheme, since it was going to be put into operation for the first time, was conditional on its being revised so as to bring about an estimated cut. I am quite certain that the Labour leaders will not be able to tell us how their scheme would work out if it was put into operation—whether it would result in an increase of 30 per cent. or 50 per cent. In one mill we worked out the figures, and we got 70 per cent. ; in another mill we got 40 per cent.

MR. BAKHALE :—Give a trial to our scheme.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—In fact, sir, they have made their own estimate of the wage cut under our scheme. Mr. Dange was quite certain that our scheme will give a cut of 20 to 30 per cent. At page 198 of the printed volume of evidence, he says :—

" If you find out the variation that exists at present, you will find how much percentage of the variation has been cut down, and therefore we would later on justify our point of view that the reduction in wages would be 20 to 30 per cent., and not 7½ per cent. or 5 per cent. as is alleged by them."

I never said it [would be 5 per cent., I have always said it is 7½ per cent. Therefore, the only thing that we can do is to agree on a certain basis and then revise it. But there is ample evidence that our scheme as a whole is fair and reasonable. Sir Joseph Kay at page 355 (printed volume) :—

“ Do you think the scheme was drawn up with proper care?  
—Undoubtedly.”

Then, Mr. Cowasji, manager of the Swadeshi Mills, although he said he would prefer an all-round cut of 5 per cent. including spinning, said that he did not object to the standardisation scheme as such :—

“ You do not object to the standardisation scheme as such ?—No.”

At page 893, Mr. Cowasji gives this evidence :—

“ Can you give a general idea to the Committee as to your impressions as regards this scheme ?—It seems to have been well thought out and all contingencies seem to have been taken into consideration.”

Then, Mr. Green (page 970) has given his own opinion that the scheme is both fair and reasonable :—

“ On the whole, you think the standardisation scheme is a fair one ?  
—It is a very good scheme, with one or two little exceptions which I have already pointed out.”

His contention is that our scheme is too liberal in the case of fancies. Then, Mr. Green, at page 983, tells us that the scheme was considered by the European Textile Officers' Association and they also believe that the allowances are liberal :—

“ MR. JOSHI :—Have you got an Association of your textile officers ?  
—Yes.

“ Did that Association ever consider the scheme of standardisation ?  
—Certainly.

“ Have they expressed an opinion ?—Yes, that it would be a good thing for the trade generally.

“ I want to know that opinion on this particular scheme in detail ; have they made any criticism ?—Yes, they think that generally the scales laid down are very liberal indeed.

“ Give us some details.—They think that the allowances for work over and above plain work are excessive.”

Then, sir, the manager of the Crown Mills, at page 1056, says in answer to Mr. Asavale :—

“ MR. ASVALE :—In what way do you say that the scheme will be in the interest of the whole industry, that is to say, the millowners and the workers?—It will be beneficial as regards the rates in different departments and the fixed salaries in different departments. At our place, if a neighbouring mill is paying a particular worker 8 annas or Re. 1 more in any department, our men say that they also want 8 annas or Re. 1 extra. But if a neighbouring mill in any particular department is paying 8 annas or Re. 1 less, and if we propose that our workers doing the same work should also get 8 annas or Re. 1 less, they will totally refuse.”

Again, Mr. Sobhani considers it a fair and reasonable scheme (page 1147):—

“ On the whole I think it is a fairly workable scheme. There may be slight defects here and there.”

Mr. Anderson, at page 1162, approves of the scheme :—

“ Do you think that it is a fair and a workable scheme?—Yes, I think it is quite a workable scheme.

“ Do you also believe that such a scheme is absolutely necessary in the interests both of labour and of the industry as a whole?—I am absolutely certain of that.”

Mr. Gardner, as I have pointed out, says at page 1230 that it is a good scheme. In reply to a question by Mr. Stones on page 1230 Mr. Gardner says :—

“ MR. GARDNER :—I think the scheme is necessary. It prevents the weavers from being victimised by the owners, and the weaver claiming too high a rate.”

Now, sir, what are the grounds on which you are asked to pronounce the scheme unfair. It is not so much on account of the cut or for other reasons. Mr. Dange says that the scheme is unfair because the motives themselves are absolutely unfair on page 145 of the printed report of the evidence. Again, sir, on page 200 they say :—

“ These words of the millowners will support our contention that no scheme that is not preceded by a thorough census of the above factors can ever be a scheme for standard wages and that the millowners never intended to evolve a real scientific standard scheme.”

Nobody has indicated any other line on which a scientific scheme can be based except on the very lines we ourselves have adopted. The English list is being continuously revised. Mr. Bakhale gave the latest instance regarding silk weft. If you look to the English list there is always something added as regards rates and conditions. You, sir, are now in possession of all facts and can see the complex nature of the problem and can certainly judge the value of such destructive criticisms against our scheme. As I said, the English list is being continuously revised. We have already done our best to make our first scheme both fair and reasonable and in that we have not failed. After a trial it can certainly be modified. If the scheme is properly understood, I am sure it can be seen by my friends in a different light. The principle of standardisation has already been accepted by the labour leaders themselves. The basis, apart from the cut in the weaving rates, has been approved of by them. We feel, however, that the standardisation scheme and the benefits that will accrue from it have not yet been fully understood and for this reason we do not intend to introduce this scheme at once. It is our intention not to introduce it before 1st October 1929. I remember to have read a statement of Mr. Bakhale that the 5½ months' strike would not have been in vain if they got the right of consultation. As a matter of fact that right was never denied to *bona fide* trade unions, because it is far easier for ourselves to negotiate with organised labour than with individual operatives in mills. It is really in our own interests that the trade unions should be recognised. Now, there are definite rules and I hope in these rules organised labour will not only recognise its opportunity but also its responsibility. That is all ; I have done, sir.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What about the percentage of cut in weavers' rates ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We will supply a complete list. In the report sent by Sir Ness Wadia, it has been stated that the cut was 13.64, now, the revised list gives 7½ per cent. That was taken for a whole year's production. In the Fazulbhai group the cut was 1, 2 or 3 per cent, now there is an addition of 2 to 5 per cent. We are asking the other mills also. We assure the other side that under the revised scheme we will not bring any higher cut than 7 per cent. We believe that it will be slightly lower. If it is a little lower we will not bring it up.

MR. BAKHALE :—For the whole industry ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes ; the average for weavers.

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not want to say anything now. I will sum up the wage cut a little later.

THE CHAIRMAN :—To-morrow ?

MR. BAKHALE:—We have got three points from outside—the weft, width and dhoti allowances. After summing up our case on those three points our work is practically finished. Instead of taking this question to-morrow I should like to request you to take it up on Monday. Mr. Rajab is not yet free owing to the trouble that is going on in Bombay. To-morrow is Friday when some trouble is anticipated. I may not be able to have consultation with him to-morrow. So, I request you to take it up on Monday.

THE CHAIRMAN:—We grant the adjournment on the strict understanding that that will be the last one.

MR. BAKHALE:—If we are not able to finish it on Monday we will continue it on Tuesday and finish before lunch as there is municipal election in the afternoon.

MR. SAKLATVALA:—If Mr. Rajab is not available, if Mr. Bakhale asks us we can supply him with any calculation he wants. Give us the sorts and we will supply all figures.

THE CHAIRMAN:—You can take advantage of this offer.

We adjourn till 11 o'clock on Monday.

---

If the Oldham List is taken as basis, the following would be the comparison on the 84 spindle slubbing 124 spindle, intermediate and 160 spindle roving :—

	Hank Up to 3			Hank Over 3 to 3½			Hank Above 3½ to 8			Hank Above 8		
	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
Slubber (Single) ..	38	0	0	36	4	0	34	6	0	32	7	0
Inter (Single) ..	34	4	0	32	8	0	31	2	0	29	2	0
Roving (Single) ..	27	4	0	26	2	0	25	0	0	23	12	0
Roving (Pairs) ..	36	0	0	34	2	0	32	10	0	31	0	0

*Bombay List.*

	Hank Up to 2.5	Hank Over 2.5 to 4.0	Hank Over 4.0 to 4.9	Hank Over 5.0 to 7.0	Hank Over 7.0 to 8.0	Hank Over 8.0
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Slubber .. ..	38	38	38	38	38	38
Inter .. ..	35	35	35	35	35	35
Roving (Single) ..	32	32	32	..	..	..
Roving (Pairs) ..	..	48	44-8	41-6	40	38-2

---

---

*Wednesday, 13th February 1929.*

---

---

Wednesday, the 13th February, 1929.

The Committee met at the Town Hall, Bombay, at 11 A. M.

Present :—

THE CHAIRMAN.

MR. KHAREGHAT.

MR. KAMAT.

---

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I hand in a copy of the revised standard list for the spinning section. We have made slight alterations, and I also hand in an explanatory statement showing the changes which are made.

We have prepared another statement, which I hand in, showing the number of frames up to 300 spindles and more than 300 spindles. They wanted the wage of the side boys upto 300 spindles increased and they wanted to know the number of frames upto 300 spindles and more than 300 spindles.

We have prepared another statement dealing with reeling, giving the actual wages and the wages under the standardisation scheme. I hand it in. We have also got the efficiency figures ready, but they have not been tabulated. We will give it to you in the afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What about the statement regarding the reeling section of the Swadeshi Mill ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That mill was on strike in the reeling department in that particular month, and as they could not give the figures, we have dropped it.

MR. BAKHALE :—Before I proceed with the summing up on the wage cut, I think it is my duty again to apologise to the Committee for my absence on Monday. The conditions in my locality were so bad that it was impossible for me to leave the premises, and I am very grateful to the Committee for having given us the adjournment for two days.

The most important question that is now before us is about the wage cut. This is really the bone of contention, and was responsible, to a great extent, for the last General Strike. The Tariff Board, in paragraph 59 at page 133 of their report have definitely stated that the only alternative to a reduction in wages is increased efficiency, and it is in this direction that, in their view, the true line of advance lies. It is clear from this statement that the Tariff Board did not in any way suggest a wage cut. What they insisted upon was to increase the efficiency of the operatives and also to bring about the efficiency of the industry to such a level that the Bombay industry could well compete with the upcountry



mills as well as with foreign manufacturers. If we take this as the basis of our argument, it is clearly seen that the Bombay Millowners have turned down this most important suggestion of the Tariff Board, and have insisted upon a wage cut, whatever the percentage may be under the standardisation scheme. So far as efficiency is concerned, they have, in certain cases, increased the work of the operatives ; but even there some of the most important recommendations of the Tariff Board which they suggested for the improvement in the efficiency of the operatives have not yet been carried out to the extent to which they ought to be carried out. My first point, therefore, is that the Bombay Millowners' Association have turned down this most important recommendation of the Tariff Board, have, in many cases, increased the work of the operatives, without carrying out the other recommendations made by the Tariff Board in this regard, and also have cut down the wages of the operatives in their standardisation scheme. A good deal of discussion has taken place before the Committee in the beginning of our work as to whether there was a cut in the standardisation scheme, or whether there was not a cut under the scheme. Before I went to Europe in May last, I knew that the Millowners were preparing a standardisation scheme, but it was never given out till the scheme was actually published that it contained a wage cut and also retrenchment of operatives in the spinning section. I would refer you to page 6 of the Millowners' written statement. In their reply to our criticism, the wording used is "The question of alleged wage cuts....." The word "alleged" used there shows that, at the time, they did not admit that there was a cut. Again, on page 56 of their written statement, the Association say: "The 20 to 30 per cent. cut in the weaving wages is also a fiction as definite calculations of all representative sorts made in Bombay clearly show." This also shows that the Millowners themselves did not know the percentage of the cut that the scheme would bring about in Bombay. We pointed out on our side that the cut will be much more than  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. ; and during the course of the oral evidence before the Committee, it must have been noticed that in certain sorts and varieties the cut went so far as even 40 per cent. My second point, therefore, is that the Millowners deliberately prepared their scheme in such a way as to have some cut in wages of the operatives and at the same time did not give out that fact when they were preparing the standardisation scheme and submitted it either to the operatives or to the public.

This brings me to the most important recommendations of the Tariff Board, recommendations which, in their opinion, would conduce to reduce the depression in the industry and also put the industry on a sounder footing. I have seen in the Millowners' statement a letter to the Government as regards the steps that the Bombay Millowners have taken in response to the several recommendations made by the Tariff Board. I shall

take up a few and point out that not any of the recommendations—except perhaps one which was in their favour and which entirely went against the operatives—were carried out by the Bombay Millowners' Association.

In paragraph 60, at page 135 of the Report of the Tariff Board, they pointed out that, to meet the inefficiency of the operatives, due to absenteeism, some extra labour or spare workers, to the extent of 10 per cent., should be employed. This practice of engaging spare hands is not quite new to Bombay. The other side has itself admitted that in some mills the practice of engaging extra labour does exist; and the Tariff Board suggested that this practice should continue, so that the inefficiency of the new men or the *budhis* that might be put in in the place of the permanent operatives should be reduced to a very great extent. But the Millowners, in paragraph 4 at page 67 of their statement said that that was not possible. Again, the Tariff Board recommended that spinners should be put on piece-work instead of on fixed wages as at present. The Millowners' statement (paragraph 4, page 68) says that the problem bristles with difficulties and anomalies, and therefore it is not possible to carry that suggestion out in its entirety. The next point that the Tariff Board raised was about the increase in work by giving more spindles to the spinners and more looms to the weavers. It is only here that the Millowners have readily agreed, and put some more work in the spinning section, and in one group of mills they have asked the operatives to mind more than two looms. Another recommendation of the Tariff Board was to remove the disparity between the spinners' and weavers' wages. We have dealt with this question very fully during the course of our work here, and I do not propose to go again over that point. In this connection also the Millowners in their statement (page 68) say that the complete removal of the disparity is not a practical proposition at the present time. What they have done is that they have increased by a Rupee or so the wages of certain operatives in the spinning section; but, at the same time, they have reduced a very large number of workers, and in the weaving section they have actually brought down the wages by  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., as they say. It is in this way, by slightly increasing the spinner's wage and considerably reducing the weaver's wage that they have attempted to remove the disparity which is pointed out by the Tariff Board. We have already said that this is not the right way of removing the disparity. Another of the Tariff Board's recommendations was greater facility for technical education. To this important question, so far as I can read the Millowners' statement, there is no reply given. But in a subsequent paragraph of their letter to the Government they state that they cannot give any pledge to give financial help to the technical schools that may be started hereafter. They say that whatever grant they give to the Technical Institute—it is about Rs. 2,000 a year—is quite enough for

their purposes. As regards this point, I may say that it is not merely by increasing the work of the operatives that you are going to increase the efficiency of the operatives. If you educate them properly, teach them the work in a proper manner, then only can you succeed in increasing the efficiency of the operatives. I have seen myself how they recruit their labour in Lancashire. The management is generally on the look-out in the different elementary schools, and try to recruit a better type of students as soon as they finish their course. After these workers are recruited, they are given facilities in the mills themselves to learn their business both in the spinning as well as in the weaving sections. Nothing of the kind is done here, so far as I am aware.

The next recommendation of the Tariff Board, and it is very important indeed, is about the recruitment of labour. The Tariff Board has commented on the existing system, and the Millowners themselves have not denied that the present system of recruitment gives rise to abuses and corruption. But they have done very little, if anything at all, to stop this system and evolve a system by which these abuses will be removed and there will be a better type of recruitment in the textile industry in Bombay. The reply that the Millowners have given is, in my opinion, a very evasive one, and cannot convince anybody. They say that appointments of operatives are generally made by the heads of departments. I am not prepared to go to the length of saying that it is absolutely a lie, but I may say that the appointment by the heads of departments is really a farce. Very little, if anything, is done by the heads of departments in the recruitment of labour. Perhaps men like Mr. Saklatvala and Mr. Stones may not know what is going on inside the mills, but we who have to deal with complaints from day to day know it as a matter of fact that this system does give rise to terrible corruption and abuses. They do not seem to have realised the bad effects that the present system of recruitment brings about in the industry as a whole.

As regards spoilt cloth, the Tariff Board recommended that the system should be done away where it exists at present. We have dealt with this question during the course of our work. I may simply say that the Millowners do not propose to stop the present system, and their argument is that the workers prefer to take spoilt cloth. I challenge this statement. If the workers prefer taking back spoilt cloth in lieu of fines, I do not understand why the workers bring in so many complaints about spoilt cloth from different mills.

As regards fines the Tariff Board recommended that the fines should go to the special fines Fund, and I think that recommendation has been agreed to by the Millowners. But what we say is that if a separate Fines Fund is to be instituted, it should be controlled by a joint committee of the workers as well as the representatives of the Millowners.

Then there are several recommendations made by the Tariff Board as regards the purchase of cotton, brokerage and so on, which Mr. Joshi has elaborately dealt with on page 137—138 of the printed evidence. I do not think it is necessary for me to go through that again, but I may simply say that very few of the recommendations mentioned by Mr. Joshi have been carried out by the other side. What they have really done is that they have given replies to Government as regards the recommendations, but have not done anything by way of carrying them out into practice. I have brought in these recommendations during the course of my statement here because Mr. Saklatvala said (page 12 of the printed evidence) "this cut, as I have already hinted is proposed to be brought about only after every other recommendation of the Tariff Board has been tackled." Technically he has tackled most of the recommendations of the Tariff Board, but if we look at the effect of that tackling, we find that the result is *nil*. It is therefore no use simply saying "We have tackled the recommendations" when, as a result of that tackling, no satisfactory result is seen.

I now come to the arguments employed by the other side about the justification of the wage cut. On page 124 of the printed evidence, Mr. Saklatvala says "If the wages were so very low, if workers had to live from hand to month, I think it is quite pertinent to ask how they could go on a six months' strike." I should really like to know whether Mr. Saklatvala was very serious when he made that statement, or whether that statement was simply a casual one. It is by making such statements that the irritation between the operatives and the management increases; resentment also takes place, and the relations between the two instead of being harmonious are strained to a very great extent. I wish the other side would stop making statements of this character which to me at any rate are absolutely puerile. If he wants to know how the workers lived during the six months of the strike, I should like him to agree to get another committee appointed to investigate the terrible indebtedness of the operatives during those six months. Mr. Joshi has also pointed out that it is the poverty of the operatives that has enabled them to continue the struggle for six months. Again I draw a very serious inference from the statement of Mr. Saklatvala—I shall be glad if I am wrong. If the workers are getting low wages, according to him, a six months' strike is not a possibility. That means the strike must break and will break if the operatives are really getting low wages. I put this construction upon it that wages have been deliberately kept so low that struggles between the employees and the management, in the shape of strikes or anything else, should be discouraged as far as possible. If that is really the object of keeping the operatives paid so low as they are to-day, I am afraid the Millowners must thank themselves if the working class population falls into the hands of extreme elements in our movement.

The third point that he made was about the acceptance of a  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent cut by the representatives of the Joint Strike Committee during the course of the negotiations. He says on page 17 of the printed evidence: "They (the Joint Strike Committee) have to show now why it should not be more than  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent." He also suggested that we had accepted the principle of the wage cut. Now, Mr. Joshi has given a reply to that at page 51 of the printed volume of evidence. He said with the full concurrence of the Joint Strike Committee that the principle of wage cut was never accepted either by him or by the Joint Strike Committee. If really that principle had been accepted either by him or by the Joint Strike Committee there would never have been a strike, or if a strike occurred it would have ended long ago and would not have lasted six months as it actually did. Therefore the onus of proving that a cut of more than  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. is not justifiable does not lie on us. On the other hand, it is interesting to know that during the course of his statement Mr. Saklatvala said that not only a  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. but even a 30 per cent. cut was justified. Now, I have, so far as was possible for me to do so, gone through the oral evidence, and nowhere has he put up a case to justify a 30 per cent. cut in the whole industry. On the contrary, in the course of evidence it came out that the cut was much larger than  $7\frac{1}{2}$  and on certain varieties it amounted from 20 to 40 per cent. When they found in preparing the statement about the comparative wages for July 1927 and under the standardisation scheme, that the wage cut was a little over 10 per cent. in the weaving section, they opened negotiations with us and modified their amended scheme to such an extent as to bring down that cut to 6 or 7 per cent. as they say. Therefore, their own action proves that 30 per cent. was not justifiable even according to their own judgment.

The next point Mr. Saklatvala made was that the cut of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. was to be on the pre-strike wages. (Page 21 of the printed volume of evidence.) Our point as regards that is that it is no use basing the cut on pre-strike wages, because we know that in certain cases between 1925 and just before the strike some reductions have actually taken place. Some of these reductions the mill-owners call adjustments. I am not prepared to call a wage cut an adjustment if I find that the original wage was in existence for 6, 8 or even 12 years. If a cut on such wages is to be called 'adjustment' then I am afraid the meaning of English words will have to be changed. Supposing for a moment (without admitting) that no wage cut has taken place between the year 1925 and the pre-strike months, then why is it that they did not agree to the payment of 1925 wages for the period of the negotiations as we urged them to do? The fact that they refused to agree to that clearly shows that there was some difference between the 1925 wages and the pre-strike wages. Then, Mr. Saklatvala stated (page 10 of the printed volume of evidence): "Later on, when we compare

the wages which we give and the wages which our competitors pay, I hope to convince you that a cut not of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. but at least of 30 per cent. would be fully justifiable in the weaving section." I have dealt with the point, and I again repeat that that justification has not been proved so far as I am aware I should like the Committee just to note what the average wage of a worker will be if that 30 per cent. cut is made. The average wage of a worker in the textile industry, according to the census of the Labour Office, is Rs. 30/-.....

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I said that a 30 per cent. would be justified only on the weaving section. Why take the average wage of the whole industry ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I think I can quote you.  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. cut was stated to be on the whole industry.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—I think it was made clear that that cut was only for the weaving section.

MR. BAKHALE :—When Mr. Saklatvala placed before you the amended scheme for the Weaving Section, he definitely stated here that the average cut in the whole industry would be  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Only on that section.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I remember having put the question definitely "Is there any wage cut on the Spinning Section ?" and the answer was "No."

MR. BAKHALE :—Even taking the cut of 30 per cent to be applicable only to the weaving section, we still get only Rs. 33/- and odd for a weaver. I should like Mr. Saklatvala to prove that Rs. 33/- and odd for a weaver is sufficient in the light of the fact that there is bound to be a disparity between the spinner's wage and the weaver's wage. If Rs. 3 1/- is going to be the weaver's wage, I should like him to tell us what wage he will fix for a spinner, as he has himself stated that the question of removing the disparity is very difficult at the present time. As regards this question of disparity between the wages of spinners and weavers, Mr. Saklatvala said that they began spinning first and weaving afterwards and therefore they had to pay more to the weavers in order to induce the spinners to go to the weaving section. You, Sir, pertinently asked him when weaving started in Bombay, but no straight reply to that was given, so far as I could see from the evidence. It was started long long ago, and yet that disparity has been maintained.

Then, in justification for a wage cut in the Bombay industry, Mr. Saklatvala stated that the wage cut was more or less the order of the day and that reductions in wages had taken place in different countries, and pointed out the Lancashire list and the Bedford District cut of 5 per cent. in America. Now, as regards a reduction of wages in other countries, Mr. Joshi has given a very

effective reply which appears at pages 63 and 64 of the printed volume of evidence. He has given you the names of countries and the actual percentage increase that the operatives have got in those countries. Now that statement of his was based on the statement prepared by the Right Hon. Mr. Tom Shaw, whom Mr. Saklatvala has quoted during the course of our proceedings, and that statement was prepared by him as Secretary of the International Textile Workers' Associations, and I do not think that that statement can be challenged. Now, as regards the Lancashire list, before dealing with it I should like to ask Mr. Stones what is the authority for his statement at page 16 of the printed volume of evidence: "In 1920 paid on 15th May 15 per cent. reduction." I have very carefully gone through the reductions made in Lancashire and I have not found a reduction of 15 per cent. in 1920. The reductions made appear at page 113 of the Blackburn list.

MR. STONES :—That is what I read from ; there may be a mistake.

MR. BAKHALE :—I have prepared a list myself from the Blackburn list, (pages 113 of the Uniform list), Colne list for coloured goods (page 141 of the Uniform List), then again the variations in the Spinning, Oldham District (pages 8-9 of the Uniform List prepared by the Amalgamated Association of Card, Blowing and Ring Room Operatives), and then again the Bolton List for spinning at pages 30-31 of their own uniform list prepared by the workers' organisation. Now, I have taken the rises as well as falls after the war. I have left aside the pre-war period. I can point out that so far as the Blackburn list is concerned the total increase since the year 1916 is 210% and the total decrease since 1921, 120 per cent. There was absolutely no decrease between the years 1915 and 1920 ; the decreases began to take place only after 1921. Deducting the total decrease of 120 per cent. from the total increase of 210 per cent. you find that the Lancashire operative gets 90 per cent. more than he got in 1914. Not only that, but when in 1919 the operatives got 30 per cent. increase their hours of work were reduced from 55½ hours to 48 hours per week. That is also a point which should be taken into consideration. Coming to the Colne list, we find that the increase after 1915 amounts to 210 and the decrease to 120 per cent. ; there is a balance of 90 per cent. ; and the hours of work also were reduced from 55½ to 48 hours per week. In the Oldham Spinning List we find that there was an increase since 1915 of 132·55 per cent. and a decrease since 1921 of 41·15 per cent. ; so that the net increase is 88·39 per cent. on gross wages, not on the uniform list. In addition to that a 10 per cent. increase was given for males in the Card and Blow Room departments in the year 1920 ; I have not taken that into consideration when I gave you the increase of 132·55 per cent.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—From what year's list are you quoting ?

MR. BAKHALE :—From the 1924 list prepared by the Amalgamated Association of Card, Blowing and Ring Room Operatives, but whether you take 1922, 1923, 1924 or any other subsequent list it will make no difference as no reduction has taken place in the wages of the operatives after 1922. Coming to the Bolton list we find that there is an increase of 210 per cent. since 1915 and a decrease of 120 per cent. leaving a balance of 90 per cent. ; and the hours of work were reduced from 55½ hours per week to 48 hours per week in the year 1919. It is thus clear that Mr. Saklatvala was not quite accurate in stating that there is a tendency outside India to reduce the wages.

The textile industry, so far as Europe is concerned, has actually given increases instead of decreases, and so far as the Lancashire list is concerned it absolutely proves that although there were decreases in some years the increases were high enough to leave a balance of 90 or 95 per cent. in favour of the operatives. There is only one instance, of Bedford District in America, which Mr. Stones and Mr. Saklatvala laid so much emphasis upon. Now, I quite admit that a 5 per cent. cut has taken place there. As against that, we have given you the names of other countries where a wage reduction has not taken place, and of countries where even if wage reductions had taken place the balance left is in favour of the operatives.

If the other side wants to take account of the tendency obtaining in other countries as regards the wage reduction, I should like to ask them whether they are agreeable to take into account also the tendency in those countries in matters equally important as wages. For example, there is a definite tendency in each and every country to reduce the hours of work as far as possible. Even Japan, which if I may say so is on the brains of the millowners, is going to reduce the working hours, as pointed out by Mr. Sasakura during the course of his evidence.

THE CHAIRMAN :—They are going to give up night work for women; I do not know whether they are going to reduce the hours of work.

MR. STONES :—I think their aim is to get out of the difficulty that will be created by the abolition of night work for women. When women will not be allowed to work after 10-30 P. M., they want to utilise every minute that is available for work and keep up the double shift, so that of necessity they will have to reduce the hours of work.

MR. BAKHALE :—I quite agree that it is to keep up double shift that they want to reduce the hours of work. But the point I was making was this, that



even in a country like Japan where the hours of work are much more than is prescribed under the Washington Convention, the tendency is to reduce the hours of work.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Mr. Sasakura said that they would reduce them in 1929.

**MR. STONES :—**He only said that there was a cry from every country that was competing with them, and therefore they would have to do that. It took them something like 15 years to put the Factories Act into force. The Washington Convention was passed in 1920, and they are going to give effect to it in 1929.

**MR. BAKHALE :—**I was only making the point that the tendency in other countries is to reduce the hours of work. I would like that to be taken into consideration by the Millowners' Association. There is also a tendency in civilised countries to insure the workers against all risks which are incidental to or arise out of the industry, sickness insurance, unemployment insurance, maternity benefit, old age pensions and so on.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**All those are general questions, and they can be put before the Labour Commission.

**MR. BAKHALE :—**I was only pointing out that there was a tendency to provide against the risks incidental to industries. I should like that tendency to be taken into consideration by the Millowners' Association. It is no use pointing out to the tendency in one single direction, which gives some help in arguing out their case ; other tendencies which are in the interest not only of the workers but also of the industry as a whole should be taken into account.

Then, they cited the case of Ahmedabad and said that in Ahmedabad they made a cut of 15 per cent. in 1923. I know, Sir, that in 1923 the Ahmedabad Millowners reduced the wages by 15 or 16 per cent. I do not know the exact percentage, but the cut did take place as a matter of fact. In that connection Mr. Joshi has pointed out (pages 62-63 of the printed volume of evidence) :—

“ Mr. Saklatvala talked about the cut in Ahmedabad and said it was 16 per cent., but he did not tell you that previously the Ahmedabad wages had gone up by 222 per cent. while in Bombay the increase was only 187. So the cut of 15 or 16 per cent. in Ahmedabad certainly does not show that the present wages in Ahmedabad are more than in Bombay or that any cut is justified in Bombay, because Ahmedabad wages have gone up and are

higher than wages in Bombay. That is given in Mr. Findlay Shirra's book on page 20. He gives a statement of increase.—

	Increase. (NOMINAL WAGES.)	Increase. (REAL WAGES.)
Bombay	187	112
Ahmedabad	222	133
Sholapur	194 (more than Bombay)	116 (more than Bombay.)
Other Centres	211 ( ,   "   " )	126 (much more than Bombay.)
For the Presidency	196 ( „   "   " )	117   "   "

The point I want to make is that it is no use isolating the wage cut in Ahmedabad which took place in 1923 to justify the wage cut in Bombay; you must take comparative statement of the wages obtaining in Ahmedabad and Bombay and other upcountry centres. We have proved to you that the wage rise in Ahmedabad and other upcountry centres was much more than in Bombay.

Then, another point is that the Bombay Millowners' Association did not remain quiet when Ahmedabad made a cut of 15 per cent. Did they not stop the bonus that the workers were getting for about 5 to 6 years? Was it not a saving they made? I am not saying that the bonus was an additional pay. I have nothing to do with that now—but I simply ask whether they did not effect a saving in their expenses by stopping the bonus in 1923? If there had been no saving by that, they would never have stopped the bonus. And in the year 1925 they did make an attempt to cut 20 per cent. in the high price allowance, that is to say a cut of 11 per cent. in the total wages. It is not as though they did not make any attempt; they did make the attempt, but fortunately for the workers that cut had to be removed owing to circumstances over which neither the millowners nor the workers had any control. Leaving that aside for the moment and coming to the present condition, what do we find? You must have read in the papers that the Ahmedabad Labour Union has put a claim for increase in wages of 15 per cent. They want the 1923 wage cut to be restored. I can tell you from my own personal knowledge that the officers of that Union are men who are as conversant with the mill industry and its condition as any trade union officials can possibly be. The Right Hon. Mr. Tom Shaw has given them a certificate to the effect that they are in intimate touch with the market conditions not only in India but also outside India. When such a body makes a claim for the restoration of wages to the 1923 level it is absolutely clear that the time has come to restore the cut that the industry is in such a condition now that there is no excuse for maintaining the cut made in 1923, that the market conditions have definitely improved to a very great extent.

Therefore if you want to take the example of Ahmedabad you must take it in its entirety. Also there is the fact that the Ahmedabad Millowners Association have not given a reply in the negative or in the affirmative. The very fact that they have not given a reply is enough to convince us to feel that there is a case worthy of consideration. If they had not felt so, they would have given an immediate reply and turned down the proposal of the Ahmedabad Labour Association.

Another point brought forward by Mr. Saklatvala in justification of the wage cut is the ratio question. I do not propose to deal with this question at any length. Mr. Saklatvala has admitted and everybody will admit that this question of ratio is a question on which there can be honest difference of opinion. Some may feel that 1s. 4d. is in the best interests of the country and other may feel that 1-6 is in the best interests of the country. Some believe that some industries may suffer by keeping the ratio at 1-4 and others by keeping it at 1-6. The fact is there and you cannot ignore. Even supposing that 1-6 has affected the textile industry, I should like the other side to tell why one of the biggest industrialists—Sir Munmohandas Ramji was in favour of 1-6. Mr. Saklatvala made a point out of it before the Committee, when he referred to Mr. Joshi as being most responsible for much of the labour trouble because he voted for 1-6. If that is the case what about Sir Munmohandas Ramji? Fortunately for them he was not in the Assembly. Otherwise he would have cast his vote in favour of 1-6. There is an other point worthy of consideration. I quite see that as a result of the fixing up of the ratio at 1-6 the Bombay Millowners may have been a little inconvenienced. But I hope they will agree that if the ratio had been kept up at 1-4 prices would have soared up, because at that time 1-6 had been prevalent for a number of years. Things were getting themselves adjusted. If at that very time you had appreciated the ratio at 1-4, prices would have soared up very high as a result of which the real wages of the operatives would have gone down. Take it anyway you like,—whether you fix the ratio at 1-6 or 1-4 the workers stand to lose both ways. In one case they are losers because the nominal wages are cut down. In the other case they are losers because as a result of the appreciation of ratio and the prices soaring up, the real wages will go down. So, there is no question of Mr. Joshi being responsible for the labour trouble. If you had fixed it at 1-4 there would have been a much more serious trouble than we see to-day.

Then, I come to the most controversial subject of the Japanese competition. The Tariff Board has gone into that question very very carefully and although we may not agree with a few of the recommendations we feel that it is a fair and reasonable document worthy of consideration. When they found that there was a real Japanese competition—unfair competition—in our own

country, they did recommend protection to a certain extent. But I should just like to point out to one question as regards Japanese industry being subsidised by the Japanese Government. Mr. Saklatvala said on page 16 of the printed evidence :

“ It is a fact that the Industry in Japan, not only the Textile Industry but other industries, are fortunately subsidized by the Government of Japan.”

As against that we have got the evidence of Mr. Sasakura. Mr. Sasakura has been quoted very frequently by the other side and particularly by Mr. Stones. I think I can also quote Mr. Sasakura, although he is a Japanese and is interested in the Japanese industry. He says on page 275 of the printed evidence :

“ There is no Government subsidy at all to the shipping companies, except that some bounty may be given for the carrying of the mails, just as the P. & O. Steamship Company are getting a bounty from the British Government. So, you cannot say that it is a Government subsidy.”

This may be a point which can be discussed provided we get the real facts. Even before the Tariff Board it was not proved to the satisfaction of the Board that the Japanese industry was being subsidised by their Government. The Millowners are making an allegation which is being refuted by the Japanese ; and therefore we cannot rely upon the statement either of the one side or of the other. But, if really the Bombay Millowners in their own interests desire to keep themselves assured as to the fact, it is up to them to send a delegation to Japan and ascertain the exact position. Unless that is done the whole public at any rate will not believe so long as that statement is contradicted by Mr. Sasakura and men of his type. Then it is stated that there is unfair competition as regards hours of work and employment of women. Mr. Sasakura has made a statement to this effect on the very same page :—

“ There are no longer hours of work at all. On the contrary, from next year, we are going to work shorter, that is 8½ hours a day, on account of the prohibition of engaging women on night work according to the Geneva Conference.”

Then he makes his statement as regards the employment of girls :—

“ These young girls coming to the mills are provided with good accommodation, some education, etc., which enables to make them happy in later life. This is one of the reasons why Japanese mill efficiency is

higher than it is here, because there they are working from the age of 17 to 21, and they are very active."

Then again he says on page 278 of the printed evidence in reply to Mr. Joshi :—

"We can employ male labour but it is costlier than women labour?.....In our country a female labourer gets as much as Rs. 50/-.

In Japan the social conditions are such that you are quite justified in working at night time. But the social conditions are different here and we cannot do so. We are not concerned with that. All we say is that you have an advantage on account of the social conditions being different here..... You can get the same advantage here also. In Japan there is no necessity of forcing labour to work efficiently. That is the main cause."

So, whatever advantage Japan may have by working longer hours and by employment of women has been set off or will be set off immediately in view of their legislation coming into force in July of this year.

Then, there is the question of depreciated exchange in Japan. The Tariff Board has dealt with it and pointed out that the Japanese exchange was at that time being appreciated.

MR. STONES :—Since then ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Since then it has depreciated. If the millowners had not insisted upon fixing the ratio at 1-4 and left the whole thing to the market conditions we would not have any cause to complain against the Japanese exchange being depreciated. They were most insistent upon fixing the ratio at 1-4.

MR. STONES :—No, Sir.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Government wanted to fix the ratio at 1-6 and we insisted that it should be fixed at 1-4.

MR. STONES :—Please read the speech of Sir Victor Sassoon who said in the Assembly : " Please leave it."

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not claim I know much about it. But I do claim that I have studied the problem since it came before the Assembly. My own impression is that even before the fixing of the ratio at 1-6 capitalists were insistent upon fixing the ratio at 1-4.

MR. STONES :—It is a big difference to the industrialists. Those capitalists who have English money in India wanted to fix it at 1-6.

MR. BAKHALE :—I leave that point out.

Then there is the question of labour charges. I should like to quote Mr. Cunningham. He states in his report on "Cotton Spinning and Weaving Industry in Japan" on page 53 under the heading 'Other expenses.' :—

"It must be remembered that, addition to the ordinary expenses incidental to the manufacture of cotton yarn and cloth, Japanese millowners have to meet considerable additional charges for the cost of recruiting the operatives and their housing and general welfare. Girls are in almost every case recruited from the country districts, often at considerable distances from the mill, and the large companies have extensive organizations for the purpose of keeping their mills supplied with new hands. At the time of writing (August 1926) it is said to be fairly easy to obtain fresh recruits, as times are bad and girls are glad to earn some money, but at other times it is not always easy to fill gaps in the number of operatives required."

In the Osaka mills the girls are very largely drawn from the Kagoshima (Kyushiu) district; in the Tokyo and Nagoya districts, from Echigo Province and the northern parts of Japan; while in the case of the mills in Shikoku and the more western part of the main island they are mostly from neighbouring country districts. The cost of recruiting varies greatly therefore and is said to range from yen 30.00 per head for girls brought from Kyushia to Osaka to yen 5.00 per head for girls locally recruited in Shikoku. As has already been pointed out, the average length of time a girl stays in a mill is usually short, so that it can readily be seen that the mills must expend very large sums in order to keep their staffs up to the required strength.

Further, in addition to the arrangements which must be made for housing the operatives, provision must also be made for their board as well as for their general welfare. No charge is made for dormitory accommodation, but for board a charge of about 15 sen day in most cases is made, this amount being deducted from the wages paid. This, however, is not sufficient to meet the total cost, and a contribution of approximately the same amount is provided by the Company. These amounts vary in the different mills, and there is no fixed rule in the separate companies, though the above figures may be regarded as being about the average. Hospital accommodation has also to be provided as well as arrangements made for recreation, so that altogether these miscellaneous expenses amount to no small total. The quality of accommodation furnished naturally varies considerably according to the mill, but in the best mills a space of not less than one and a half *jo* (1 *jo*, or Japanese floor mat, measures 6 feet by 3 feet) is provided for each girl, the number to a room being about 10 or 12. In some cases less accommodation is supplied, and there appear to be no fixed rules, though it is stated that factory inspectors are not easily satisfied with less than the average mention-

ed. A large general dining room is provided, and this is in many cases fitted with a stage at one end so that concerts and cinematograph exhibitions can be arranged from time to time. The Kanegafuchi Company has the best reputation as regards general welfare work, as the President, Mr. Muto, was the pioneer of such undertakings in Japan. Their equipment is, therefore, probably the best in Japan, and at the Hyogo mills of the Company there is a small theatre as well as a small school for girls and the usual provision for sports and games.

All the Companies provide means by which the operatives can either deposit their wages with the Company or, if they wish, remit them to their families, while at most mills a monthly magazine is published, giving an account of doings at the mill and in some cases a list of those girls who have sent sums of money to their friends. By these means the Companies endeavour to make known to the families of the operatives their mode of living and to impress them with the care that is taken of them, while at the same time new recruits are attracted to apply for employment. In some cases, it is understood, moving pictures of life at a mill are widely shown by recruiting offices in parts of the country from which the operatives are usually brought.

This quotation is quite enough to bring out the additions that are given to the wages that are being paid to the operatives. There is a considerable charge on the Japanese industry in providing for these facilities to the operatives. Therefore the question as to whether the Japanese industry is being subsidised by Government cannot be settled unless real facts are ascertained. As regards the hours of work and employment of women, Japan is now making headway and improving herself. As regards labour charges you have to take into consideration the points mentioned by Mr. Cunningham. Therefore I should say that the Japanese competition is not really such as to justify a cut in the wages of operatives. I have now dealt with most of the points which Mr. Saklatvala raised during the course of his statement.

I now come to our own point—why the cut is not at all necessary. In the first place as has been pointed out by Mr. Joshi the textile industry is by no means a sheltered industry and so long as the present system of running the industry remains there is bound to be a cycle of depression and also of prosperity. It is therefore well for those who are captains of industry to make provision at a time when the industry is in a prosperous condition for the period of depression. Unless that is done there is no hope for the industry so long as it continues to be a competitive industry. Therefore it is absolutely necessary in the case of the Indian industry as a whole to provide against bad times when the industry is in a prosperous condition. Judged by that standard and that rule which I am sure will be acceptable to all right-minded people I

should like to know whether the Bombay millowners did make any provision like that when their industry was experiencing a boom period. My reply to that is that they have failed to do so. This failure is to a very large extent responsible for creating the present situation. We do not deny the fact that the textile industry as a whole in the world is more or less in a depressed condition and Bombay cannot be an exception to that rule. But Bombay did make exactly the same mistake that Lanashire did and both are reaping the benefits of their mistakes. Profits earned during the boom period were to such an extent that they were never earned before. I think the profits for the few years during which the boom lasted came to about 58 crores.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That is a mistake.

MR. BAKHALE :—What is the figure ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—You will see a brief statement given on page 394. The profit and loss figure is given there from 1917. The net profit is shown as 26 crores and 49 lakhs or 7 per cent. on the capital invested on land and machinery.

MR. BAKHALE :—Even taking the profits and loss since 1917, the net profit during the last 11 years comes to Rs. 26,49,00,000/- not a small amount indeed. But during the boom period a large percentage of this profit was squandered away by giving high dividends. I know, Sir, that the Tariff Board did say that the payment of high dividends was not responsible for the depressed conditions of the industry. Mr. Joshi has already pointed out that during the course of his statement he did not agree with the view. I am not taking the question of payment of dividends from the point of view of the depressed condition of the industry. But I am taking that question from the point of view of making provision for the lean years. If reasonable dividends had been paid, the balance of the profits would have been useful to the industry in its depressed condition. I do not think the question of wage cut would have ever arisen. They did not do it. They practically wasted most of the profits. When the industry finds itself in a bad state they come to the workers and say : "Now, the condition of the industry is bad. You must agree to a wage cut."

MR. KAMAT :—How does it help the present issue ? It is crying over spilt milk.

MR. BAKHALE :—If the millowners got a great deal of advantage as a result of that prosperity, it is unfair to ask the work-people to suffer when the condition of the industry becomes bad. It may be crying over spilt milk. I agree entirely, but it is not right that workers should suffer in times of depression and should not get anything or very little, if anything at all, when there is



prosperity all round. Those who were benefited by the boom period should really find out the money to run the industry on right lines. The workers are not really responsible for it.

Now, I should like to consider the saving that the millowners are going to get as a result of the cut. In the spinning section according to the statement they gave, the total saving comes to Rs. 1,89,585/-. When we were discussing the spinning section Mr. Saklatvala told us that as a result of the agreement we came to nearly 1,000 more doffer boys would be employed. The pay of the doffer boy is about Rs. 20/-. That means the extra expenditure will be Rs. 20,000/-. Then, in the case of a few operatives the wage has actually been increased. There also they will have to pay something more as a result of the increase they have given. I have put down the whole figure at Rs. 25,000/-. The net saving per month therefore comes to Rs. 1,64,000/-. In addition to the savings that the mills have already made or will make as a result of the retrenchment of the operatives in the weaving section there is again going to be a saving of Rs. 3,16,798. This saving was calculated according to the comparative statement that they gave us the other day comparing the July 1927 wages with the standard wages. There again we found out that on that comparison the average cut was a little over 10 per cent. for the whole weaving section. They revised their statement and brought down the cut between 6 to 7 per cent. You will have to minus this from Rs. 3,16,000/-. I think there will be a saving of Rs. 70,000/-. If I am wrong, I wish to be corrected.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Per month ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes. The total saving in the weaving section comes to Rs. 2,46,000/-. The net saving in both the sections comes to a little over Rs. 4,00,000/-. So, they save Rs. 50 lakhs a year. This I think will be the saving as a result of the cut in the weaving section. I want you to consider whether this saving of Rs. 50 lakhs a year cannot be made in any other way by making economies in other directions in the expenditure which including the wage bill is not less than 30 crores a year. That is what the balance sheet of 1927 gives. Can not they make a saving in other directions if they are really serious and really sympathetic ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Including cotton ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Including everything over which you have no control.

I want the Committee to find out whether it is not practicable. My own feeling is that that can be done, if really we are bent upon doing it and bent upon making economies in every possible direction. Take, for example, the question of over-capitalisation. The other side has agreed

that there was over-capitalisation during the boom period, that capital was inflated; and Mr. Dhanjibhoy Batliwala stated during the course of his evidence that, so far as his mill was concerned, the capital was doubled, from Rs. 31 lakhs to Rs. 62 lakhs. At the same time, it is now admitted that some mills have begun to reduce their capital, to reduce the inflation that was brought about during the boom period. We have not got the figures as to the extent to which inflated capital is being written down. It is worth while considering the figures of the capital that has been written down during the last few years. When you write down inflated capital, certainly you reduce interest charges and depreciation charges.

MR. STONES :—No; we are writing down ordinary capital.

MR. BAKHALE :—But you certainly do reduce your depreciation charges, and there may be a reduction in a few other items also. Mr. Saklatvala said that overhead charges have been reduced (page 117 of the printed evidence). But he does not tell us what reduction has really taken place. Similarly, on the same page, it was pointed out that insurance charges have been reduced, but we are not told to what extent it has been done.

As regards cost of production, I should like to refer to page 241, where Mr. Dhunjibhoy Batliwala has given evidence. On page 273 of the printed evidence there is given a statement giving the cost of manufacture in the Textile Mill per pound of cloth produced. From that Mr. Batliwala deduced that he and the other Millowners did make an earnest effort to bring down the cost of production. Now, on page 241, Mr. Kamat asked him a pertinent question, *viz.* : “ You state that the economies were made between 1923 and 1927. They could not be in pursuance of the advice of the Tariff Board which sat in 1926 ? ” The reply was “ No. ” Mr. Kamat again asked “ How much of this economy, which you claim to have done, is due automatically to the market rates falling, say, for stores, and how much is it due to your deliberate conscious effort for economy ? ” The reply was “ Deliberate economy has been effected in insurance. The market rate for stores has gone down, and less money is spent. I cannot say, for my mills, that I have reduced the consumption of stores. If I consumed 100 in 1925 I am still consuming 100. We have fought for reduction in municipal taxes and insurance charges and they have been reduced. ” Mr. Batliwala, in reply to the Chairman also stated with reference to commission on cloth “ Formerly, if it was 3½ per cent., we have now reduced it. But he did not give us figures showing the extent of that reduction. Then again, he was dealing with the cost of production of one mill only, and he was asked in this connection “ Do you think the figures for all the other mills will be the same ? ” The reply was “ I cannot

answer for all the other mills. I am talking of my mills." The next question was "Is your mill making a profit or is it making a loss?" The reply was "It is making a profit." In reply to a question whether he inflated his capital, he said "We paid to shareholders in 1922 one bonus share, that is, our capital was increased from Rs. 31 lakhs to Rs. 62 lakhs." Again, he was asked "As regards coal, you have made no reduction in the quantity of the fuel used?" The reply was "No. It is the reduction in the price that has brought down the cost." As regards fuel consumption, on page 243, he was asked "You have not compared your consumption of fuel with consumption in Japan or Lancashire?" The reply was "No, we have not." The next question was "As regards stores, how did you make economy? Is it in quantity, or in price also?" The reply was "In quantity also we are always after it. We have set down that so much stores should be used per month in a department, and, without my sanction even the Manager cannot give more stores in that department. If he has to give more, he must come to me." He was then asked "Can you tell us to what extent this reduction is due to the cheapening of the articles, and to what extent it is due to economy, or the consumption being less?" The reply was "I do not think we have changed our consumption much during the last three or four years, because I have set down that so much consumption should be made in a particular department. Most of this is due to the cheapness of article, and the duty being taken off." If you read the evidence of Mr. Dhunjibhoy Batliwala, you will find that he has not given us a clear idea, at any rate, as to the conscious effort made by the Bombay Millowners as a whole, as a result of which direct economies were made in the cost of production in directions other than wages. I do not think we have got evidence enough to prove that, as a result of conscious efforts, cost of production has gone down to the extent to which it should go down, if the industry really is to be improved.

There is another question pertaining to this point, and that is as regards audit. On this question, we examined a gentleman belonging to the firm of Messrs. Ferguson & Co., and he told us that his business was to see that the statements of accounts were correct and proper, and that there were no irregularities in the accounts. I shall quote a few questions and answers from page 326 of the printed evidence :—

"MR. JOSHI :—I am not a public auditor but I know this much that it is a part of the duties of the auditor to suggest means for effecting economies if they find, while going through accounts, or through balance sheets, that in any items exorbitant prices have been paid. That is my point, Sir.

"MR. WHITEBY :—If I found any such items, I should do as Mr. Joshi says but as a matter of principle, it is no part of an auditor's duty to find

out whether a mill is paying too low or too much for its cotton, but certainly if there should be an extraordinarily heavy item, I would draw attention to it. But we cannot go into the rates of contracts and we are not expected to know how far the contract rates have been adhered to or departed from.

“ MR. JOSHI :—I know, Sir, it is one of the duties of the Auditor General of the Government of India to suggest means for economy while studying audit reports should he come across excessive expenditure on any items.

“ MR. WHITBY :—I am of a different opinion altogether, speaking as an Auditor strictly, and I do not think Auditors can be rightly expected to keep in touch with market conditions or prices, current at any particular period. I must and do absolutely contest that point, Mr. Joshi. No authority lays it down as a part of an auditor's duty.

“ MR. JOSHI :—Because you do not find in these balance sheets monies paid for brokerage or muccadumage, you do not show them here?

“ MR. WHITBY :—Quite so.

“ MR. JOSHI :—Can you tell me in how many balance sheets or profit and loss accounts these items were shown separately?

“ MR. WHITBY :—I understand that there is at least one balance sheet but I have not got it here.

“ MR. JOSHI :—The same remark applies to stores, spare parts, yarn, waste, dyes, and chemicals. The figures of commission paid are not shown separately?

“ MR. WHITBY :—That is right.”

Therefore, we have not got any means by which an outsider can judge whether real economies were made in the industry or not. Whatever economies may have been made hitherto have been made by the Millowners themselves, who are interested in the industry, and as they themselves are responsible for the expenditure they incur, I do not think that they can bring to bear upon that question that detached view which is absolutely necessary when we want to effect economies in any particular industry, or trade, or any other business. Mr. Joshi has cited the position that obtains in the Government of India and our public men—I hope Mr. Kamat will bear me out because he was a member of the Legislative Assembly—are insisting that the Auditor-General of the Government of India should be absolutely independent of the Government of India, so that, without having any sense of pressure, he can audit the accounts

quite strictly, make comments which may be even adverse to the Government of India, and produce a report which the Legislature can discuss and lay down a general policy. In the Government of India, if you read the first report of the Public Accounts Committee of the year 1922 and compare it with the report which we have just received in the year 1929, you will find a most satisfactory change in that report. As a result of the pressure brought by the Public Accounts Committee of the Central Legislature, various improvements have been made not only in the system of accounts but in every other direction. If, therefore, our industry also had been a national industry, we could have certainly brought the same pressure which we are now bringing upon the Government upon those industries and other enterprises which belong to the State. There would have been the same scrutiny which we are having in other departments of Government. Unfortunately, the industry is in the hands of a few people. We have no access to all their figures and statistics. Whatever they tell us we have to accept, or have always to become suspicious of the figures that they supply. Under these circumstances, it is impossible for us to judge, even from their balance sheets, as they are published and passed by the auditors, whether real economies to the extent to which they should be, ought to be, and can be made have been actually made in the industry as a whole; we have no means at all to prove that, unless there is an audit independent of the Millowners and with all the facts and figures coming before that audit. I therefore submit that we are not at all convinced that real economies have been made. If they could convince an impartial body and place before that body all the figures, statistics and every other possible information in their possession, certainly we shall be able to make out a case that further economies are possible. But, unfortunately, neither you nor we have got access to those figures. We have to rely upon their public documents, and the evidence of Mr. Whitby did not take us very far in the direction of proving whether economies have been made or not. Therefore, we say that economies are not made in other items of expenditure, and therefore there is no justification for a wage cut.

Looking at the industry from a general point of view, I think I have made out a case that there is absolutely no necessity for a wage reduction to any extent. Rs. 50 lakhs can be saved, if they must be saved at all, in many other directions, when so much as Rs. 30 crores are being spent a year, and the wage bill only forms part of that expenditure to the extent of Rs. 6 crores.

I should also like the Committee to look at this question from the point of view of the operatives and the cost of living. During the course of the evidence, it was pointed out and proved, and Mr. Saklatvala admitted that they did not give rises in the wages just at the time when the cost of living had

already gone high. They gave the rises afterwards. That means that when the cost of living was increased, the workers' wages were more or less the same, as a result of which their indebtedness considerably increased, interest charges increased, and afterwards came some rise in the wages. That has been admitted during the course of the evidence; and even to-day we honestly feel that the workers' wages are not quite adequate to allow them to live in a fairly decent condition. We have already pointed out, when we were dealing with the question of minimum wage, how the present average of Rs. 30/- is quite inadequate to meet the expenditure in Bombay.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What is the argument? Do you want to cut down the whole of the saving that they propose, or merely to restore the 6 per cent. wage cut?

MR. BAKHALE :—I want the wages to remain as they are without the slightest cut.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—There are two things concerned in that. There is the question of the total amount of wages paid to all operatives, and there is also the question of wages paid to individual operatives. I understand your view is that the wages to individual operatives should not be reduced, that each man should get as much as he was getting before. But there is also the question of reducing the numbers. What are you arguing about? Reduction in numbers or cutting of wages? They say wages are reduced in the case of weavers. If that is so, how much saving can there be? You are talking of savings of Rs. 50 lakhs and Rs. 40 lakhs. That includes the whole of the reduction, in numbers as well as in wages.

MR. BAKHALE :—If you leave aside the question of the saving in the spinning department, my arguments get strengthened. Then there is a smaller saving, and I say that that saving can be brought about by resorting to economies in other directions.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Are you opposing entirely any increased efficiency by reduction of the number of operatives?

MR. BAKHALE :—I think we dealt with that question when we discussed the question of retrenchment. I am not against increasing the efficiency of the operatives. I do believe that if our workers increase their efficiency, their standard of life will also be raised, and at the same time the industry also will be benefitted. But there are certain conditions precedent to the introduction of efficiency methods which must be fulfilled; and when these conditions are fulfilled, I am certainly willing to bring about that increased efficiency which is

necessary in the interest of the industry as a whole. But so long as those conditions are not fulfilled, I have already said I am not in favour of the rationalisation scheme. As regards the wages, I do not want any cut at all. On the contrary, I want an increase both in the spinning as well as in the weaving sections, and if that increase comes, certainly the industry will be benefitted. Even to-day we believe that the wages are inadequate. Now they are going to cut down the wages by 6 to 7 per cent. because their competitors are paying less. But your competitors are there all the same. They will adopt the same procedure that you have adopted; they will reduce their wage. That competition is bound to remain. But if you are going to do like that, I do not see any end where you will stop. Wages will be brought down to a level which will be nothing short of sweated wages; and if this comes about, is our industry really worth living, with sweated wages to the operatives. By sweated wages you are reducing the strength of the nation, and by reducing that strength you are maintaining your industry which gives a profit to a few individuals. I am not in favour of that at all. I want the industry to be prosperous, but I want it to be prosperous not at the cost of the operatives, but at a decent living wage for the operatives employed in that particular industry. We have been told that there is going to be  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. cut in the weaving, but there is going to be no cut, as they say, in the spinning, although we feel that in one or two mills at any rate there is going to be a cut even in the spinning section. But in the weaving also, I should like the Committee to refer to the evidence of the Mill Managers who came before the Committee, in the course of which it was pointed out that on some varieties the cut will be not only 6 to 7 per cent., but much higher indeed; it varies from variety to variety, from 15 to 18, 20, 25, 30 per cent., and in the case of some varieties it comes to even 40 per cent.

I want the Committee to realise the gravity of the situation before it makes any recommendation. I am quite sure that, if this cut is made, whatever recommendation the Committee may make, there will be that danger, and it is not an imaginary danger. There is bound to be a strike in the textile industry, and perhaps that strike will come not from the Parel area first but from the Madanpura area, where the wages are comparatively high. It is no use disguising the fact that if that strike comes from the Madanpura section, which is more or less sober at the present time, the Millowners and nobody else will be responsible for the danger which all of us see ahead at the present time. I want the Committee to realise the gravity of the situation. I want them to realise also the condition to which the industry will be reduced after a wage cut. The last strike will be nothing as compared with the strike that will come, if you are at all going to reduce the wages. A strike benefits none.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Will that come on account of standardisation?

MR. BAKHALE :—It will come on account of standardisation with a cut.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Even without a cut some of the wages will be reduced.

MR. BAKHALE :—I can quite understand standardisation coming into force and at the same time there taking place a few adjustments. But I should like the Committee to make a distinction between a cut and an adjustment. I quite realise that even under the standardisation scheme some weavers or some workers will be affected adversely. If you base the standardisation scheme on the existing average wages obtaining in Bombay, even then some workers will be affected by it. But, as we have ourselves put it down in one of our demands, we want standardisation; we shall be the first people to use every possible weapon to convince the people that now that they have got standardisation their wage is secured so far as that scheme is concerned, and though there may be a slight fall or rise, they should accept it when they have got such a big principle as standardisation in Bombay. We can do it, but if you are going to introduce a standardisation scheme with all the adjustments that come along with it, and at the same time have such a heavy cut of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. generally, extending in some cases up to 40 per cent., it will be a terribly difficult job for anybody to prevent a strike taking place. I want the whole situation to be realised properly.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Then your argument will be that the cut will be practically so small that it is not worth while making it on account of the disorganisation that would follow later. Supposing there is a cut of a small amount, will there not be a strike, and will not the industry be disorganised?

MR. BAKHALE :—If the cut is removed, and if the standardisation scheme is based upon the average wages obtaining at the present time in Bombay, I think that those who have some influence with the workers at the present time will do their level best to have the principle of standardisation accepted and persuade the workers not to go on strike as far as possible. How far we shall succeed in our efforts is very difficult for anybody at the present time to say; but certainly we shall make every endeavour. I do not say that there will not be a strike. There may be a strike, but by persuasion and by other methods, we can at least reduce the period of the strike if there is going to be any at all.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Then what is the difference between the General Strike and the strike which may come. They will say that any reduction that there may be is due to this standardisation.

MR. BAKHALE :—If the argument is to be placed on that basis, I think you will have to agree to the present system. But if you are going to have



your standardisation scheme on a scientific basis, it is difficult for any reasonable man to oppose it. There may be inconveniences and even resentment in the case of a few people, and there may be a strike, but we feel that, if the present average wages are maintained in the standardisation scheme, the distress will not be so acute as it would be if the standardisation scheme comes into operation with a wage cut. I do not think I have to say anything more about this point, and I thank the Committee very much for having given me a very patient hearing.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is all about the wage cut. You have not quite touched the point about the disparity between the spinner's wage and the weaver's wage.

MR. BAKHALE :—I have dealt with it when we were dealing with the question of retrenchment.

MR. KAMAT :—I am not quite sure whether I have followed you rightly about increased efficiency. Are you against it even if extra wages are paid? On that understanding will you oppose it?

MR. BAKHALE :—In the first place, there are certain conditions which will have to be fulfilled, if there is going to be increased efficiency.

MR. KAMAT :—Till those conditions are fulfilled, you would not advise the workers to have extra wages and give increased output?

MR. BAKHALE :—If those conditions are not fulfilled, it will be very difficult for the operatives to increase their efficiency, although they are given more wages.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What conditions do you consider as necessary?

MR. BAKHALE :—I think the Tariff Board has made its recommendations.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—There are lots of recommendations; you must specify what recommendations should be fully carried out before there can be any rationalisation scheme. Otherwise it would be a hopeless task. What conditions would you impose?

MR. KAMAT :—You hinted at some reforms even outside the recommendations of the Tariff Board, such as old age pensions.

MR. BAKHALE :—When Mr. Saklatvala referred to the reductions that had taken place in wages in other countries, I was making the point that there were other tendencies also in those countries.

MR. KAMAT :—For instance, take unemployment insurance to which you have been referring; would you insist that that condition must be fulfilled before the rationalisation scheme is put into force?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes ; so far as retrenchment is concerned that condition should be fulfilled. At any rate we would not give our support unless that condition is fulfilled ; that is absolutely clear.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You consider that in every case the operative should get the full amount of the extra benefit that accrues by his increased work ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I will just very briefly refer to some of the points raised by Mr. Bakhale. Mr. Bakhale in his preliminary remarks gave me the impression that the strike was due to the fact that we had made a cut in our standardisation list. As a matter of fact when the strike started, of course there was no question about any cut in the standardisation list, because the standardisation list was not published at all nor had we discussed it with them. I am afraid Mr. Bakhale has mixed up the other wage cut with the standardisation scheme. He also said that when we used the words "alleged wage cut" we meant that there was no cut in the standardisation scheme. The word "alleged" was used in respect to the cuts in varieties which were mere adjustments and no wage cuts at all and had no reference to the standardisation scheme. As soon as the standardisation scheme was placed before them, we have all along stated that as far as the weaving section is concerned there is a wage cut.

Then, as regards piecework rates for spinners, Mr. Bakhale says that we have not carried out that recommendation of the Tariff Board. I think we have made it clear that inasmuch as the standardisation scheme creates difficulties and is not likely to be approved by workers, we would have complicated matters further if we had tried to bring piecework for spinners in the standardisation scheme. That was the only reason why we left it out. Mr. Dange made it clear that he would oppose tooth and nail any piecework system in spinning.

MR. BAKHALE :—Will you tell me the page ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I am afraid I have not got the reference. In the course of Mr. Stone's evidence Mr. Dange nodded "dissent," as is put down in the evidence and Mr. Stone said : "Here is Mr. Dange opposing this, Mr. Dange was definitely opposed to the extension of the piecework system to any department on principle.

Then, as regards powers of jobbers, what we are trying at present in the standardisation scheme is gradually to curtail the powers of jobbers. So that we might produce a better class of jobbers, we are putting in our own apprentices and training them. We will gradually put them into posts of

jobbers whenever there is a vacancy. That is what we are trying to do. It is very difficult to compel jobbers as a class to attend any night classes or anything of that kind.

Then, as regards the tendency in the world about increasing wages and so on, Mr. Stones will give you that more fully than I can, but I wish to point out that the instances cited by Mr. Joshi were of those countries which have not gone back to the gold parity or to the same exchange ratio as prevailed before the war: they had to increase wages because of movements in their exchange ratio and not out of good will towards the workers.

MR. BAKHALE :—How do you know that ; can you prove it.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Mr. Stones will deal with that.

Then, as regards bonus, Mr. Bakhale says that it was a saving of expenditure. It was not a saving in expenditure ; we stopped the bonus simply because there was no surplus profit to be divided. So it does not make any difference as far as the present state of the industry is concerned ; we have not made any saving.

Then, as regards the Japanese subsidy, I think from the evidence it is clear that there is subsidy. At page 71 of the printed volume of evidence, Mr. Joshi says :—

“ About the Japanese shipping subsidy, this is what is stated in this pamphlet.—

‘ There is no Government subsidy to the steamship lines to India. Subsidies are paid by the Government to shipping lines carrying raw cotton from the United States of America and China.’ ”

At any rate the principle is there. Government do pay subsidies. They say it is for carrying mails. This is what is stated at page 53 of the Tariff Board Report :—

“ Many witnesses before us laid considerable stress on the advantage the Indian manufacturer has over his Japanese competitor in that the latter has to pay freight both on his raw material and his finished product. The cost of freight is, however, a small item in the cost of the finished product. The freight for cotton from India to Japan is 4.56 yen per bale subject to a discount of 1.40 yen per bale to Japanese spinners. This works out at 2 pies per lb. The freight on piecegoods from Japan to India is 14.5 yen per ton less a discount of 10 per cent, which works out at 2.1 pies per lb. The total freight on both raw cotton and piecegoods thus amounts to 4.1 pies per lb. which, it may be noted, is the railway freight on piecegoods alone per lb. from Bombay to Sholapur.”

The very fact that freight is so very insignificant shows that there must be a subsidy.

Then, as regards high dividends, of course the Tariff Board have made it quite clear that they have not been the cause of depression and that we have not paid quite as high dividends as they paid in Japan. And we have seen from the statement prepared that the return on the capital invested comes to 7 per cent. per annum during all these 11 years including the boom period, and the Fiscal Commission themselves have laid it down that any industry is entitled to make at least 8 per cent. So, even including the boom period the industry has not gained so much as is generally believed.

Then, Mr. Bakhale made the charge that we wasted our resources, that we made high profits and during the high profit times if we had conserved our resources we would never have asked for a wage reduction. Now, on page 241 of the Report of the Tariff Board you will find a table showing the financial position of the Bombay cotton mill industry; that table we have brought up-to-date, and you will notice that we did conserve our resources a good deal, and it is not correct to say that the whole of the profits was divided up. For instance, when there was a profit of 10 crores, 3 crores were taken to the reserves. Now, Sir, I submit that it was because these reserves were there that the industry was at all able to carry on up to the present time. We are now living on our reserves. Had there been no reserves, even the industry would have gone under within the last three years, and at least there would have been no wage cut for the simple reason that there would have been no employment in the industry.

As regards the figure of wage cut, Mr. Bakhale made it 50 lakhs; that means that on 6 crores there is a reduction of 8 per cent. Mr. Bakhale himself now admits that as far as the weaving section is concerned there will be 6 to 7 per cent. reduction.

MR. BAKHALE:—On the basis of your figures.

MR. SAKLATVALA:—Yes. Therefore, I do not think Mr. Bakhale can make out a case that there is going to be an 8 per cent. reduction.

Then, as regards retrenchment most of the retrenchment has already taken place; we have pointed that out also. Since 1927 the number of men has been considerably reduced and the retrenchment may not be so much now as is tried to be made out.

THE CHAIRMAN:—You have estimated the figure at 2,000.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes ; it may be even 2,500 ; Mr. Bakhale himself admits it. That is in the Spinning Department. In the Weaving Section except for a few jobbers there is no retrenchment.

Then, as regards the  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. cut, they themselves have admitted ( page 18 of the printed volume of oral evidence ) that they had published the statement in the Press. Mr. Joshi said it is a wrong interpretation. I will quote the words :—

“ THE CHAIRMAN :—Was your proposal published in the papers.

“ MR. SAKLATVALA :—It was published in all the papers. Theirs appears in the “ Chronicle.”

“ THE CHAIRMAN :—You admit, Mr. Joshi, that this publication was made ?

“ MR. JOSHI :—We admit that the publication was made, but we do not admit the interpretation put upon it.”

So, at one time at any rate they were prepared to accept a cut, and they were prepared to go to the men and induce them to accept at least  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. cut. Then, later on they were even prepared to increase the cut to  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. I can very well understand if in the first instance Mr. Joshi under stress of circumstances was compelled to accept a cut of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. and later on withdrew the acceptance ; but after holding meetings with his colleagues and after consulting the men, after a fortnight, he was prepared to increase that cut. That being so, I am certain that they must have felt confident that if so required they could induce the men to accept a small cut of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

Then, as regards the 30 per cent. cut, of course what I had intended to say was that looking to the state of the industry or looking to what others were paying, we would have been justified in making even a bigger cut ; it was intended to convey that a 30 per cent. cut was going to be made. I might here refer to the evidence of Mr. Sasakura that the Bombay weaver does not deserve to be paid more than 13 annas per day, when compared to the Japanese weaver. He has made a definite statement to that effect, and now under the standardisation scheme we propose to pay him Rs. 1-12-0 per day.

MR. BAKHALE :—But he is himself paying 20 per cent. more than the other Bombay mills !

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes ; but what I had intended to convey was that looking to the state of the industry and looking to what others were paying, even a bigger cut would be justified.





Coming to the 7½ per cent. cut on pre-strike wages, Mr. Bakhale made the point that we did not at the Government Conference accept the proposal to base the cut on the 1925 wages. I wish to point out that we did not agree or disagree with it. We wanted that the wages during the interim period should be paid according to the standardisation scheme; the other side wanted the wages of 1925 to prevail; the Honourable Sir Ghulam Hussain said that he would not allow one side or the other to dictate, and he said that 1927 wages should be paid. We have made it quite definite that what we intend by a 7½ per cent. cut is a cut of 7½ per cent. on the average wage of weavers in the industry. The average wage of the industry in the weaving section was Rs. 48/-; we intend to bring it down to about Rs. 44/- or Rs. 45/-. That is quite a definite statement; we have not left it indefinite.

Then, Sir, the other argument was that if we reduced the wages, our competitors will follow suit and workers in other districts might also suffer. But that argument does not hold good in view of the fact that the Ahmedabad workers, although they know very well that we are making an attempt to reduce wages, have put up a proposal for an increase. Therefore, because, wages have been reduced in one centre, it does not follow that wages will be cut in other centres also.

As regards audit, Mr. Whitby has made it quite clear that we in India give far more information to the public and to the Shareholders than is done in England. Sir, if you will see the English Companies' reports, you will find that they give very little information, practically no information, at all; on the expenditure side they lump up everything, wages, office charges, etc. We give a good deal more information. At page 335 of the printed volume of evidence Mr. Whitby has made that point clear.

“MR. GEDDIS :—How do published profit and loss accounts in this country compare with published profit and loss accounts at Home, as regards the amount of information given to the public?..... There is no comparison; the profit and loss accounts published at Home usually give practically no information to the shareholders or the public, whereas in this country profit and loss accounts give very considerable information.”

Mr. Stones will deal with the other points.

MR. STONES :—There are two points, Sir, which I would like to take up. First as regards the retrenchment that has taken place in other items. Let us take, for example, stores in mills. Much has been made of Mr. Batlivala's evidence. I notice that Mr. Bakhale has not referred at all to the evidence I gave when summing up the rationalisation scheme. There I pointed out that there was



a saving in the monthly consumption of main weaving stores per 100 looms. In shuttles and pickers plain, the cost has been reduced from Rs. 43/- to Rs. 15/- and from Rs. 21/- to Rs. 14/- respectively.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Page?

MR. STONES :—I will give you a copy of the statement I read out. There was a saving in many items; in some cases there was a natural increase.

MR. BAKHALE :—That refers to your group?

MR. STONES :—Yes; there are 11 or 12 mills. I gave full details of the reduction in the cost of materials.

The next point is: Mr. Bakhale points out that the Japanese wages are even higher than in Bombay. I do wish to stress that the weavers' rates in Japan, looked at from every angle, are less than the weavers' rates in Bombay.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is not what you said before Mr. Stones. I was reading yesterday a passage where you said the weavers' wage in Japan was the same as in Bombay.

MR. STONES :—But we have to boil it down to cost per piece. Whatever the weaver earns, the weaver in Japan is drawing less than the weaver in Bombay for a given piece. In the appendices I attached to the statement on the Rationalisation Scheme, there is a comparative statement of weaving rates for standard sheeting 36 × 40 — 13½ (that is the biggest production in the Japanese mills.) The present rates for 2 looms, 3 looms and 4 looms in Bombay are: 9·93 annas 8·14 annas and 7·45 annas; according to the Millowners' amended list, the rates will be 9·00, 7·38 and 6·75 annas. Now, taking the Yarn Association Reports, the rates come to 6·93, as against our present rate of 9·93 on two looms. In Cunningham's report, at 95 per cent. efficiency, the rates are 6·98, 4·66, 3·49; less 15 per cent. weighted, 6·07, 4·05 and 3·03; 80 per cent. efficiency, 8·29, 5·53 and 4·14; less 15 per cent. weighted, 7·21, 4·81 and 3·60. 80 per cent. is Mr. Sasakura's basis of efficiency. Every one of these figures, the rate per piece is higher than in Bombay. In this connection, I might point out a very important point. The United States Tariff Commission report points out that much secrecy is drawn over the actual conditions in Japan. It is authoritatively stated :—

“In the spring of 1919, when the problem of the improvement of labour conditions were being heatedly discussed in Japan, the cotton-spinning companies were subjected to specially severe criticism in the public press, because of the low wages paid their employees while they were making enormous profits. Accordingly, it is reported that the spinning companies

decided to include hereafter in their published statement, in addition to formal wages, the other items that entered into actual wages the money value of the maintenance furnished to the workers and such increase as had previously been declared in the form of "war bonus" in the alleged belief that they could be thus more easily reduced in a period of depression. This was confirmed by personal interview with cotton-mill workers and by an examination of the monthly reports of the Association, and explains the surprisingly large increases in the average daily wage reported during 1919 by the Japan Cotton Spinners' Association. Moreover, examination of such reports as are available regarding the operations of individual spinning companies indicate that, with the merging of war-time bonuses and maintenance into regular wages since 1919, there has also come in the practice of including the amounts distributed as semi annual bonus with the normal wages paid during the final month of the business term or the month during which the bonus was declared."

Even the figures given in the Association's amended list are higher than any of the figures given.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**You say the weaver gets the same wage in Japan and looks after more looms ; so the percentage is higher in Bombay.

**MR. STONES :—**The actual payment per piece is higher. If you take Mr. Sasakura's evidence before this Committee of the wage given for six looms at 95 per cent. efficiency, it is 3·34 annas ; if this is weighted less 15 per cent., it is 2·90 annas. Even taking 80 per cent. efficiency, it is 3·96 annas as against 9·00 as per the amended list of the Association or 9·12 as revised. The rates quoted from every source are much higher than in Bombay. The average wage of the Japanese worker, male and female, 1·22 yen, converted into the present rate of exchange, is lower than the average paid to the Bombay operative. The worker in Bombay is paid twice as much as he is paid in Japan for the same piece.

Mr. Joshi referred to wage increases given in other countries. But they were countries like Czecho-Slovakia, Poland and Germany and the period referred to was 1922 and 1923. They were all countries in which adjustments were taking place in currency.

Mr. Bakhale raised the question of the tendency in other countries to have lower hours of employment. I wish to point out that just at present the Employers' Federation in England have given notice to the operatives that the period of oiling and cleaning should be excluded from the 48 hours of work, that is, that it should be 48 hours of actual work and that cleaning and oiling

should be done outside of that period. That is under discussion; it is not yet decided; but certainly it is a tendency the other way in an advanced country like England.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is just one point. I will quote from page 69 of Cunningham's report, Part XII—Transport of raw cotton to Japan and of Cotton Yarn and Piecegoods from Japan, by subsidized steamship lines.

“ 1. Imports of Raw Cotton.

Raw cotton is shipped to Japan principally from India, the United States of America, China and African countries.

(a) From India.

Cotton from India is carried, principally from Bombay, in vessels of the Osaka Shosen Kaisha, Nippon Yusen Kaisha and P. & O. Steam Navigation Company. These three companies have formed a “ conference ” and make an annual freight agreement with the Cotton Spinners' Association. From 1926 the Kokusai S. S. Company has been admitted to the conference to the extent of two sailings a month during the season. The Japanese companies mentioned receive no Government subsidy in respect of steamship lines from India.”

MR. STONES :—It was only recently published in the papers that a direct subsidy was being given to lines operating from Japan to East Africa, and we know that Japan is taking Uganda cotton from East Africa and taking to East Africa piecegoods. We also know that we are losing business in East Africa.

MR. KAMAT :—There are one or two questions which I want to clear up. In your recent negotiations your proposal was that the rates should be tried for three months. If at the end of 3 months the result was that the wages cut was more than  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. you guaranteed that it would be adjusted in such a way as not to exceed  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.

MR. STONES :— Yes.

MR. KAMAT :— If the result shows that the wages were below  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. you do not wish to bring them up ?

MR. KHAREGHAT :—It is with regard to the weaving section.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We will revise the rates with regard to the weaving section in such a way that it does not exceed  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. If it goes up to 9 per cent. we will revise it in order to bring it down to  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. If the cut comes to 5 or 6 per cent. we will not touch it. If there is no cut at all then we shall have to bring it up, which is not likely.

MR. KAMAT :—What are the chief lines on which you have competition from Japan ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Shirtings, sheetings, T cloths, chaddars.

MR. STONES :—Dhoties are now developing.

MR. KAMAT :—In those sorts in which there is no competition from Japan do you insist upon a cut of 7 per cent. ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—There is very keen competition from up-country. As regards the sorts which have to compete with Japan, you must have seen from the evidence that the cut is only 5 to 6 per cent.

MR. KAMAT :—Taking a particular sort in which there is no competition, you want to reduce the rate from  $10\frac{3}{4}$  pies per lb. to  $7\frac{1}{2}$  pies per lb. and the result will be a cut of 30 per cent. I want to know whether your competition is so high as to require such a heavy cut as 30 per cent.

MR. STONES :—Those figure are not worth the paper on which they are printed. We are taking only the average.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We do not say that by making this cut we will be able to compete with Japan. What we say is that we are trying to reduce the entire cost of production. We have taken the recommendations of the Tariff Board seriatim and we have succeeded in bringing down the expenditure with regard to many items. Still we are not able to compete with Japan. Therefore at present we reluctantly have to touch labour. That is our position. In spite of that, if the industry does not flourish we shall certainly go to Government for protection.

MR. KAMAT :—What are the other sorts in which there is competition ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Fancy goods.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is no competition.

MR. STONES :—There is competition from Italy.

MR. BAKHALE :—In Italy they pay very low wages.

MR. STONES :—It is for that reason they are able to compete with us.

MR. KAMAT :—I want to know whether it is possible to avoid any violent disturbance in the weavers' wages ?

MR. STONES :—It is not possible because there is a great deal of variation between mill and mill.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—What the result will be can be seen only after the standardisation has been put into operation.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—In any particular sort in which you want to specialise, there must be adjustment to induce weavers to take to it.

MR. STONES :—Otherwise weavers will not work that sort.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—You wanted to consult Mr. Rajab in regard to certain sorts?

MR. BAKHALE :—That has still to be done.

MR. KAMAT :—Supposing this  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. cut is put into force by how much will you be able to reduce the cost of manufacture per lb.?

MR. STONES :—I cannot work it up now. In the particular sort in which we compete with Japan the total cost comes to 4·17 annas, the total for spinning. Two-third of that is weaving. If you deduct 5 per cent. from this that will be the figure.

MR. KAMAT :—How far does it help you in the average price per pound?

MR. STONES :—It helps us a little. Here on two looms we pay 9·93 annas to weave the cloth. If Mr. Sasakura's statement is to be taken as correct for 80 per cent. efficiency they pay in Japan 3·96 annas as against 9·93 annas we pay to-day. The highest rate that we have been able to find in any reference is 8·23 annas. The standard rate will be 9·12 annas.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Taking the 72,000 looms, take 13 pounds as a fair average per loom per day and working the figure out for the year it comes to very nearly one pie per pound.

MR. KAMAT :—One pie per pound?

MR. STONES :—You mention Japan particularly. This will not help us much.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What is a yen equivalent to in rupees?

MR. STONES :—To-days's rate of exchange is 1·26 rupees as against a normal of 1·35.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Will you be able to deal with the other points, which were left over, with regard to weaving?

MR. BAKHALE :—I am sorry I cannot take it up this afternoon. I met Mr. Rajab only last night.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What are the two points?

MR. BAKHALE :—Width, weft and Dhotie and Sari allowances. I cannot talk to him this afternoon, as he has no telephone through which alone it is possible, if I am to deal with those points, this afternoon. It is risky to meet Mr. Rajab at night. So, I shall be able to meet him to-morrow. If we meet again to-morrow I shall be able to take it up.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You will be able to finish in the afternoon.

MR. BAKHALE :—I think so.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What about the efficiency figures.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The roving efficiency figures are ready.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What about the people working on two-loom and two-frames?

MR. BAKHALE :—We have dealt with it and have nothing more to say.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Why should you not meet Mr. Rajab now?..... We shall meet at 3-30 p. m.

MR. BAKHALE :—It is very difficult. As I told you he has no telephone, which is the only means by which I can talk to him now.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I do not want to discourage the other side from putting any points before you. But Mr. Rajab himself has admitted that as regards plain cloth the cut will be 5 per cent. On page 2009 you will find it. They are also convinced that the revision is such that at any rate the cut is not going to exceed  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. They have also agreed to the basic rate as being fair. The parity between sorts and sorts has been accepted. The only question is about the weft and width allowances. If Mr. Rajab says that the weft allowance in certain sorts should be put up.....

MR. BAKHALE :—That we shall modify.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That will destroy the whole basis, if the width or weft allowance is put up. It will destroy the whole basis we have agreed to. The real point is unfortunately we call them allowances. Mr. Rajab looks upon them in the nature of a trade discount put there for bargaining and that it can be stretched. It is not so.

MR. KAMAT :—Does a discussion of the allowances alter your position in any way?

MR. STONES :—It does.

THE CHAIRMAN :—As you are going away, we shall hear your argument and will take them into consideration afterwards.

MR. STONES :—I know their points. I can argue their case as well as our own case.

THE CHAIRMAN (TO MR. BAKHALE) :—We allow you to take up these allowances to-morrow. Try to finish it up.

We adjourn till 3 O'clock for hearing Mr. Stones.

( After Lunch. )

MR. STONES :—The first item that is under dispute is the weft allowances and deductions (page 15 of the Standard List, weaving section). During our discussion, we have made certain alterations in this from the original list. At the request of Mr. Bakhale, we have added a new column for mule cops. Mule cops were formerly given a percentage over 6" pirn column. This has been struck out, and a new list for mule cops has taken its place. Similarly, we found that certain mills had 7" and over pirns, and a new column has been added to provide for that.

I will now enumerate the points under dispute. Firstly they object to any deductions, for universal weft in the deductions sections, and they think that the scale of allowances should be increased in the region of 14s, 13s, 12s and 11s. We have made additions in the original list after 10s. On the question of deductions for universal weft, we maintain that by re-winding weft we give the weaver a bigger supply of yarn, from twice to three times the original length on the shuttle, and as a result he is able to get a large improvement in efficiency. This re-winding costs us at least 6 pies per lb. of yarn re-wound, and in putting these deductions of 1 per cent., 2 per cent. and 3 per cent. we are only giving back to the mill a small proportion of the cost that they have to incur in preparing this weft. At the same time, the weaver is getting a bigger benefit than the amount we are deducting from this list. I shall quote from the evidence of Mr. Gardener (page 828 of the printed evidence) :—

" MR. BAKHALE :—With your knowledge of the Lancashire list and the Lancashire conditions, would you tell me whether in Lancashire they make a deduction like the one that we have here under re-winding weft ?

" MR. GARDENER :—This is universal re-winding. I have told you how it is reckoned up and 15 per cent. is deducted. I have done it myself. We had 7 inch cops, which we call bastard cops. When we started on universal pirns I gave each weaver one extra loom, and dropped the rate 15 per cent. They worked for a month, and then came to me and asked ' Don't you think 15 per cent. deduction is rather too much ?' I told them ' here you have your universal pirns and cops. If you take cops you have

the old rates ; on bobbins 15 per cent. less. You can please yourself, and take whichever you like.' There must have been some advantage as all choose the universal bobbins.

" MR. BAKHALE :—As regards that point, I do not know, because it is not provided in this list. At any rate, when I was in Lancashire a few months ago, this question of reduction under re-winding weft had come before the two organisations. The weavers' amalgamation as well as the employers' amalgamation wanted a reduction under re-winding weft ; the weavers' amalgamation have not agreed to make any allowance under that head.

" MR. GARDENER :—Our weavers get 15 to 20 per cent. extra per day on re-wound weft."

The position in Lancashire is that a fight is going on for a reduction on universal weft. In some districts it has been agreed to, but, as Mr. Gardener points out, he was able to get 15 per cent. reduction in the list. In our asking for 2 to 3 per cent. reduction, we claim that we are doing the operatives very well, in view of the expense we have gone to.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Is that deduction shown in the book at all ?

MR. STONES :—It is not in the Lancashire List to-day. There is a dispute going on there for two years now. As a matter of fact, a personal friend of mine, the President of the Universal Winding Corporation, has been in England 2 years endeavouring to get the associations to agree to a deduction. The matter is still under discussion there, but in certain mills they have been able to arrange it mutually. The big point is that there is a great deal less work for the weaver. The shuttle runs for an increased length of time. In this connection, I would invite attention to what Mr. Saklatvala stated on page 497 of the printed evidence. He said :—

" On a 5" lift pirn, the yarn contained in the shuttle is much less than in the case of a 6" or higher lift. In our case, for instance, in a 5" lift pirn on 20s yarn, we have about 568 yards, and in the case of 26s weft 754 yards on a loom of 32" reed space, the weft would run out in about 3 minutes and 55 seconds. If the same yarn was wound on a universal bobbin, the length would be for 26s, 1,411 yards, almost twice as much, and the shuttle would not run out before 7 minutes and 20 seconds."

Mr. Saklatvala raised that point in discussing this.

The other point in connection with this is that we claim we have been very generous with regard to the items that they wish to raise. This is the point that Mr. Rajab raised. This is where weft is used most, and therefore



they say we ought to give increased allowances. The Colne list starts from the same weft that we use. Apparently in the Uniform List the allowances commence at 30s weft. In the coloured list they give allowances for 15s. My point is that most of the coloured goods have coarser counts than in the Uniform List. On page 132 of the 1924 edition of the Uniform List, you will see that no addition or deduction is to be made for weft finer than 15s. The allowances start from 15s; for 15s it is 2 per cent., and it goes on increasing as the counts are coarser. We originally gave a little less than these allowances, particularly in the coarsest counts. Our feeling then was that the Colne list was arranged for 4 looms, whereas ours was for 2 looms, and it was much easier for the man to earn his wage looking after 2 instead of 4 looms. Since our discussion, we have raised some of these allowances, particularly in the coarsest counts, which, however, are still below the allowances made in the Colne list. But the point is that Mr. Rajab and Mr. Bakhale want the rate to be increased on counts where we are already in excess of the allowances paid in the Colne list.

MR. BAKHALE :—Have you taken the Colne list and compared it with your ordinary weft allowances?

MR. STONES :—The Colne list is the one that commences giving allowances at 15s, just as we do.

MR. BAKHALE :—They have got another weft allowance in that list?

MR. STONES :—That is in the uniform list. When we discussed this originally, Mr. Bakhale raised the point as to why we did not commence the same as in the Uniform list. I pointed out that we had done it in the case of 90 per cent. of the cloth made in the country, and what we had done would lead to simplification.

MR. BAKHALE :—What is the simplification?

MR. STONES :—If we give allowances for the coarser weft, then there is no need to give allowances except on the coarsest weft. The average weft in Lancashire is above 28s; the average weft here is round about 20s; and the average weft used in the Colne trade is round about 24s. We fixed our basis so that those allowances need not be made, except from 15s and below. In the Colne list it happens that they have the same standard that we use. I might mention, however, that ours was not worked out on the Colne list at all.

MR. BAKHALE :—Does not the Colne list provide for coloured weft?

MR. STONES :—It gives extra for coloured weft, 5 per cent. like we do.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Is not the Colne list entirely for coloured goods?

MR. STONES :—Yes, but it happens that they use coarse weft in coloured goods, and where they use grey weft they commence the allowance only at 15s, where they add 2 per cent., whereas we start it at 14s. That is just the difference. If you deduct 2 per cent. from the figure of the Colne list, it approximates to what we have given in our column 6" lift and lifts over 6" but below 7". For 15s we give there 5 per cent., the Colne list gives 2 per cent. For 14s the Colne list give 4 per cent. against our 6 per cent.; for 13s, the Colne list gives 6 per cent. against our 7 per cent.; for 12s we give 8 per cent. and the Colne list also gives 8 per cent. For 11s we give 10 per cent.; the Colne list then makes a rapid increase. The strange part is that the other side do not want to increase from these figures; they want to increase where we are already in excess of the Colne list. For the coarsest of counts, 3s and below, where the addition is 80 per cent., there is no complaint, and reasonably so, because there are very few cloths made of that. Our point is that we have taken a base, and if we had to move these weft allowances we should have to move the base also. In any case, on the counts that they wish to raise the allowances, we are already above the proportions of the Colne list.

MR. BAKHALE :—Why is it that the Lancashire list provides two width allowances, one for colour and the other for plain?

MR. STONES :—For the same reason that we have done it in our new list; because the check looms run at a lower speed than plain looms. So they have to have different allowances; that is due to the speed. In relation to weft, we are giving higher allowances on counts from 15s to 10s. Our point is that it is fairer to labour than the Colne list. Of 8s weft, there is a certain amount; except for that the rest of them are rarely needed.

MR. BAKHALE :—And it would not be beneficial to anybody if you put them up?

MR. STONES :—That is the point, Mr. Bakhale. They wish to have an increase on these counts, 15s, 14s, 13s, and 12s. We say we have already given an allowance in all that we should have given.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What is the increase that has been suggested?

MR. STONES :—They have modified it since; Mr. Rajab suggested an allowance for weft. On 5" pirns, 2 per cent. allowance for weft. Taking the 6" lift, 40 per cent. has gone up to 50 per cent.

20	"	"	40	"
25	"	"	33	"
20	"	"	28	"
18	"	"	23	"

16 per cent. has gone up to 20 per cent.

14       "       "       16       "

12       "       "       13       "

10 remains as it was ; 8, 7, 6 and 5 have been left as they were. The increases have been below 10s.

MR. KHAREGHAT :— Below 10s, there is no dispute ?

MR. STONES :—No. They want a rise in the finer counts.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Is that right, Mr. Bakhale ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes ; we do not mind lower figures on coarse count ; we want an increase in the finer counts ; we want allowances as given in the English list.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Have you put up any of your own figures ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I will give them to-morrow.

MR. STONES :—The next question is the width allowances on the next page (page 13). In preparing the original list, it was not proposed to give a cut. Mills were circularised and they were asked what they thought a reasonable allowance should be, and they gave their figures. The original list has now been amended, so as to increase the allowance for plain looms from 70 to 78 per cent. for 17" looms and increases have been given right up to 35" width. Above that width up to 66" they remain standard as before. In the narrower classes we have made a definite increase in the width allowances, the idea being to give a higher range in the narrower looms where we found that there were lower wages. In addition, a further clause was added :—

"In looms up to 32" reed space, when the cloth width is more than 6" less than the reed space of the loom in which it is woven, then for purposes of calculation, the cloth is to be taken 6" less than reed space, *e. g.*, 24" cloth working on 32" loom would be taken as 26" cloth, and the square yards and allowances calculated on 26" although 24" cloth is being woven."

The para below is the one which existed already, where we took ten inches for all widths. Now, for looms up to 32", an addition has been made to give an additional wage to the worker. There was very little complaint, I think, on these allowances for Plain Looms.

Then, with regard to Drop Box Looms. As I pointed out when framing the chart early in December, the narrow looms had been given too little and the broad looms far too much. We therefore struck out entirely the scale of allowances for Fancies and Checks at page 19, and compiled a new width allowance

suitable for check looms. This also was compiled to give a higher wage than was originally contemplated for check looms. The point in dispute as regards page 16 is this. It now stands :—

42/46"	...	...	15 per cent.
47/82"	...	...	(Standard).

They wish it to be.—

42/48"	...	...	15 per cent.
49/53"	...	...	10 "
54/82"	...	...	(Standard).

This we are prepared to agree to, subject to the Millowners' Association's sanction.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What is that agreement based on ?

MR. STONES :—I could not tell you myself. I understand that we made this offer, subject to the sanction of the Association, and they did not agree ; so that it is left there.

MR. BAKHALE :—What is the final position ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Mr. Rajab's point was that on narrow width looms we had given very liberally, but that as regards wider we were not providing for on the same scale, specially as regards 48" cloth that is also woven on 56" drop-box looms. So that is the alteration that he suggested. Now, we had pointed out to him at the time that in the whole industry these wider looms were very few—the bulk of our looms are 28", 32" and 36"—and that being so, we did not mind meeting his desire. We have suggested these alterations and they agreed, but we have not put it up before the Committee, and we are not in a position to say what the final position is, but I do not think there would be much difficulty in getting them agree to this.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What do you want, Mr. Bakhale ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I am sorry I have not brought my notes to-day because they are rather rough and I must show them to Mr. Rajab before I place them before the Committee.

MR. STONES :—The other item is the question of Dhctie and Sari Allowances. As I have mentioned we do allow extra rates for 3 shuttles and 4 shuttles, of 5 per cent. and 10 per cent. respectively.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Is there any dispute as regards that ?

MR. STONES :—I think not ; these were mutually agreed on.

As regards page 18, (Scale for Dhotie and Sari Allowances), we have split up the width of dhoties over a smaller range and given a bigger allowance for the wider bordered dhoties. In the old list we had four divisions; we now have five. Taking the first column this is how they compare :—

OLD.				NEW.			
Upto $\frac{5}{8}$ " wide colour plain				Up to $\frac{5}{8}$ " wide colour plain			
weave border	...	...	10%	weave border	...	...	10%
Over $\frac{5}{8}$ " and up to $1\frac{1}{4}$ "	...	...	13%	Over $\frac{5}{8}$ " and up to $1\frac{1}{4}$ "	...	...	13%
Over $1\frac{1}{4}$ " and up to 3"	...	...	17%	Over $1\frac{1}{4}$ " and up to $2\frac{1}{2}$ "	...	...	17%
Over 3" and upwards	...	...	20%	Over $2\frac{1}{2}$ " and up to $3\frac{1}{2}$ "	...	...	20%
				Over $3\frac{1}{2}$ "	...	...	25%

There was no dispute on that section; an agreement was reached on the question of the method of this classification. In the second column, for counts 28s to 32s warp from Uganda or American cotton, we have reduced the allowances from 10 to 5 per cent up to  $\frac{5}{8}$ " width. It was 10, 13, 17 and 20 per cent. it now reads 5, 8, 12, 15 and 20 per cent. For counts 28s to 32s warp from Indian cotton, there is also a 5 per cent. reduction upto  $\frac{5}{8}$ " width. It was 20, 23, 27 and 30 per cent., it now stands 15, 18, 22, 25 and 30 per cent. The last column remains the same. The reduction in column 2 of 5 per cent. has been brought about because the mills using these counts are only two in number, and they found the rates to be excessively high. You have got the evidence of Mr. Gardener before you. He has now brought a list showing the current rates on various sorts and what they will be under the new list, *i. e.*, 5 per cent. more.

(At this stage Mr. Stones handed over to the Committee the statement mentioned and explained that on almost all sorts there would be considerable increases.)

MR. MALONEY :—The case of the Madhowji Dharamsi mill was brought forward before you as a special case for consideration. Soon after the strike, when this mill resumed work, they wanted to put into force the rates which were arrived at in consultation with Mr. Bakhale's Union, which brought about a reduction of 17 per cent.

MR. BAKHALE :—When was it?

MR. MALONEY :—One year ago.

This mill was paying abnormally high wages. When the mill resumed work after the strike, they wanted to introduce the rates agreed to by Mr. Bakhale's Union. You ruled, Sir, that according to the agreement they should,

pay the old rates. That fact must be taken into consideration in considering the question of reduction. I submit this statement showing the varieties and the percentage of reduction under the revised standard scheme.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—They are using Uganda cotton.

MR. MALONEY :—Yes.

MR. BAKHALE :—What is the position of the Indian Mills which use Indian cotton ?

MR. MALONEY :—In the case of the Indian Manufacturing Company, the highest cut is 29 per cent. and in certain sorts the increase is from 3 to 12 per cent. The average cut is 14 per cent.

MR. STONES :—In Bombay there are only two mills that come under column 2 ; and the rest are given in the various other columns for dhoties. This is the highest paid mill next to Madhowji Dharamsi.

MR. MALONEY :—In the Pearl Mills there are variations some slightly up and some slightly down. There is 1·4 per cent. cut in dhoties.

MR. BAKHALE :—I hope all these statements will be placed before the committee.

MR. STONES :—Yes.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Please explain to us this statement.

(Mr. Maloney then explained the statement to the Committee.)

MR. KHAREGHAT :—I suppose they are put in merely to show that there are increases ?

MR. STONES :—They are given from the mills that manufacture these particular sorts, to show the position in those mills before and as it is at present.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Are they limited to dhoties ?

MR. STONES :—Nothing else but dhoties—the only thing really in dispute.

Before, we had the Indian Mills paying huge rates, and that is the mill with the biggest cut. But the average wages were remarkably high. That of course you have in the evidence. There is an increase in the Currimbhoy Group, for example, on dhoties ; there is also an increase on dhoties in the Kohinoor Group, but there is a decrease in the rate in the Indian Mill ; that mill was paying remarkably high wages all through.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—It will have a still further decrease under standardisation ?

MR. STONES :—There will be a big reduction.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Column 3 “For Counts 28s up to 32s warp from Indian Cotton” affects most of the mills?

MR. STONES :—That will affect quite a number, but the bulk are in the final column “For counts above 32s warp,” which is usually 40s warp. There is not a tremendous amount of dhoties made in the middle column, or coarse dhoties in column 1 or fine dhoties in column 2. There are only 2 mills concerned in the 2nd column, and there will be a few sorts in most mills in column 3, but the bulk will be in column 4. You will see that from the list.

MR. KAMAT :—What is the relative production for 32s and finer counts?

MR. STONES :—That is to say, in fine dhoties there has been a remarkable advance. It is difficult to estimate, but I should say more than half the dhoties are being made in the finer counts. I should say roughly 50 per cent. are finer counts, 35 per cent. in No. 1 column, that is below 28s warp, about 5 per cent. in column 2 and 10 per cent. in column 3; that is a rough estimate.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What is the main justification for reducing by 5 per cent. the allowance in the column “For Counts 28s up to 32s warp from Uganda or American cotton”?

MR. STONES :—Because we found that the rate was too high there; we have reduced it just as we have increased in other directions.

MR. BAKHALE :—To please the Kohinoor Mills.

MR. STONES :—Column 2 is to give the Kohinoor Mills a chance. Column 3 : we found those sorts were relatively higher than other sorts. We met together to try and sort things out. We have given fairly freely in many directions, for example in the Fancies list, width allowances. Here we felt that these two columns could be reduced, and the evidence on which we have proceeded is the evidence that you have before you now.

MR. KAMAT :—Column 3 will affect about 20 per cent. of the dhotie production?

MR. STONES :—Estimating roughly, I should say 10 per cent. column 3 and 5 per cent. column 2.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What is your intention about dhoties? What increased percentages are you proposing to give?

MR. STONES :—The other side wanted to bring dhoties in other mills in Bombay up to the level of the Indian Mill. Where we were fixing 20 per cent.,

they wanted 40 per cent. and 45 per cent. I think Mr. Rajab will modify, his opinion to-morrow. It was practically standardising dhoties on the level of the highest rate in Bombay for dhoties.

This morning, when I opened upon rationalisation, I mentioned that I had discussed the question of reduction not only in the price of stores but also a reduction in the quantity of stores. I do not find any trace of it in the evidence. I hand in a statement which will give the required particulars.

Ex. 1

THE CHAIRMAN :—The rates have been reduced ?

MR. STONES :—There has been a big reduction in the cost on account of stores in the Rachel Sassoon Mill to which the statement I have handed in relates and in the other mills in our group for two causes ; one is the fall in prices of stores and the other is the decreased consumption of stores.

MR. BAKHALE :—What is the percentage between the two ?

MR. STONES :—It is difficult to work that out, because in some cases there has been a rise in the prices of stores.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As regards the Madhowji Dharamsi Mills, they have made a complaint. In consultation with Labour Leaders they had actually drawn up an agreement, and certain rates were reduced, because they had agreed to do away with too high rates ; and those rates were reduced in February 1928, and both parties had put their signatures to the agreement and agreed to it.

MR. BAKHALE :—I should like to see it.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes, you can do so. Then the question arose whether they were justified in paying those rates, and whether the 1927 rates should not be paid. Of course, you, Sir, took the strictly legal view, and said that as this mill was not made an exception under the agreement, they must pay 1927 rates and they are paying 1927 rates. But now, since we are not going to put the scheme into operation before 1st October next, they wish to raise this point again. Of course they are bound to pay the 1927 rates till the issue of your report. But later on if the standardisation scheme is not put through, there is no reason why the other side should not abide by the agreement which was arrived at regarding the reduction made. I think Mr. Rajab signed it.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Agreement between whom ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Between the Mill and the Union.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Could you produce the document ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We could produce it.



MR. BAKHALE :—So far as our Union is concerned, I do not remember any single case in which we have signed an agreement with the owners during the last three years.

MR. KAMAT :—The fact that an agreement was signed was not disputed when the point was brought before us. It was never disputed that there was an agreement.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We will produce the document.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The agreement of October 1928 to pay 1927 wages lasts only pending our report, and then it will be a matter for your Joint Committee to come to an agreement.

MR. BAKHALE :—So far as this agreement is concerned, I am quite clear that I did not put my signature to any agreement since the Union was started. As regards Mr. Joshi, I may tell you that since 1921 up to the present time he has been in Delhi always between February and March, and if this has taken place between January and March his signature cannot be there.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—There are two signatures.

MR. MALONEY :—Mr. Syed Munawar and Mr. Rajab are the signatories, on behalf of the Union.

MR. STONES :—It is a matter for the Joint Committee, if it is given a start.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Why can you not start considering how your Joint Committee should be constituted. I hope we will get our report out next month. A lot of questions will arise, and if the Committee is already formed by then, you can discuss them quickly. I throw out that suggestion. If there are any more remarks to be made, they can be made to-morrow.

The Committee adjourned till 3 P. M. on Thursday, the 14th February 1929.

## RACHEL SASSOON MILL.

### Monthly Consumption of Main Weaving Stores per 100 Looms.

		1925.	1927.
Total number of Looms worked .....		134198	299524
Average Looms worked .....		15·98	19·08
Bands Picking ...	Monthly consumption per 100 looms ...	Lbs. 12	10
	Rate per lb. ...	Rs. 2 8 6	2 8 1
	Monthly cost per 100 looms ...	" 30 6 0	25 0 10
Buffers Spring ...	Monthly consumption per 100 looms ...	Lbs. 5	4
	Rate per lb. ...	Rs. 1 9 8	1 4 6
	Monthly cost per 100 looms ...	8 0 4	5 2 0
Pickers Drop-Box..	Monthly consumption per 100 looms ...	Doz. 1 $\frac{1}{2}$	11/12
	Rate per dozen ...	Rs. 8 7 5	8 5 0
	Monthly cost per 100 looms ...	" 11 4 7	7 10 0
Pickers Plain ...	Monthly consumption per 100 looms ...	Doz. 3 $\frac{1}{2}$	2 $\frac{1}{4}$
	Rate per dozen ...	Rs. 6 15 3	6 6 0
	Monthly cost per 100 looms ...	" 21 7 4	14 5 6
Shuttles ...	Monthly consumption per 100 looms ...	Doz. 1 $\frac{5}{8}$	1 $\frac{1}{8}$
	Rate per dozen ...	Rs. 23 11 0	13 0 9
	Monthly cost per 100 looms ...	" 43 6 10	15 3 6
Sticks Picking ...	Monthly consumption per 100 looms ...	Doz. 1/3	1/4
	Rate per dozen ...	Rs. 4 0 0	4 5 4
	Monthly cost per 100 looms ...	" 1 5 4	1 1 4

---

---

*Thursday, 14th February, 1929.*

---

---

THE Committee met at the Town Hall, Bombay, at 3 p.m.

*Present :*

THE CHAIRMAN,  
MR. KHAREGHAT,  
MR. KAMAT.

MR. BAKHALE :—To-day we propose to discuss the weft allowance, the width allowance and the dhoti allowance. I should like first to take the weft allowances on page 15 of the scheme. You will notice that they have increased the percentages in their modified list and have made a separate column for mule cops. They have also added a separate column for 7 inches lift pirn and over. Formerly they had a column for 6" lift pirns and over only. Now, they have 6" lift and lifts over 6" but below 7". Before I go into this I should like to refer to one matter which is rather important in the beginning. I refer to the statement which Mr. Stones made on page 829 of the typed report of the proceedings. I cannot tell you the date exactly. Here is what he says :—

“ There is a mistake on page 15. For 16 and 17 counts, up to 5-inch lift, the weft allowance is given as 9. The correct figure is 11.”

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That refers to the example down below. The example has remained as it is. This refers to the note below.

MR. BAKHALE :—So far as the note is concerned there is no reference to so many inches lift and so on. Here he definitely makes a statement “for 16 and 17 counts, up to 5-inch lift,” the correct figure is 11. He further says :—

“ After our conference, we have increased it to 11 and the figure should be 11 instead of 9.”

This note simply says :—

“ Dosuti weft to be treated as resultant count, e.g., 16s dosuti weft on universal pirns as 8s and would have 9 per cent. added as per above list.”

There the statement of Mr. Stones is absolutely definite because he says that for 16 and 17 counts, up to 5-inch lift, the weft allowance should be 11 instead of 9. If you look to the amended list, you will find that 16 and 17 have been bracketed together and in the second column the percentage has been given as 9%. So, from the fact that 16 and 17 have been bracketed together and the figure 9 appears in the second column together with the statement of Mr. Stones, I think that it was his opinion that this figure 9 in the second column should be changed to 11.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I think there was some misunderstanding. Mr. Stones may have made a slip. For 20s and finer 2 per cent was omitted. That correction was made.

MR. BAKHALE :—This refers to 14th, 15th or 16th of November.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—All revisions were made after we had private discussion. It is impossible that Mr. Stones could have referred to that.

MR. BAKHALE :—I simply point out the mistake and leave it to the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN :—This refers to dosuti weft and Mr. Stones was asked to make it clear, as he thought that there ought to be an increase.

MR. BAKHALE :—This statement Mr. Saklatvala makes on page 828 :—

“ On a 5" lift pirn, the yarn contained in the shuttle is much less than in the case of a 6" or higher lift. In our case, for instance, in a 5" lift pirn, on 20s yarn, we have about 568 yards, and in the case of 26s weft 754 yards. 754 yards on a loom of 32" reed space, the weft would run out in about 3 minutes and 55 seconds. If the same yarn was wound on a universal bobbin, the length would be, for 26s, 1,411 yards, almost twice as much, and the shuttle would not run out before 7 minutes and 20 seconds. That explains why we have to make a special allowance in the case of smaller pirns. We maintain a smaller pirn because we get better outturn in the spinning, but we suffer in the weaving. In spite of that, our production in spinning more than makes up the loss in weaving.”

Soon after this statement by Mr. Saklatvala, Mr. Stones says : “ There is a mistake on page 15 ” and so on.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—If you read further you will find that it refers to dosuti weft. The Chairman then put him a question and he made it clear. So far as 5" lift pirn is concerned, our mills use it. Perhaps there are one or two others. All these figures were put in by myself and not by Mr. Stones. When we amended it the figure 2 was left out and this was put in. This refers to the note.

MR. BAKHALE :—I was rather surprised when I read it. It does give rise to misunderstanding. Leaving that point aside, I should like to refer now to the average weft count that is used in Bombay, because we feel that the range that has been given here is not broad enough to secure allowances for the operatives on those counts which are ordinarily worked in Bombay. In Lancashire the standard is kept from 31s to 100s. But there also on page 18, clause 10 says :—

“ Ordinary pirn cops :—The standard being 31s to 100s both inclusive, shall be reckoned equal. Above 100s 1 per cent. shall be added for every 10 hanks or fraction thereof.”

That means that they have provided for an increase above a certain figure while we have not got anything like that in our list so far as 5½" lift, 6" lift and over and universal additions are concerned. I therefore suggest

that just as they have provided for additional percentages for 100s a similar provision should be made here and similar allowances should be given above 70s.

As regards the average weft count Mr. Pennington, during the course of his evidence which appears on page 1080, said that in his own mill the average weft count was 24s. Mr. Desai of the Indian Mill said that the average weft count used in the Indian Mill was 40s. That appears on page 1107. Mr. Rajab says on page 2014 that a majority of the looms are working on wefts finer than 20s. Thus it is clear from this that so far as 5½" lift and 6" lift are concerned a large majority of the workers will not get the weft allowance because in the case of 6" lift we have maintained the standard at 15s; and also in the case of universal winding. So far as 5" lift is concerned they have provided for an allowance of 2 per cent. on 20s and above. We therefore suggest that in order that the cut may not be very heavy and that the workers who are using average weft counts should get some allowance, the range should be widened. I should like in this connection to refer to Mr. Gardener's evidence which appears on pages 1312-13. I put him the following question :—

" Leaving aside for the present ring pirn and pirn cop, in Lancashire they have provided a wider range from 5s to 30s under ordinary pirn cop and from 4s to 29s under large cops. Don't you think our range also should be a little wider ? "

Mr. Gardener replies :—

" You will find it that way possibly later on. We cannot get everything right straight away. There will be many things like that cropping up."

Mr. Sutton says :—

" Don't you think that this point would probably show itself better in practice than in theory as we are at the present moment? If it is faulty, then to that extent it should be amended. We can always raise it up."

On page 2013 Mr. Rajab said that the range should be widened. Mr. Gardener and Mr. Sutton were rather cautious in expressing themselves, but from the way in which they expressed themselves I could infer that they were not quite satisfied with the range that has now been fixed. It is very difficult, even supposing for a moment that we maintain the present range and if after some time we find that the range should be increased, under existing circumstances to do so in the near future. The scheme will come into force 4 or 5 months later, and if after six months' experience we bring forward a proposal of that kind to widen the range, I am afraid the Millowners will ask us to wait till the scheme is given a fair trial for some months more.

MR. MALONEY :—What do you mean exactly by "widening the range"?

MR. BAKHALE :—To provide allowances for 20s up to 24s or 25s : that is what we mean.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Will you say how much you require for 20s and so on ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I am coming to that. The point that I am making is that the range should be widened, and it should be like this : In the case of 5" lift, the range should be 25s and finer, a larger allowance than what is given, viz., 6 per cent. ; they have provided 2%. On 5½" lift they stop at 19s ; we do not stop there. We say that on 20s, 25s and finer the allowance should be 5%. Then on 6" lift and over, we make 25s and finer the standard, and on universal also we make 25s and finer the standard. We do not ask for any allowances on 6" lift and on the universal.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The deductions are to be taken away ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I am taking it column by column. I am coming to the Universal after that. Then there is the second column introduced for the first time for the mule cops. What I said during the course of the evidence was that the allowance provided for mule cops was less, and it should be increased, particularly on 10s and below. In the original amended list, in the note below you will find that for 10s and below 5% addition has been given. This addition is to be made to the allowances which appear in the 4th column. What we said was that there should be greater allowance for counts less than 10s. Now, they have consolidated this additional percentage which appears below the tabulated statement, added it up to the figures that appear under 6" lift and given a separate column for mule cops. It has been admitted that mule cops are rather difficult to work. I should like to refer you in that connection to the evidence of Mr. Green on page 978. I asked him " Cop weft working is more difficult ? " The reply was " Yes. It is very difficult indeed and if a weaver is not very careful, there will be a tremendous lot of waste and the mill will suffer a big loss." Then, as regards calculation, there is the statement of Mr. Stones on pages 2013-2014. I asked this question to the witness " 10s and below—5 per cent. addition. Do you think it is necessary to give a little more than 5 per cent. for counts below 10s ? " The reply was " Yes. Counts 10s, 8s, 6s, etc., should be provided for separately." Mr. Stones then said " In fact they are provided for. Let us take an individual case. On 6" lift and over Ring Pirns (additions) column 4 (page 15) percentages are provided for 10s, 9s, 8s, etc. By adding 5 per cent. to those percentages we do get 17 per cent. for 10s, 19 per cent. for 9s, 21 per cent. for 8s, 23 per cent. for 7s. The only reason why a flat rate of 5 per cent. is given for counts below 10s is, I think, there is already a varying scale given in the basic scale." You will, therefore, see that he was in favour of giving 5 per cent. addition for 10s and below for 6" lift. Now, you have got here new figures in the 5th column for 6" lift and over but below 7" lift. Now, if you add to that 5 per cent. for below 10s, you will find afterwards that that percentage has not been maintained. Take, for example, 3s and below. There the percentage is very high, viz., 50 per cent. ; and plus 5 means 55 per cent. Here we have got 56. Then 40 per cent. plus 5 is equal to 45. There we have got a deduction of 1 per cent.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Mr. Bakhale, it is 5 per cent.

MR. BAKHALE :—I take the statement of Mr. Stones.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—5 per cent. on 50 will be  $2\frac{1}{2}$ ; 5 per cent. on 40 will be 2.

MR. BAKHALE :—Then, how do you account for this?

MR. KHAREGHAT :—I think it means an addition to the percentage in that column.

MR. BAKHALE :—It is definitely calculated here: It is 17 per cent. for 10s; now that 17 per cent. would never be arrived at unless you took the 10 plus 7; and he has given here definitely 17 per cent. for 10s, 19% for 9s, 21% for 8s, 23% for 7s, and so on. So, he definitely gives us an idea as to how the percentage is to be calculated on mule cops. But here, if you compare their new figures on 6" lift and make an addition which they themselves have given previously, you will find that in most of these cases the mule cops allowance is much less than the one which they intended to provide previously.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—But then they have increased the 6" lift allowances.

MR. BAKHALE :—In that case, you will have to take Mr. Green's evidence into consideration. He says, taking 6" mule cops into consideration and the comparatively extra labour involved in driving a mule cop there should be, according to the Millowners' standardisation scheme, 5% addition on 10s and below. So, whatever figures they may adopt as being reasonable for 6" lift, there should be an increase of 5%, according to themselves, on 10s and below for the mule cops. I think I have made the position absolutely clear so far as this point is concerned. Here, if you compare these figures in the 5th column for 6" lift and add the percentages for mule cops which they themselves have provided on page 15, you will find that most of these allowances are low, much too low as you go downwards. So, it is not merely, as Mr. Stones said the other day, that it was in accordance with my wishes that they had provided a separate column for mule cops. I agree entirely so far as the consolidation is concerned, but I do not agree with the figures which they have now put down; they are considerably less than before. Even according to their own figures, I want these figures to be considerably raised.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What suggestions have you to make about it?

MR. BAKHALE :—I am prepared to maintain the parity which they themselves have given us between the 6" lift and the mule cops. Let them go on adding to the 6" lift percentages as they provide for here.

MR. KAMAT :—Uniformly?

MR. BAKHALE :—Not uniformly. I am giving my own figures. So far as mule cops are concerned, we believe those percentages are very low.



I have made it absolutely clear that we want larger percentages for 10s and below. What we say is on 8s and below 9% addition for 6" pinn, 9s 8% addition, 10s 7½% addition, 11s to 15s 6% addition, 16s to 20s 5% addition, 21s to 24s 4% addition, 25s and finer 3% addition.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is larger than what you put in the Strike Committee's standardisation scheme.

MR. BAKHALE :—In the original standardisation scheme, we had practically copied the Millowners' scheme so far as the weft allowances are concerned. There is a reason for that. We had kept these allowances as they were in the Millowners' scheme, because we had increased considerably the basic wage on page 13. If you compare our basic wage, corresponding to the basic wage of the Millowners according to the original scheme, you will find that there is a very great difference between the two basic rates. So, although we had maintained the weft allowances as they were, we thought that that would be compensated for by the increased rates that we had provided for in the basic list. But now that we have practically agreed to the basic rates as provided for and improved upon by the Millowners' Association, we think that our weft allowances also require a revision, and it is in the light of that that we have given fresh figures for the weft allowances.

Now, I come to the third column "Up to 5" lift." Here you will find that the allowances have been considerably increased on counts up to 10s. As a matter of fact, they are much more increased than we expected, and much more than what we have ourselves provided for in our revised list. Take, for example, 3s and below. They have provided for 65 per cent. Mr. Rajab, in his revised list, has provided only for 52 per cent. On 4s, they have given 59% ; Mr. Rajab has provided for 44%. On 5s, they have given 53%, Mr. Rajab has got only 40%. On 6s, they have given 48%, Mr. Rajab has given 38%.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Is that in his evidence ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not think he has given these figures in his evidence. He said he would submit a further list, but after that we had negotiations with the Millowners, and I do not think it would have been fair to them to give these figures of Mr. Rajab. For comparison, I can give you a copy. Most of the other figures are not quite relevant just now, but you can refer to these figures which I will just quote. These figures are as demanded by Mr. Rajab, and we on behalf of the Strike Committee accept them.

MR. MALONEY :—The whole list ?

MR. BAKHALE :—No ; with the variations that I am going to propose now. Mr. Rajab has given figures for page 13, but that goes out in view of the compromise.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Were these figures placed before us during our discussion ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes. Please refer to page 15 of Mr. Rajab's figures, and there you will find that up to 10s, the allowance is more in the Millowners' scheme than in Mr. Rajab's scheme. The following will give the figures: On 10s they have got 26%, while Mr. Rajab has given 24%. But from there onwards, Mr. Rajab's allowances increase while the Millowners' allowances decrease.

<i>Counts.</i>	<i>Mr. Rajab's figures.</i>	<i>Millowners' figures.</i>
11s .. .. .	22%	20%
12s .. .. .	19%	17%
13s .. .. .	14%	12%
14s .. .. .	13%	11%
15s .. .. .	13%	10%
16s .. .. .	12%	} 9%
17s .. .. .	.....	
18s .. .. .	.....	5%
19s .. .. .	.....	5%
20s .. .. .	} 10%	} 2%
21s .. .. .		
22s .. .. .	} 8%	
23s .. .. .		
24s .. .. .	} 6%	.....
25s and finer .. .. .		

So far as the principle that in the 5" lift there should be weft allowance for all the counts is concerned, both of us are agreeable, but what that allowance should be is a matter on which we unfortunately differ. On behalf of the Strike Committee I stand by Mr. Rajab's list: I do not mind if the higher allowances that the Millowners have provided for up to 9s are reduced and brought down to the figures of Mr. Rajab, if at the same time the percentages after 11s are increased to the same extent as provided in Mr. Rajab's list. We believe that the high allowances given on 3s, 4s and 5s will not be available to the operatives, because 3s, 4s and 5s weft is used only on a very small scale. What really matters is the allowance above 11s. I have already cited the evidence of people like Mr. Pennington and Mr. Desai as to what the average of weft counts is. If you take their figures and compare them with the figures of counts for which allowances are provided in the Millowners' Scheme you will find that practically very few workers will get the benefit of these allowances if they are kept at the level at which they are kept at the present. After the elaborate statement that Mr. Stones made on this point yesterday, I am sorry to say that I have not yet understood his argument. He compares this list with the Colne list in Lancashire, which really provides for coloured warp and grey weft. Here we have got only one weft allowance which is common to both, and therefore I think it is unfair to compare our one weft allowance scheme with one of the two that obtain in Lancashire and then to say that our scheme is based on the Colne list. If you want to take the Colne list, certainly take first the whole Lancashire basis and accept it, and then we are prepared to go by the Colne list. If they want to go by the Colne list, I want to ask why they have worked out an ordinary list at page 18.

MR. MALONEY :—It is dhoties ; another list altogether. They do not make dhoties in Colne.

MR. BAKHALE :—Therefore, I say it is unfair to compare our list with the Colne list in Lancashire.

Then, coming to the 5½ lift, there also you will find that up to 10s they have given much higher allowances than the allowances provided for by Mr. Rajab in his scheme, but down below, after 10s, the allowances go much lower. Now, we want that to be rectified. I do not mind if the higher allowances provided for coarser counts are reduced provided the allowances on the higher counts, say from 11s, are increased to that extent and provision is made for 5½" lift up to 25s and above to be given an allowance of 5 per cent.

In the 6" lift also, you will find that in four cases, up to 6s, there is a higher percentage given by the Millowners than is provided for in Mr. Rajab's scheme, and after that they have given less than what Mr. Rajab has suggested. They have kept the standard at 15s, while Mr. Rajab wants the standard to be kept at 25s and finer.

MR. MALONEY :—That is no standard at all.

MR. BAKHALE :—You may put your own standard, but we want to keep 25s and finer as the standard.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—For 6" lift also you adopt the whole of Mr. Rajab's scheme ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes, only with this correction : in your copy there might be " 3 per cent." in the 4th column against " 25s and finer " : that should be deleted and column 4 should be kept blank, that is, there should be no allowance after 24s.

Then, there is a new column put in for 7" lift and over. Originally 7" pirns used to get the same allowance which was provided for for 6" lift. You will find that so far as this column is concerned there is a definite cut, and they themselves have reduced the percentage on 7" lift.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—For 7" lift it is the same as for the Universal ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes, except that there are no deductions in the 7" lift. Now, sir, I do not know why they have separated the 7" lift and provided reduced rates of allowance for that. Mr. Pennington during the course of his evidence stated (page 1080) that in his mills 7" lift was being used. There may be some other mills also where this lift is being used. There, according to the amended scheme of the Millowners, they are going to give a cut to the extent of some per cent. Another interesting thing in this connection is that the allowance for 7" lift and the allowance for Universal are exactly the same, except for the fact that there are no deductions for the 7" lift. Now, it was pointed out during the course of the evidence that universal re-wound weft costs more and therefore deductions are

necessary. If that is really the case, I do not understand why there should be the same allowance for the two, 7" pirns and Universal re-wound weft. We, therefore, say that the old position should be maintained and what is given for 6" lift should also be given for 7" lift and over.

As regards the last column (Universal), you will see that there also up to 7s counts, the allowances are higher than those allowed by Mr. Rajab, but after that the allowances begin to decrease and Mr. Rajab's allowances increase. On behalf of the Strike Committee I stand by the figures of Mr. Rajab.

This is one point, and another point is as regards the reductions.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Was Mr. Rajab given a column for 7" lift ?

MR. BAKHALE :—No ; his figures are based on your amended scheme.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—You have reduced also for universals. Mr. Rajab has got 22, whereas they have got 35.

MR. BAKHALE :—The point is, the remarks I made as regards 5" and 5½" lifts are applicable to all the columns ; I do not mind the higher percentages for coarser counts being reduced, provided the smaller percentages on higher counts are increased according to Mr. Rajab's scheme.

In connection with the reductions on universal re-wound weft I would refer you to the evidence of Mr. Anderson which appears at page 1203 of the typed volume of the evidence.

" Will you kindly explain why you have made a deduction of one per cent., 2 per cent. and 3 per cent. in column No. 5 for re-wound weft under universal additions ?—That must be because there is a longer length of yarn on the pirn.

" Do you think that a similar deduction is made in Lancashire ?—I do not know. This is the Millowners' list. My mills are not affected as we have no universal pirns.

" I take a hypothetical case. If Lancashire has a deduction, Bombay should have a deduction. If there is no deduction there, there should be no deduction here. Do you agree with that ?—If you are going to do the whole thing on that basis.

" The whole thing is based on that ; our list is more or less the same as that of Lancashire, and we have made similar allowances for different kinds of extra labour.—In that case, I agree with you."

Then, Mr. Gardener at page 1312 :

" In the direction of percentage. Do you know the range in Lancashire ?—In Lancashire we should have to reckon up by the ordi-

nary pin cop as you have your percentage here and then you would have to make 15 per cent. reduction. You get your weft percentage."

Then, Mr. Green on page 981 :

" MR. GREEN :—In the Lancashire mill where I was working previous to coming to India, if it was a universal pirn of 6" they used to deduct from the standard list 15 per cent. against the cop weft."

Then, Mr. Stones on the strength of the evidence of Messrs. Green and Gardener says (page 1760) :

" Mr. Green and Mr. Gardener have admitted that they had 15 per cent. deductions on universal weft."

It is thus sought to point out that in Lancashire on universal pirns and on universal re-wound weft there was a reduction of 15 per cent. I should like you, sir, to remember one fact in this connection, and that is that in Lancashire the weft allowance is based on mule cop ; it is not based on ring pirns, and the 15 per cent. reduction, if there was any at all, must have been made from the allowance provided for the mule cops ; and again that 15 per cent. reduction must have been made not on universal re-wound weft alone but also on ring pirns. It is wrong therefore to say that there used to be a reduction of 15 per cent. on universal re-wound weft alone. That is not a fact. The fact is that the Lancashire list has taken its basis on mule cop, and on that basis there used to be a reduction of 15 per cent. both for ring pirns and universal re-wound weft. You will therefore see that they did not make any distinction between ring pirns and universal re-wound weft. Now, if you refer to the Lancashire list itself, you will find that there is no mention there of this 15 per cent. reduction. The point that they make in this connection is that the Lancashire list must have been revised during the last 15 years, and Messrs. Gardener and Green had worked in Lancashire long long ago. So far as I can see from the list, I find that the various additions and reductions that were made in the list were added to it as addenda ; the original list has been maintained as it was, so that we might get an idea as to the position that existed in Lancashire a few years ago and also the position as it is there at present. When you refer to the various addenda that they have added to this list, you do not find a single line about a reduction of 15 per cent. which Messrs. Green and Gardener referred to. It may be that that was an agreement in that particular mill, or group of mills, between the mill authorities and the workers' union in that particular district, but so far as the universal list is concerned there is no such agreement at all. Also, when reading the evidence I found that there was confusion between universal re-wound weft and ring pirns. Reading the evidence of Messrs. Gardener and Green and also Mr. Stones' construction of it, my feeling is that Mr. Stones was trying to make out that there was a 15 per cent. reduction when universal re-wound weft was being used. It is not so. Whether you used universal re-wound weft or ordinary ring pirn, there used to be a reduction of 15 per cent. from the mule cop percentages.

Mr. Gardener has agreed, as you will notice from the evidence, that an endeavour is being made in Lancashire at the present time to secure a reduction on the universal rewound weft. The employers' organisations have made a definite proposal to that effect. The Weavers' Amalgamation which is the central body of the Lancashire weavers have not submitted to that agreement. They are not in favour of reduction at all, because they feel that: "If you spend more on universal rewound weft, you get better prices also; and you stand to gain as much as the worker. Therefore there should be no reduction at all on rewound weft." This is all that I have to say with regard to different columns. One point more I wish to make is that these allowances are generally obtained on khadi, drills, chaddars, tent cloths and a few other varieties. Already there is going to be a fairly heavy cut on drills. If the percentages on weft allowance are allowed to be kept as they are to-day in the revised scheme of the Millowners, I am afraid the cut on drills will be heavier still.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—What is the weft in the drill?

MR. RAJAB :—In some varieties 14s and in others 12s.

MR. BAKHALE :—I am anxious as far as possible to minimise the discontent of the operatives. Therefore so far as the range of the counts is concerned I may point out that there is a tendency in Bombay to go finer and in a very short time a fairly large number of mills will go finer. Therefore it is necessary that our range should be sufficiently wide so as to provide some allowances for the operatives. I think I have finished so far as weft allowance is concerned.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I will be very brief, sir. All I can say is that if Mr. Rajab insists upon his suggestions he will make the whole scheme very unscientific, if not absurd. I feel after hearing Mr. Bakhale that they have not as yet understood the nature of these allowances. They have openly stated that their idea is to get the majority of the weft used under the allowances. The allowances are put there for extraordinary work and not for ordinary work. There is the basis rate and everything has been provided there. The extra weft allowances are there. If you bring all sorts under allowances, it destroys the whole nature of the allowance themselves and upsets the whole scheme. As regards the weft allowances naturally the coarser the count the less the length of the yarn in the shuttle and therefore more shuttling. For this reason we have provided higher allowances for coarse counts than for the finer counts. As I said, the allowances are not to be made applicable to all wefts for the simple reason that all wefts do not require any extraordinary work. As regards coarse counts—of course in very coarse counts specially—the shuttle runs out so quickly that there is constant re-shuttling and loss of efficiency. To compensate for this extra work and loss of efficiency we provide allowances. The very fact that Mr. Bakhale is even prepared to have the allowances on coarse counts reduced and have it put up on other counts shows that they do not follow any scientific scheme. They make it a matter of expediency and want to upset the whole scheme.

I shall now deal with it column by column. In the case of 5" lift it is quite an exceptional thing. There is 5" lift in our mills and perhaps in one or two other mills. When we started this in Bombay—our original lift was 4½"—the weavers strenuously objected to work on 4½" lift pirn. All we could do was to alter the frame to the best of our ability, use a slightly bigger bobbin and bring the frame to 5" lift. In the case of 5" weft, specially coarse counts, 10s, the shuttle gets exhausted quickly. Mr. Bakhale seems to think that we have put these allowances higher because the varieties we make are very few. As far as our Tata Mill is concerned in the case of our khadi it is 6s weft 8s warp. So, in our case, the allowance of 48 will considerably help our weavers. As regards 5" lift this is the only column where we allow 2 per cent. on 20s, barring mule, because of the difficulty of inserting the cop. The weaver has to be careful and it takes time to insert the mule cop in an ordinary pirn. In 5" lift we have given 2 per cent. The reason is that in our mills even after raising the lift from 4½" to 5", we give half a pie per pound over our ordinary rates, because of the short lift. The production comes to 13 and 14 pounds and the weaver gets about 6½ pies. So, in order to continue that compensation we have put in 2 per cent. The weaver's earning will be Rs. 1-12-0 on the average. This 2 per cent. allowance will make it up to 6 or 7 pies. That is the only reason why we have allowed 2 per cent. With regard to 5½" lift there also the same argument applies as regards higher percentages with regard to lower counts. There we stop at 19s, because naturally as we go to higher counts like 20s and so on there is considerable difference between 5" and 5½" lift as regards quantity of yarn. As we go to 6" we stop at 15s for the same reason. Then as regards 7" lift and over when we had our amended scheme before us we were not aware of the fact that 7" lift bobbins were used in the Spring Mills. Therefore we did not make any special provision. We stated 6" and over meaning 6" and 6½" lift which is the common lift in Bombay. Afterwards it was brought to our notice that in the Spring Mill they are using 7" lift pirn. Now, 7" lift pirn is a speciality. They had to get a longer shuttle and shuttle box and therefore the yarn wound on these bobbins is practically the same as in the case of universal pirn winders. Therefore it is unfair for them to give the same allowance as people who work on 6" lift where they use ordinary shuttles. They have gone to the length of spending money in getting larger shuttle box and longer shuttles. Therefore we considered it fair that we should reduce the allowance in their case. As Mr. Stones has dealt with the other points, I do not propose to go into details.

MR. KAMAT :—About these deductions, Mr. Bakhale has contended that although you spend a little more on universal pirns you fetch extra prices as well. Do you admit that?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—No, sir.

MR. BAKHALE :—I should like to know from you why there is no deduction on universal rewound weft as such in Lancashire?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Mr. Stones stated that when he was there it did obtain.

MR. BAKHALE :—Deductions did obtain over the allowances for mule cop. There is no further deduction. Suppose in A mill you use mule cop ; in B mill you use ring pirn ; and in C mill you use universal rewound weft. B and C mills make the deduction over the mule cop allowance that obtains in A, though C mill does not make any further reduction, because they use universal rewound weft and B does not make any further reduction, because they use ring pirn.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—On universal winders after 16s the quantity is considerable.

MR. BAKHALE :—That is in Lancashire also.

MR. MALONEY :—I can throw some light on the point raised by Mr. Bakhale. Universal weft is not popular in Lancashire. But to the extent to which it is used there should be a provision in the list. Mr. Gardener is quite right in saying that the rate for rewound weft for 7" ring bobbins is low. But the necessity has not yet arisen. Universal weft is very little in use in the cotton manufacturing centres like Oldham, Bolton, Blackburn.

MR. BAKHALE :—Even there the employers' association has asked for a deduction.

MR. MALONEY :—They cannot use the universal winding to any extent unless they get something to pay for it.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—If you do not give the mill the advantage for the cost it incurs on universal winders, if you take away these deductions and instead you put an increase on the rates, the only thing that the mill will do is to stop winding on universal pirns as regards these counts. Universal pirns are really used in cases of coarser counts, as regards khadi, drill and chudders. I do not know whether it would pay any mill to wind 20s and finer on universal pirn winder.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Is it so, that universal pirn winder is used only for coarser counts ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes. That is as far as grey only is concerned, because coarse grey yarn on 6" lift bobbin is very little compared to universal.

MR. BAKHALE :—I understand in the Indian mills they are using 20s on Universal.

MR. RAJAB :—Our Weaving Master who is sitting there can bear me out.

(The Weaving Master of the Indian Mills was heard to say that this was done in a small proportion of cases.)

MR. KAMAT :—Could you give us any idea as to the extra cost you have to incur for winding universal weft, say, 20s and over ? Is it 4 per cent or 6 per cent. or 10 per cent. ?



MR. SAKLATVALA :—It works out at 6 pies per lb. on an average. What we maintain is that to make the whole scheme look properly scientific and devised in a proper manner, we must take all this into consideration and put up the allowances where they are due and also make deductions where they are justified.

MR. KAMAT :—If the deductions are to be allowed, they should be commensurate with the extra cost which you say you do incur. Could you give us any idea as to the extra cost you have to incur in percentages?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It is 6 pies per lb.; over 20s it will be a little more.

MR. BAKHALE :—You do not get any extra price for that?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—No.

MR. BAKHALE :—Then why do they use it?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We use it mostly in case of colour and coarse counts. In case of colour, we get not only more yarn but also better winding, but on the grey, it is merely to have more yarn. I know the makers of these universal winders claim that the cloth will look better and so on. But so also the electric motor drive people say that the cloth will look better and fetch better prices if there is an electric drive. It is really nothing of the kind. We are on electric drive now, and our cloth is just the same as before.

MR. BAKHALE :—We will now come to the width allowances on page 16. Here you will find a big change has been made in the tabulated statement. Originally we had only 2 columns, "width of cloth in inches" and "allowances to be made." Now, they have got the first column as it is, "width of the cloth" the second column is given for plain looms only, and the third column gives allowances for drop box looms, 2 shuttles. I will deal with the drop box allowances a little later; I shall first confine myself to the first column. Here also you will find that on narrower widths they have increased the allowances, but in the broader looms the proportionate increase does not exist. If you compare the new allowances they have provided with the allowances that Mr. Rajab has given in his statement, you will find that the allowances of the other side are higher in certain cases. But when you come to the broader width of cloth, you will find that Mr. Rajab's allowances go on increasing, whilst theirs go on decreasing. We believe that the allowances they have provided up to 29" width of cloth are reasonable, if we also take into account the fact that there is a  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. cut in the weaving section, although from our point of view and particularly in view of the fact that we do not accept the  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. cut, these allowances should be a little more. But I leave it at that, so far as widths above 29" are concerned, and I come down to widths above 30" and over. Here we believe that the allowances they have provided for are very low, and should be increased as per Mr. Rajab's list. There again, there is the big question of the standard. They have kept it now at 36" to 66", but they proposed to their Committee that for 36" there

should be an allowance of 2 per cent. and the standard in that case would be from 37" to 66", but that is subject to the approval of the Committee of the Millowners' Association. Now, we have got some evidence as to the standard that should be maintained, and I should first like to refer to the evidence of Mr. Pennington, which appears on pages 1082-1083. The following were the questions and answers :—

" Q.—Coming to the width allowances, page 16 of the weaving section, you have kept the standard from 35 to 65 inches. Do you not think that standard is a little too broad ?

" A.—There is rather a big gap there ; I admit that."

Again, on page 1084, the following occurs :—

" Q.—Suppose a man working a 40-inch loom and another a 70 inch loom, do you think that the labour involved in both is the same ?

" A.—It is not the same.

" Q.—Why should you keep a standard so low and so broad as that ?

" A.—Really I do not know why there is such a wide variation in the standard list."

Mr. Pennington, I should like to emphasise, is one of those people who were consulted when the original scheme was prepared. So, he can be called a technical expert in this matter, and this is the view that he has expressed before the Committee. Then again, Mr. Anderson, on page 1203-04, has replied to my questions. I shall quote from it :—

" Q.—Coming to the next page, scale of width allowances, will you explain to me for my information why it is that the standard of width has been kept so broad as from 35" to 65" ?

" A.—I cannot tell you that. It is for the Committee of the Millowners' Association.

" Q.—Have you not studied the standardisation scheme ?

" A.—Certainly I have, but this particular item from 35" to 65" standard width you must ask the Committee of the Millowners about.

" Q.—You are fairly conversant with the standardisation scheme. You may be able to give me some explanation at least ?

" A.—I cannot explain that point.

" Q.—You may not be able to explain to me why this has been done but now that this has been done, you can help me with your opinion. You have got two workers working on two different looms, say 40" loom

with 35" cloth and 70" loom with 65" cloth. In both cases here according to this scale the standard is the same and you will not get any allowance for width. I want to know from you whether the work involved in both these sorts is exactly the same ?

" A.—The point is that on the 65" he has more ends of warp to look after than on 35". It depends on the counts of weft he uses as to whether he has more work or less work on account of the weft on the pirn. The same length of yarn on the pirn would only run out quicker on the 65" width cloth than on the 35" cloth. Therefore, he would have to re-shuttle his pirn more often on the 65" than on the 35", assuming they both run at the same speed.

" Q.—That means the other man on the 70" loom with 65" width of cloth will have to do a little more work than the other man ?

" A.—Yes.

" Q.—But if the standard has been kept the same on 35" to 65" he will not be able to get any allowances that he is entitled to under, similar circumstances ?

" A.—Yes, for the extra width he will not get."

Then again, I refer to Mr. Ramsingh Dongarsingh's evidence, on page 1760, where the following questions and answers occur :—

" Q.—Then on page 16 of the same book you will find the scale of width allowances given. There they have taken the width standard from 35 to 65 inches. Don't you think that it is a little too wide ?

" A.—From 35 to 65 no allowances have been provided. I think some allowances should be given there.

" Q.—You will have to keep some standard and then provide allowances for higher and lower widths ?

" A.—35 to 50 should be the standard. I am expressing my opinion.

" Q.—You agree that this standard is a little too wide ?

" A.—Yes."

Of course, Mr. Rajab has stated on page 2015 that the standard is too wide. That appears on page 2015. It is therefore clear from the evidence of those gentlemen who are either managers or weaving masters in some of the most important mills in Bombay that the standard is too wide and should be brought down. We have therefore provided in Mr. Rajab's new statement that the standard should be from 45" to 55". I know, sir, that Mr. Stones has made every endeavour to explain why the standard has been kept so high as that, but in spite of that, in view of the opinions of these managers, I do maintain that the standard is too wide and must be brought down.

I should also like to refer to the allowances as they exist in the revised scheme. I will take a few examples to show the extent to which they can be called scientific, fair and reasonable. I would like you, sir, to refer to pages 13, 14 and 15 of the Book of Examples, and in each case I would ask you to take the first, namely, "X-quality Longcloth. In the first case (page 13) you have 28" cloth; in the second case it is 30" cloth (page 14); in the third case it is 33" cloth (page 15). The various dimensions also have been given, such as reed, pick, warp, weft, etc. They are more or less the same. But you will find that the rates per piece are not the same as they ought to be. For example, the variety on page 13 X-quality longcloth, if worked out, gives you the rate of 45.21 pies per piece. That is the rate according to Mr. Rajab's calculation. The figures they have given on that page and subsequent pages have been modified by the Millowners themselves and the allowances have been increased in certain cases. So, these figures would not give us the exact idea. Therefore, Mr. Rajab has worked out this quality in order to find out the rate per piece, and compared it with the other two at pages 14 and 15. In the first case, 28" cloth, the rate comes to 45.21 pies per piece; in the second case, 32" cloth, the rate comes to 44.9 pies per piece; and in the third case, 33" cloth, the rate comes to 46.39 pies per piece. It is also necessary to remember the speed of these looms which is given on those pages. In the first the loom width is 32" and the speed 220; in the second the loom width is 36" and speed 210; and in the third the loom width is 40" and the speed 200. And the basis of earnings also are different according to the calculations of the Millowners' Association themselves. You will thus see that speed differs in the case of these three looms, and yet the worker producing 30" cloth gets actually less than the worker who produces 28" cloth. Now 28" cloth is worked on 32" loom; 30" cloth on 36" loom and 33" cloth on 40" loom. We have calculated the width allowances they have given, namely, 28" cloth 24 per cent., 30" cloth 15 per cent. and 33" cloth 8 per cent. According to our calculation the man working 30" cloth actually gets less than the man who works 28" cloth. This is the comparison between the first case and the second case. If you compare the first case with the third case you will find that in the third case the worker gets only 1.18 pies more per piece. In the case of the third, I am told by Mr. Rajab that the quantity of cloth produced is only a piece and a half per day. You will thus see that although the third man works a little harder than the first man, he gets only 1.18 pies more.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Is that a piece and a half on all the looms?

MR. BAKHALE :—At any rate I have taken the production as you have given in your Book of Examples. According to you a man should ordinarily get more when he works on wider cloth, but here I have given you a case in which a man working a wider cloth is getting less.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What is the basis of calculation; I want the figures. What is the basic rate taken and what is the width rate?

MR. BAKHALE :—On 28" cloth he took 24 per cent. width allowance, and 1.25 is the basic rate.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—1.25 in all the cases ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What is the width allowance taken in the second and third cases ?

MR. RAJAB :—15 per cent. and 8 per cent. respectively.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—How did you get 1.25 ?

MR. RAJAB :—Because it is 37 picks.

MR. KAMAT :—There is no intermediate pick shown here ; it is 36 and 38.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That is all right ; just to get the exact figures, the intermediate figure is taken.

MR. BAKHALE :—I think I have pointed out that it is no use insisting too much upon the scientific nature of these figures. If you take the three figures together—the original, amended and the modified—you will find that the latest is practically out of recognition if you compare it with the original scheme. Even from the beginning we have been told that the scheme is a fair and reasonable one. I do not want to rub this point further beyond saying that there is a possibility of readjustment in the scheme itself. I therefore want to put in our figures. If there are mistakes in your scheme there may be mistakes in our scheme also. I want that to be considered by the Committee. So, the thing boils down to this : we want a standard to be maintained at 45" to 55" and as regards percentages we stand by the figures put in by Mr. Rajab. I do not object to parities from 17" to 29" and from 30" to 44" and from 45" to 66". But we stand by the percentage increase given by Mr. Rajab on page 16.

I now come to the drop-box looms. Here I think a violent change has been made. Originally we had the width allowance on page 16 and on page 19 we used to have the drop-box allowances. Now, what they have done is that they have amalgamated the drop-box percentages into the width allowances. By the amalgamation of these two we find that a little more advance has been made on the width of cloths which are produced on 28" looms. But for the other widths of cloth there is a considerable reduction. If you take the drop-box sort as was provided originally you will find that there is a reduction in these allowances. As regards the drop-box varieties on 17s, 18s, 19s and 21s, as Mr. Rajab told me, there is not a single example in this book of examples of the drop-box sort containing such narrow widths. I take it that this book contains the sample varieties and there should be at least a few varieties with these widths. So, although they have given us an advance here, we feel that this advance will do no good to the operatives. However, we admit that the advance is there. As regards the rest we feel that there is a deduction. I shall tell you how. Originally they provided separately for drop-box allowance on page 19 and at the same time we were getting the width allowance. The width allowance was both under plain as

well as drop-box sorts. We were getting drop-box allowance to the extent of 45 per cent. on two shuttles. Now, by the amalgamation of these two allowances and by providing a separate column for width allowances we believe that a cut has been made. Take, for example, 26" width of cloth. Originally we were getting 15 per cent. allowance. Now, on 26" they have given 32 per cent. But I should like to leave that aside. For 26" width of cloth 15 per cent. and for drop-box 45 per cent. That should be 60 per cent. Now, they have given 58 per cent. I should like you to work that out even from 24". For 24" the original allowance was 20 *plus* 45 per cent. That means 65 per cent. Now, they have given 64 per cent. On 25" the allowance was 18 *plus* 45 which is equal to 63. Now, they have given 58. On 26" I have already dealt with it.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—So much difference ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—There is good reason for it. Mr. Bakhale has made a mistake in not taking the allowances in conjunction with the basic rate. When we revised the basic rate we put up the coloured considerably. These drop-box varieties will get a higher basis than others. You will see that from our revised list.

MR. BAKHALE :—That will have to be calculated.

Then again, as regards the standard under drop-box 47" to 82" I am afraid that the worker will not get even the width allowance, because this is consolidated with the drop-box allowances. If this is kept as the standard he will lose the width allowance he was getting under the amended scheme.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—You forget the base.

MR. BAKHALE :—I am quite prepared to work it out.

Take, for example, 82". They have given 10 per cent. for 67" width of cloth. If you add the drop-box allowance it will be 55 per cent. I should like to know whether the base is so increased as to compensate for the loss on 55 per cent. allowance.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—It would depend upon the number of picks also ?

MR. BAKHALE :—We are now dealing with the drop-box. We are concerned with that and the other factors are known.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You might put in some figures about that.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We will give you figures for some sorts worked at present.

THE CHAIRMAN :—I should like to know whether we can go on now. Would you like to finish the discussion ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I am in the hands of the Committee. If you think we can take it up to-morrow I am quite agreeable to it.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We had better finish this part.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is another point which I should like to bring to your notice. Now, 67" has been made the standard under drop-box column. So, the allowance he will get is nothing except the base rate. If you work out the figures for 67" cloth on plain loom he gets not only the base rate but also 10 per cent. Here the drop-box man who should get more gets less than the man working on plain loom. So, whether you consider it from the point of view of standard or from the point of view of allowances that have been provided for, we are wholly against this column, because we feel that there is a terrible cut here. As regards the point Mr. Saklatvala has just made that the basic rate has been increased, I am quite prepared to consider that point. I should like to be convinced and I hope that the Committee will get itself convinced that the basic rate is so increased as to maintain the wage that he would get under the amended scheme with the width allowance and 45 per cent. for drop-box.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—In higher widths we were paying too much in the case of drop-box.....

MR. BAKHALE :—I am prepared to take the width allowances in the amended list and in the revised one. Take the width allowance to be 45 per cent. for drop-box, which you have provided in the printed list. Compare the wage that a worker would get with the basic rate and then I should like to see whether the man is compensated for for the heavy reduction which we feel has been made here. What we therefore say is that so far as the plain loom allowances are concerned they should be increased after 30s according to Mr. Rajab's figures. So far as the drop-box figures are concerned we are against them. We maintain that the original scheme, as it obtains on page 19 of the amended printed list, should be kept as it was, and the width allowances that they have given should be kept as they are now, subject to this, that they should be modified in the light of Mr. Rajab's figures. Otherwise, we are afraid that the drop-box cut will be simply terrible, much more than the one that they had provided for originally.

MR. KAMAT :—Under Mr. Rajab's scheme, he wants more width allowances, more weft allowances, and also increases in the basic rate from 1.02 to 1.07.

MR. BAKHALE :—That is gone now.

MR. KAMAT :—You do not stand by that ?

MR. BAKHALE :—The statement that I have given you refers and stands good only in the case of weft, width and dhoti allowances ; the other pages go.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We will go into the calculations later. The allowances are to be considered in conjunction with the base. As regards the standard, again it is the same argument that it should be a reasonable standard, and what we ought to allow for is for extra work. Mr. Bakhale quoted Mr. Anderson. But what does Mr. Anderson himself say ? He says

that there is a " little more " work, and that little more work is amply compensated for by the fact that our base is founded on the square yard measurement. It is only when you go to higher width of looms that this extra work comes in. Between 40" looms and 66" looms, there is not that much extra work, and between 40" and 66" there is already sufficient compensation in the base itself.

MR. BAKHALE :—Does not the increased square yardage and the reduced speed cancel each other ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—No.

MR. BAKHALE :—I can produce statements of mill managers that they have said yes.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That can be worked out ; we can show that the weaver is compensated for. It is only when we go to higher width of looms, say, over 66" that extra work comes in, and for that we have again provided 10, 15 and 25 per cent. As regards drop-box, I think we had given you the figures that we were prepared to alter the base to a certain extent, because we know it is not going to make much difference. As I had said, in the industry the drop-box looms are always 28", 32" and 36". There are very few 66" and above, and if they want we can alter the base. In fact, we had made certain suggestions to them, but we have not been able to place them before our committee.

THE CHAIRMAN :—What do you mean by " alter the base " ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Alter the standard. Instead of 47 to 82, we will make it 49 to 53 and give 10 per cent. on that.

MR. BAKHALE :—We are not in favour of any standard being kept for drop-box, because the weaver loses even the width allowance there.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We will show you whether it is compensated for or not.

MR. MALONEY :—There is one point about this width allowance and drop-box. Originally it was stated that we should pay 45 per cent. allowance for drop-box, no matter what the width. That was absolutely unscientific, for the simple reason that the only difference between a drop-box and a plain loom in the wider width is the difference in the shuttling. They both run at the same speed and give the same production. Therefore, you could not pay 45 per cent. allowance for wide drop-box.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Is there any provision in Lancashire about drop-box looms ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I think we can find it out to-morrow.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Would you be able to give us some examples about the working of width allowances and drop-box ? They say that the standard is too wide, and point out anomalies.



MR. SAKLATVALA :—As regards that I pointed out to Mr. Bakhale that in the case of 28" cloth and 30" cloth, the difference in the width of the cloth is only 2". Of course, you have got the looms graded to that extent. From 32" we have to go to 36", or from 36" to 40". The difference in the reed space is higher than the difference in the width of the cloth. Just when you go on the border line, just when you step into the higher looms, that difference must occur. Now, as you go on to weave broader ones, for instance in 40" looms instead of 33", if you go to 35" cloth or 36" cloth, the reverse will be the case, and you will see that the weaver gets much more than in the other case. But when you come on the border line, the difference in the width is only 1", and the difference in reed space is 4"; that is bound to be so.

MR. BAKHALE :—Why should not the difference be the other way about? I quite realise your point that we have taken 32" loom and 36" loom. I am looking at these 2 looms from the point of view of the percentages of allowance that you have provided. I say that even these figures, scientific as they are, require revision.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—In what way?

MR. BAKHALE :—In the direction of removing the disparity that I have just pointed out. There may be anomalies, but I do not want the anomalies to go to such an extent as to put the worker to considerable loss.

MR. KAMAT :—Under Mr. Rajab's scheme of width allowances, what would be the comparative figures instead of 44 pies and 46 pies, which you gave just now?

MR. BAKHALE :—We would have to work it out, and I will let you have the figures to-morrow.

MR. MALONEY :—Regarding the figures for drop-box, are the figures to be worked out on the old basis and new basis (that would be difficult with short notice), or just the figures under the finally revised list, as regards the wages that the operative would be able to earn—the cut on the present existing rates on these sorts?

THE CHAIRMAN :—Figures should be given as regards the complaint that there would be such a difference between the old and new allowances.

MR. BAKHALE :—What should be done according to me is this: Take a few sorts on drop-box, have the rates calculated according to the printed list, take the base for that, the width allowances for that and the drop-box allowances for that. Take the new list, take the new base; for bigger widths take only drop-box allowances, because width allowance does not exist so far as drop-box is concerned. We will then compare the two.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We revised this list for the very purpose of reducing the allowances. The allowance of 45 per cent. was too heavy, as pointed out, as we went on wider looms.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We can verify that from the figures. We have no means of knowing how much in excess they are. The figures may be given in a week, or as soon as you can let us have them.

The Committee adjourned till 11 a.m. on the 15th February 1929.



---

---

*Friday, 15th February 1929.*

---

---

Friday, the 15th February, 1929.

The Committee met at the Town Hall, Bombay, at 11 A. M.

Present:—

THE CHAIRMAN.

MR. KHAREGHAT.

MR. KAMAT.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Sir, we have worked out all the examples in the Book of Examples on the new basis. It is a modified list ; we have got only one copy and we will give it to you. That will make things quite clear.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Would you kindly correct all our copies ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes.

MR. BAKHALE :—May I take it that the discussion on drop-box is rather incomplete in view of the figures that Mr. Saklatvala has promised ?

THE CHAIRMAN :—I do not know if there is very much to be said about it.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Not very much to say. The figures will make it clear that according to the present basis the wage works out in the narrower looms at a slightly higher rate than in the broader looms. We have marked all the drop-box sorts.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—It may be that there ought to be some revision of the rates of the width allowances. They are not properly worked out.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The width allowances were properly worked out before. When we found that on broader looms like 72" the scale was too high, we increased the width allowances for narrower looms.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Increased it out of proportion. That is why there was the anomaly of a man working a 28" cloth getting more than the man working a 30" cloth.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That was due to the fact that it was pointed out by them that there was no reason why a weaver working on two narrow looms should be paid much less than the weaver on a broader loom.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—The anomaly at present is that a man who works a smaller piece gets more than the worker who works a much larger piece.

MR. MALONEY :—That is always possible when you jump over to a new reed space. What really ought to be done in such a case is, you should shift to a lower rate when you go to the next width.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—The point is 28" cloth costs more than the 30" cloth.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That is due to the fact that you can grade the width of your cloth by half an inch, quarter of an inch or three-quarter of an inch, but you cannot grade your looms.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—It is not due to that ; it is because the allowances are too high for narrower cloth. The proportion between the allowances is wrong.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That is only when you weave the width of the cloth in the nearest loom space. Mr. Rajab worked out a 28" cloth on 32" loom ; 28" cloth can be worked also in 36" loom.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Your allowances are according to the width of the cloth and not according to the loom.

MR. MALONEY :—We have graded according to the width of the cloth. The anomaly arises because the speed is regulated according to the reed space and not according to the width of the cloth.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—28" comes to 124 ; 30 comes to 115.  $28 \times 124$  will be more than  $30 \times 115$ . The proportion ought to be such that it will come out equally. Your original standard list was all right, but in making adjustments by giving a few percentages here and there, you have upset the proportion.

MR. MALONEY :—There will always be that difficulty when you can weave cloth of a particular width in two different looms of different widths, no matter how scientific your grading. You have to grade not according to reed space but according to the width of the cloth.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Then possibly you will have to specify the width of the loom.

MR. MALONEY :—The only way to correct it is to make the rates lower for the narrower reed space or increase the other rates ; if you increase the other rates it will mean you will have to increase throughout.

MR. BAKHALE :—Lowering the rates is out of the question.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Lowering or increasing is not unscientific.

MR. BAKHALE :—I think you do require some adjustment.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—As the narrower looms work more rapidly the wages will be higher.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—On the other hand the square yard width will be much less.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—The speed factor will also increase the man's wages.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Not only the speed factor but also the efficiency factor.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—If you take merely the width, then the allowance should be according to width, so that a man who works a higher width will get a higher wage.

MR. MALONEY :—That is all right, but when you get to a new reed space, then you get the same anomaly.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Then, you must work out according to the loom width. You want the width allowances according to the loom and not according to the cloth.

MR. MALONEY :—We have to consider the width of the cloth.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—If you want an allowance according to the width of the loom, then you must change the basis.

MR. MALONEY :—If you go by the width of the looms, you will get big jumps, which will not convince the workers. If the cloth is not put in a correct reed space, he is going to be penalised.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Sometimes we work 28' cloth on 32" looms, but if all our 36" looms are not engaged and we have orders for 28' cloth in excess of what we can turn out on 32" looms, we put them on 36" looms also.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—It may be in exceptional cases.

MR. BAKHALE :—There are one or two other points with regard to the width allowance which I should like to be cleared before I proceed to the dhoti allowance. Supposing a weaver works 67" width cloth on 72" plain loom and another weaver works 67" width of cloth on a 72" drop-box loom.....

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Take 66".

MR. BAKHALE :—Take 70".

MR. MALONEY :—Impossible to weave.

MR. BAKHALE :—Can 68" be woven?

MR. MALONEY :—65" can be woven on 72" loom.

MR. BAKHALE :—What will be the width on a 76" loom?

MR. MALONEY :—69".

MR. BAKHALE :—We will take 69". Suppose a man weaves 69" width of cloth on 76" loom and another man weaves on a drop-box loom of the same width, the same pick and the same reed. I should like to know from you Mr Saklatvala, whether the man working on the plain loom will or will not get the width allowance according to your latest list and whether the man working on drop will not get any width allowance, as 47" to 87" is taken as the standard. In that case the man weaving on the plain loom the same width of cloth will get 10 per cent. more than the man working on drop-box loom of the same width, etc.

MR. MALONEY :—You get a higher percentage of colour in drop-box than in plain loom.

MR. RAJAB :—On plain looms we work sometimes colour.

MR. MALONEY :—There is a lower percentage of colour.

MR. RAJAB :—On splits we have 100 per cent. of colour. On the plain looms there is a percentage for colour plus split.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—The warp allowance should be the same for both ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As far as warp is concerned it is the same. If it is worked on plain loom with 69" cloth, the weaver will have a 10 per cent. allowance. In the drop-box there is no allowance. It is quite true. But then, I do not think that there are any 76" drop-box looms.

MR. RAJAB :—Why have you provided up to 67 inches? Simply put down your percentages.

MR. MALONEY :—We lay down the percentages in the book of examples.

MR. BAKHALE :—I think it is an anomaly.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It is an anomaly. You are taking quite an exceptional case. In the first place there would be no cloth which would be woven on plain loom with 50 or 100 per cent. colour same as in a drop-box sort. There is colour which is mostly used in checks on drop-box. You assume that on the plain loom there might be a variety which will have the same number of hundred per cent. coloured ends. Then, you are quite right. In one case the weaver will get 10 per cent. allowance and in the other he will not get that allowance.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Why was this distinction made ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Another point. On the plain looms you pay 25 per cent. allowance for 83" width of cloth and upwards. On the drop-box, you pay for 83" cloth and upwards 10 per cent. That means taking the other things common here also don't you think that the weaver on plain loom will get more than the weaver on drop-box loom ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I should say so.

MR. BAKHALE :—While preparing a scheme you have provided for exceptional cases also. Take your own former scheme and compare it with the scheme you have now prepared and you will find the anomalies.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We wanted to change this as far as the standard is concerned from 42" to 48" so that 48" width may have an allowance of 15 per cent. Then you give an allowance from 49" to 53" of 10 per cent, and wanted the base from 54" to 82".....

MR. BAKHALE :—You mean the drop-box.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Your contention is that instead of the standard being taken as 54" to 82" if we take that standard we must pay as much as we pay on the plain sorts.

MR. BAKHALE :—I think this is a wrong method of putting this column here.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Do you say that the old arrangement is better?

MR. BAKHALE :—We may have some adjustments on the old basis. This is absolutely full of anomalies.

MR. MALONEY :—I can explain why this anomaly exists. When Mr. Stones handed in to the Committee a graph showing why the standard is kept at from 35" to 66", he explained that plain looms with wider widths were being paid too high a rate according to the standard list. Having committed ourselves to it, we do not want to withdraw it. When we worked out the wages that should be obtained we calculated this and gave the width allowance to reach that wage. What Mr. Bakhale says is correct. It would be possible that for weaving 100 per cent. colour cloth on a plain loom he would get more than a weaver would get on a drop-box loom for the same width of cloth.

MR. BAKHALE :—Looking to the nature of the work, is it fair?

MR. MALONEY :—It is fair and reasonable unless you wish the adjustment, of the plain rate. That is the only way we can meet you. If any adjustment is to be made on plain loom rate you will have to get a lower rate than can be obtained according to this list. That means you will lose. If we retain this list on drop-box you lose nothing because there are no wider looms under this.

MR. KAMAT :—That is no reason why you should penalise the drop-box weavers.

MR. MALONEY :—It is not penalising. The drop-box rate is arranged in such a way that he can get the width allowance as is shown in the example. That condition has not been withdrawn by the millowners.



MR. BAKHALE :—Is that book sacrosanct so far as the drop-box wages are concerned?

MR. MALONEY :—You have already made several changes and you want to add one more anomaly.

MR. BAKHALE :—There are already too many anomalies.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The difference between the drop-box and plain looms is not so much as we go on to wider looms. In the narrow looms drop-box the weaver has got more work. As we go on to the wider looms, the extra work is not so much. After all he has to handle a very large sley to push it forwards and backwards. The amount of energy to be used is the same as regards the wider looms also. In the narrow loom the weaver has got to regulate the speed and has more work. As we go on to wider looms the work is not of such a nature that he should be paid the same percentage. Another factor is that in the industry there are more drop-box looms of 28", 32", 33" than 66" and above.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What is the additional work on account of drop-box.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The man has to handle a certain amount of weight of one drop-box motion and besides the looms run at a lower speed. The sley is very big for wide looms. In the narrow looms it will weigh 100 and as we go to wider looms the proportion of weight will be much less. The speed will not be the same. The very fact that in wider width the drop-box and plain looms run at the same rate is worthy of consideration. In the case of narrow width the speed is less.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Does he lose in any other way by lessening the speed?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The drop-box man has to attend to the drop-box motion and handle weight and has to be careful. If anything goes wrong with the machine itself there is a likelihood of a greater stoppage, because there is an additional complication in the machine itself.

MR. BAKHALE :—Mr. Rajab says that he can give the names of the mills where wide drop-box looms run at a lower speed than plain looms.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I can give the names of mills wherein the difference is only 5 revolutions. In the other case it is from 28 to 33.

MR. MALONEY :—With regard to the difference in speed factors I have a list of mills which Mr. Rajab is referring to where they run the plain looms

at a higher speed than is laid down in the list. As regards drop-box looms they are run nearly at the speed we have laid down in the list.

MR. RAJAB :—I can show you some mills which run dobbies at a higher speed than drop-box.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The doobby is running faster ?

MR. MALONEY :—That is he is going to get more wage.

MR. RAJAB :—The speed you have shown for drop-box is not attained in any mill. I can show you dozens of them.

THE CHAIRMAN :—We want to know whether there is any other information. This we can consider.

MR. BAKHALE :—We have made our point clear. We are not agreeable to this column, because it contains too many anomalies. The weaver is losing much more than.....

MR. SAKLATVALA :—You prefer the old basis.

MR. BAKHALE :—I would prefer the old rate with regard to drop-box allowances. As regards the other figures we may not agree just now.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You had better leave it there.

MR. BAKHALE :—Then we come to dhoties. I thought that the contention on dhoties would be more than on the other allowances but unfortunately this width allowance is more contentious. I wish to draw your attention to the note they have put in a note : “The following additions to be made to grey plain cloth column in the standard list on page 13.” If you refer to their printed list you will find the following note :—

“For dhoties below 8 yards per pair,  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. more to be added.

Extra allowance for doobby dhoties	—	Cumber board sorts.
Upto 15 shafts		12 per cent. to be added.
Over 16 shafts		20 per cent. to be added.

Now, that note has been changed. That means these allowances have been taken away for dhoties as well as for saries. I should like to draw your attention to the statement of Mr. Stones on page 848. He says :—

“We now come to saries. These are to be taken as standard list according to the percentage of colour and have allowances for doobby and headings as in dhoties. It is made on the same style as a dhoti, only with coloured warp and weft. Instead of plain cloth basis, it is based according

to the percentage of colour in the warp. If it is 26 to 50 per cent. colour for 30 picks per inch, it is 1·09, on account of the cloth being made from coloured warp instead of from grey warp, and we have added a percentage for borders as mentioned in this list."

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Has that been intentionally put in, in order not to give them an allowance ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I cannot say, for the simple reason that there is a note at the bottom, as follows :—

" Coloured Saries.—These are to be taken as Standard List according to the percentage of colour and to have allowances for dobby headings and border as in Dhoties."

I cannot understand how to reconcile this note with the new note that they have put in at the top, because, according to the new note the worker will get according to plain cloth column allowance. I think that the original note should be retained.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—I think it is a mistake in words.

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not attribute any motive at all.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—You know, Mr. Bakhale, that our complaint has been that we did not have the chance to revise this, as we were busy in the Committee. It is only when we got the adjournment that we had to do this in a short time.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—Strike out the words "grey plain cloth."

MR. MALONEY :—That applies to dhoties only.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—There will be no question of coloured warp in dhoties ?

MR. BAKHALE :—No.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—It applies to dhoties, not to saries.

MR. BAKHALE :—Border allowances apply to saries. Everything else is all right except those words which ought to be deleted.

MR. MALONEY :—They cannot be deleted.

MR. BAKHALE :—Where is the point in having them ?

MR. MALONEY :—The reason was that, in working out examples, several mills worked out their dhoti prices including colour allowance on the colour allowance basis.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You may say “The following additions to be made in the case of dhoties to grey plain cloth column, page 13.”

MR. BAKHALE :—If you simply say “The following additions to be made,” it will be all right, because for saries you have got a separate list.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—You can make it clear by saying “The following additions to be made in the case of dhoties to grey plain cloth column.”

MR. MALONEY :—It is a question of interpretation.

MR. BAKHALE :—What is the possibility of another interpretation?

MR. MALONEY :—I am only telling you what actually happened. At least 25 per cent. of the mills work in the percentage of colour in the case of dhoties.

MR. BAKHALE :—In the case of borders?

MR. MALONEY :—Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You can say “For coloured saries, see note below.” Will that be all right?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is another small point to which I should like to draw the attention of the Committee. In this item “Up to  $\frac{5}{8}$ ” wide, colour plain weave border, there are certain varieties of dhoties where I think we have got bleached borders. I should like the word “bleached” to be added, so that it will read “colour or bleached plain weave border.”

MR. KHAREGHAT :—That can be met by striking out the word “colour ;” it will then read “up to  $\frac{5}{8}$ ” wide, plain weave border.”

MR. BAKHALE :—I should then like to draw attention to the oral evidence about the cut that we are expected to have on dhoties and saries. Mr. Desai, on page 1109 said that the cut in the Indian Mill will be 20 per cent. I shall quote from that page :—

“ Q.—What is the reduction the adoption of the standard list will have at the Indian and the Kaiser-i-Hind Mills ?

“ A.—In the Indian Mills the reduction will be 20 per cent., and at the Kaiser-i-Hind Mill it will be 9 per cent.”

Then, on page 1115, certain questions were put to Mr. Desai, and I shall quote them and his replies :—

“ Q.—What is the rate according to the standard scheme ?

“ A.—According to the standard rate in one sort we get 16 per cent. less. In one sort, 10 pies per piece is the present rate; the standard rate will be 8·56 pies, that is a reduction of 16 per cent. In another sort, the present rate is 20·62 pies per piece; the standard rate will be 16·40 pies or 25 per cent. less; for still another sort I am at present paying 32 pies per piece; according to the standard list I shall have to pay 30·37 pies, that is, about 5 per cent. reduction. For some the rate is 16, for some 20, for some 25, for some 24, and so on. I have given the average.

“ Q.—Twenty per cent. reduction is not on the dhoties only?

“ A.—It is on dhoties only.”

Then, I should like to refer to Mr. Rajab's evidence, on page 2018. In reply to questions, he there says:—

“ There is a very heavy cut in dhoties, and especially in fine dhoties. As you know, in some mills the cut is very big, nearly 30 or 40 per cent. In the majority of the mills the cut will not be less than 20 to 30 per cent. Therefore, the allowances for dhoties should be increased.”

Then, I should like to refer to the following evidence of Mr. Hafiz Mahomed Hussain, a weaver in the Khatau Makanji Mills; it is on page 1977.

“ Q.—Do you find any cut made in your wages?

“ A.—Yes; there is a cut made from 25 to 40 per cent.”

Again, on page 1978 the same witness says “ On finer varieties the cut will be more.” On the same page he says “ We have brought three or four examples worked out. On a sari 40" wide, 9 yds. long, 1 lb. 2 oz. weight, 36 reed, 56 pick, 50s warp and 70s weft, the cut will be 44 per cent.”

Again, he says, on the same page that the cut in rate will be from 4 to 5 pies. On another variety he says that the cut will be per piece from 27 pies to 18 pies; on still another variety the cut will be from 36 pies to 20 pies, and on another sort it will be from 6½ pies to 4½ pies.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Does he give the warp?

MR. BAKHALE :—He has given it in the evidence. He says that on another variety the reduction will be from 48 pies to 32 or 33 pies. You will thus notice that, even according to the printed amended list of the Millowners, the cut is going to be very heavy indeed, so far as dhoties are concerned.

Then I come to the columns of allowances. I should like you to compare the change that has taken place so far as page 18 is concerned, the changes from the original list (the green book) right up to the typed list. You will find, in the first place, the difference in Column No. 1. There we had originally the

borders divided into 4 sorts. Now that has been split up, and one more addition has been made. We have nothing much to say about that. We are agreeable to that, because we do not feel that the workers will really get the benefit of this division, because the finer you go, the width of the borders is really less. That is what Mr. Rajab says. However, we leave it at that as we do not want to bother ourselves as to the division that has been made now. Originally, in the green book, we had only 2 columns "Counts below 30s warp" and "30s warp and over." In the amended list we have got 4 columns for counts below 28s, and we have got 2 columns for counts 28s to 32s, one for Uganda and American cotton and another column for the same counts for Indian cotton, and the third for counts 34s and upwards. I should now like to draw your attention to the evidence that we have on the second and third columns, namely about Uganda or American cotton and Indian cotton. I refer first to the evidence of Mr. Pennington, on pages 1085-86, as follows :—

" Q.—Coming to dhoties and saris, you give the allowances in the third and fourth columns distinguishing between Uganda, American and Indian cotton. The percentages vary. How are the weavers to know the kind of cotton?

" A.—The weavers would know it when weaving."

" Q.—At present is there a mixture of Indian and American cotton?

" A.—There is.

" Suppose there is a mixture of Indian and American cotton how will you class it?

" A.—It will be classed as Indian.

" Q.—You will take the percentage of Indian cotton?

" A.—No, no."

I should like to draw attention to the fact that the classification of the mixture, according to Mr. Pennington, will be Indian and not American, and at the same time he says that the allowance will not be given on the basis of Indian cotton, but on something else. I do not really understand what he exactly means. Then I quote the following from Mr. Desai's evidence, on page 1121 :—

" Q.—On page 13 of the standardisation list for the weaving department, you will find that there are two columns for allowances for counts from Uganda and American cotton and for counts from Indian cotton?

" A.—Yes.

" Q.—If I bring a weaver to the Committee here and if I produce two or three pieces prepared from Uganda, American and Indian cotton, do you think that he will be able to tell the Committee which cloth is made from which kind of cotton ?

" A.—No, the weaver will not be able to do so with any precision, but generally he can distinguish between the different varieties.

" Q.—If I bring a weaver here and place before him three kinds of cloth and if I tell him also the kind of counts, will he be able to tell the Committee which kind of cotton was used for each kind of cloth ?

" A.—No, he will not be able to do so.

" Q.—In calculating his wages according to the standardisation scheme, he will have some difficulty in getting his wages because he will not be able to know which kind of cotton is used and as the allowance varies because of the kind of cotton used he will experience some difficulty in getting the wage ?

" A.—An individual weaver will of course find some difficulty, but I do not think that the mill authorities will do so.

" Q.—Suppose the weaver says in his own interest and in order to get a high percentage that the cloth is produced from Indian cotton, while the employer or the weaving master or the assistant weaving master says in order to reduce the percentage that the piece is produced from Uganda or American cotton, how will you solve this difficulty ?

" A.—The weaver will have to see the head of his department.

" Q.—Taking a hypothetical case in which the head of the department says that that piece is produced from American cotton and the worker says that it is produced from Indian cotton, how will you solve the difficulty ?

" A.—At present they have got the trade unions and they can get that checked or ask the mill authorities or the manager.

" Q.—That means the weaver will not be able to do it himself ?

" A.—Personally he will not be able to do it himself.

" Q.—I was told yesterday that the weaver will easily understand it. Will a head jobber or a jobber understand it ?

" A.—No. He will not be able to tell which cotton was used."

Then I would invite attention to the evidence of Mr. Anderson, on page 1204, from which I quote the following question and answers :—

“ Q.—Coming to page 18, scale for dhotie and sari allowances, you will find therein under column 3 and column 4 different allowances given for counts from 28 to 32 from Uganda and American cotton and for counts from 28 to 32 from Indian cotton. Do you think that this will be workable in actual practice under the standardised scheme ?

“ A.—How do you mean ?

“ Q.—The point I want to make is this. Suppose a worker produces a cloth and when the question of calculating his wages comes up, there will be difficulty on the part of the worker at any rate as to whether Uganda or American or Indian cotton was used. I just want to know from you as to whether an ordinary worker will be able to judge from the piece produced as to the kind of cotton used for that particular piece ?

“ A.—He could tell the difference between Uganda and American or between Uganda and Indian. But I do not think he could see the difference between the American and Indian cotton.

“ Q.—Suppose I bring a worker here and three pieces of cloth produced from Uganda, American and Indian cotton, and then I ask him to tell me which piece is produced from which kind of cotton, will he be able to tell me ?

“ A.—He can distinguish between Uganda and Indian but not between Indian and American.

“ Q.—So there will be some confusion in calculating the wages ?

“ A.—Yes, I think so.

“ Q.—Do you not think this system should be rather simplified ?

“ A.—There may be a way out to simplify it but I have not studied it.

“ Q.—Do you think that a way should be found in order to avoid any misunderstanding ?

“ A.—Yes.”

Then, I shall quote the following from Mr. Gardener's evidence, on page 1226 :—

“ Q.—Will you turn to page 18 of the weaving section. There are 4 columns given : Counts below 28s warp ; for counts 28s up to 32s from Uganda or American cotton ; for counts 28s up to 32s from Indian cotton ;



for counts 34s and upwards. Do you think it is possible to put this into practice? Will a weaver who draws his wage be able to distinguish between the different kinds of cotton?

“A.—No; he knows nothing about it. Why do you put in something which he cannot understand? The spinner will know about that. If you place before me different kinds of yarn I shall not be able to distinguish the class of cotton it is spun from.”

Mr. Gardener is clearly of the opinion that we should not put in something which the worker will not be able to understand. Then, on page 1761, Mr. Dongarsingh in reply to a question of mine says:—“One Mill does not spin 30s out of two cottons at a time. I do not think that there will be any difficulty with regard to calculation.” The following are further questions and answers on the same page:—

“Q.—Suppose I bring in three pieces of cloth and one made out of Uganda cotton, one made out of Indian cotton and the other made out of American cotton. I place them before a worker and ask him to distinguish the different kinds of cotton used. Will he be able to say from which cotton the cloth was produced?”

“A.—The weaving master will be able to say.

“Q.—Worker?”

“A.—How can he?”

“Q.—The worker will have to depend on the management for calculating the wages?”

“A.—The weaver can very well recognise the yarn.

“Q.—So, this will not lead to any confusion?”

“A.—No.

“Q.—Suppose it is a mixture of Indian and American cotton?”

“A.—There is a mixture like that but it is taken as Indian.”

The fact therefore is absolutely clear that it will be very difficult for the workers to find out the kind of cotton used, and there will be some confusion in calculating the wages. We therefore say that these two columns should not exist there at all. As a matter of fact, during the course of the evidence, Mr. Khareghat remarked that this difficulty could be avoided by deleting the second column, *viz.*, “Uganda or American,” and Mr. Stones said that that was one of the possible solutions.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Which is mostly used? Indian or American cotton?

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**Mostly it is Indian cotton, just for warps of more than 28s or 30s. It is only two mills that use Uganda cotton, and for them we have made a special provision. The Kohinoor and the Madhowji Dharamsi Mills use Uganda, and if they go out of the way to spend more money and get a better class of cotton, and make the work easier for the weaver, it is fair that they should not pay the same wages as for other cotton.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Do they use Indian cotton also?

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**Yes, but not for these particular dhoties. For coarser counts dhoties they do use Indian cotton, or a mixture of Indian and American.

**MR. BAKHALE :—**There is no question of mixture. The column says "Uganda or American." If there is a mixture, it is bound to be treated as Indian.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**It is Indian. I may just point out with regards to this question that they themselves have always insisted that we make no distinction between poor cotton and good cotton. Here is the only place where we do make a distinction, because it was brought to our notice that it is just possible that mills might try to spin finer counts from Indian cotton just on this border line, and therefore we wanted to give the weaver an addition, and we have put 10 per cent. for the ordinary dhoti allowances.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Would it not be better to drop this column 4 "Uganda or American" and say instead "For counts 28s up to 32s warp where Uganda or American cotton alone is used, the rates to be 10 per cent. less than those in the case provided for Indian cotton"?

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**It comes to the same thing. We can make this column clearer by saying "For counts 20s up to 30s warp from *pure* Uganda or American cotton."

**MR. KHAREGHAT :—**Let them decide it between themselves.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**Why not provide for it from the beginning? If it pays Mr. Gardener to use Uganda cotton on these particular dhoties, it might pay other mills to do so. If at any particular time Uganda or American cotton was cheaper than Indian cotton, they might make use of the former.

**MR. BAKHALE :—**During the course of the evidence, it came out that the Kohinoor Mills used Uganda cotton for their dhoties, and the Indian Mills used Indian cotton, still their efficiency is as high as 88 per cent., while the Kohinoor

Mills, us have an efficiency less by 2, or 3 per cent. That was pointed out by Mr. Gardener. If you compare the efficiency given by Mr. Desai for his mill and the efficiency for Mr. Gardener's mill, I think you will find that though the Kohinoor is using a better type of cotton, their efficiency is less, while Sir Munmohundass Ramji, using Indian cotton, is getting a higher efficiency.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Are the speeds the same ?

MR. BAKHALE :—You may find it out.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The efficiency given for the Indian Mill does not refer to dhories alone ; it is the general efficiency.

MR. RAJAB :—But the majority of the work is on saries ; therefore the average will not be less.

MR. MALONEY :—We can ask the Kohinoor Mills whether it is so. There is no doubt about it that the use of Uganda cotton gives a higher efficiency.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—It is easier work for the weaver, because the yarn is stronger.

MR. BAKHALE :—What is the result ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Do you mean to say that American or Uganda cotton with  $1\frac{1}{4}$ " staple is not very much better than Indian cotton ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I am going on the evidence that was given here. I am taking the efficiency given by the two mills.

MR. MALONEY :—The type of operative and the speed have also to be taken into consideration.

MR. BAKHALE :—Then I cannot understand why there should be a distinction between the allowances given for Uganda or American cotton and Indian cotton. Originally they did not have this distinction. This column has really been split up only to please the Indian Mill on the one hand and the Kohinoor on the other. That came out during the course of evidence. When we want to start on a scientific basis, and we want to claim the scheme is fair and reasonable, is it fair that a provision like this should be made, in order to please one or two particular mills ? That is exactly what it amounts to.

THE CHAIRMAN :—But, if it is based on reasonable grounds ?

MR. BAKHALE :—I do not think, Sir, that it is so based, because it did not come out in the evidence.

MR. KAMAT :—If they have developed a speciality of their own, do you mean that they should be stopped ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Let it go on, but why the workers be penalised ?

THE CHAIRMAN :—How are they penalised ?

MR. BAKHALE :—In comparison.

THE CHAIRMAN :—Do you work quicker ?

MR. BAKHALE :—There is that question of efficiency which you have also to take into consideration.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—In the case of worse cotton you are given greater consideration.

MR. BAKHALE :—I am prepared to join issue with you on that point, Mr. Saklatvala. I am not prepared to admit your argument that you have put in these columns in order to compensate the worker for bad cotton. It is not so ; we have seen from the evidence that you have done it in order to please two important mills.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It is not the Indian Mill alone ; we are making use of this cotton.

MR. BAKHALE :—In order to please these two mills, you are going to be unfair to the majority of the workers.

THE CHAIRMAN :—The majority use Indian cotton.

MR. BAKHALE :—In the case of dhoties there is going to be a reduction in the majority of cases.

MR. MALONEY :—How ?

MR. BAKHALE :—There is going to be a reduction : that is not denied. We are not therefore prepared to agree to have these two columns for the same counts, simply because there are one or two mills which must be satisfied.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—I do not know how the Indian Mills are going to be satisfied.

MR. BAKHALE :—They are not going to be satisfied because even with these percentages they have got a cut.

MR. KAMAT :—This column does not affect the Indian Mills ; it affects only those who use the Uganda cotton.

MR. BAKHALE :—We are not agreeable to these two columns being retained : we want one column for 28s up to 32s. In that connection, I should like to draw your attention to the evidence of Mr. Desai (page 1108-09 of the typed volume of evidence) :—

“ Have you got any particular kind of criticism on these allowances ?  
.....In the third column on page 18 the allowances for warping between

28 and 32 in Indian cotton is 25 per cent, and in the 4th column for 40 warp and 50 weft I think it is less. It should be more.

“Do you think it more difficult?.....Yes; he has got to be very careful and accurate.”

“Is it not his duty to be accurate?.....Yes; it is.

“The fine counts warp will only have fine counts weft when the shuttle will run much longer?.....Yes. But he has to mind finer threads. On coarser counts he can catch the broken threads easily. For coarser counts rough handling will do; for finer counts it will not do.”

Then, again, at page 1118, Mr. Desai's evidence is :—

“MR. BAKHALE :—Do you think that the 20 per cent. allowance for 28s to 30s for Indian cotton should be increased also?.....In our Indian Mill it comes to 20 or 21 per cent, but in the Kaiser-i-Hind Mill it comes only to 9 per cent. less.

“Would you keep it at 20 or increase it?.....That is the business of the millowners, not mine.

“What is your personal opinion?.....If it is increased, then my present weaver's average will remain the same; I have a better class of workmen at the Indian Mill. Perhaps that may reduce the average.

“What would you suggest if you were asked to give your opinion as to whether this 20 per cent. should be kept at it is or it should be increased?.....That is the lookout of the millowners.

“Leave aside the millowners; give your own personal opinion..... At present I am getting an average of 88 per cent. efficiency. If it is reduced and if the standard rate is given, then my efficiency will decrease the rate.

“Therefore, do you strongly recommend that this allowance should be increased or should not be increased? The choice is between a reduction of the allowance and a reduction in efficiency?.....If it is increased, it will be better for my mill.”

Then, on page 1119 :—

“If the millowners insist that 20% must remain and if it remains, your efficiency is bound to go down to a certain extent and instead of getting a better type of worker, you will get an average worker?.....Yes.”

This is the evidence of Mr. Saklatvala at pages 1227-28 :—

“ In our own scheme what we have done is we have not put any distinction as regards cotton. He (Mr. Gardener) says that he will have to pay higher for finer counts. On the other hand, in our mills the cut will come to 10 per cent. So, to equalise things we made an extra column and reduced in the case of Mr. Gardener’s mill the allowance from 15 to 10 and in the other case we raised it from 15 to 20. In spite of that, Mr. Gardener maintains that even with 10 per cent. allowance, it is higher. It prohibits him from taking up these sorts, as 800 looms out of his 1,400 are on this particular variety, and it becomes a live problem as far as his own particular mill is concerned. Their point is that they give superior cotton to what is normally used in Bombay, and they do not get anything beyond this 5 per cent.”

Then, again, Mr. Stones says on the same page :—

“ I am sorry to go at length into this matter, but it is of vital importance to this mill. I want to explain why these two sections on which our friends opposite lay special stress, came into existence. There is no doubt there is a very strong point in the case of this particular mill that they give the worker the best possible material obtainable. The only advantage they have is that there is good production. It is possible they may realise higher prices for finer counts.”

This is important to remember. Then I asked Mr. Gardener, “ What is your efficiency ?” and his reply was : “ As I make it, it is 82 to 86 per cent. ” Then I asked “ In his mill I think the efficiency is about from 80 to 88 per cent. Is that with Indian yarn ?” And the reply was : “ Yes. ” Mr. Stones again says :—

“ Sir Munmohandass’s witness pointed out the other day that with Indian cotton on same dhoties, he was obtaining up to 88 per cent. efficiency. I really want to give an opportunity to the witness to have his say as far as the list is concerned. My point is that in standardisation somebody has got to suffer. They agree to that in principle, but when he has got to suffer to the extent of 800 looms out of 1,400, they begin to feel that they are carrying their suffering a little too far. On the other side, Sir Munmohandass’s mill will suffer by the prospect of losing their good weavers. We have met these difficulties in hundreds of cases, but we have not been able to solve the problem to the satisfaction of all concerned. We have still another scheme, which they are going into further, which may possibly be able to meet this problem a little bit better. In the meantime, it is not before you, and I am only mentioning it in passing. ”

Khareghat asked : " Could you not solve the difficulty by striking off column 2 altogether ? " And Mr. Stones replied : " That is one solution of the problem. " You will, therefore, see why this column has been put in. The reason is absolutely clear from the statements of Messrs. Saklatvala and Stones.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—What about the Madhavji Dharamsi Mill ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We came to know at a later stage that they were also using Uganda cotton.

MR. BAKHALE :—In the original list, the allowances for  $\frac{5}{8}$ " were 10, 10, 20 and 15 per cent. Even with those allowances there was, as you have already seen, a heavy cut in dhoties. Now, these allowances have been decreased in the 2nd and 3rd column, particularly for 28s—32s from Uganda cotton where it was 10 per cent. it is now 5 per cent., and for 28s—32s (Indian cotton), where it was 20 per cent., it is now 15 per cent. Reductions have been effected in the 2nd and 3rd columns to the extent of 5 per cent.....

THE CHAIRMAN :—Not for the last

MR. BAKHALE :—Not on the last. If this reduction is made, you will see that there will be a heavy cut in the weavers' wages particularly on the fine counts. Even with the allowances as they appeared in the original list we were saying that the allowances were too low, and yet, in response to our criticism, instead of increasing the allowances they have actually reduced them and are going to effect a heavy cut so far as dhoties and saris are concerned. We are, therefore, not agreeable to this scale of allowances at all. I have given you the scale of allowances that Mr. Rajab has prepared and we stand by that. We say that for counts below 28s warp the percentages of allowances should be 20, 23, 27 and 30 ; in view of the fact that they have split up the range into one more, Mr. Rajab's figures have to be adjusted. Then, again, we want only one column for 28s—32s warp, and for that the percentages of allowance should be 30, 33, 36 and 40. After that we want a column for 32s—40s, another for 40s—50s and a last for over 50s. In this connection, I would like to draw your attention to the evidence of Mr. Desai at page 1117:—

" You said in reply to Mr. Stones that dhوتي allowance for 34s should be higher than 15 per cent. ?.....Yes. "

He says that there should be a higher allowance for counts above 32s and Mr. Rajab also is of the same opinion and has provided separate allowances for counts 32s—40s, 40s—50s and above 50s. Five columns of allowances are given in Mr. Rajab's statement and we stick to that. We believe that with these allowances there will not be a cut in the wages of the operatives so far as dhoties and saris are concerned.

It is very difficult, so far as dhoties and saris are concerned, to compare our list with the Lancashire list, because the Lancashire list is absolutely on a different basis. What they do in Lancashire is, they calculate the rates according to the ordinary cloth and then pay a certain percentage over that for dhoties, 9, 10 per cent and so on. At page 27 of the list you will see they say :—

“ There are two systems of paying for dhoties. The first is :—

12 yards, 8 per cent. above List (min.) ;

11 „ 9 „ „ „ „ „ ;

\* \* \* \* \*

The second system is 10 per cent. upon all lengths without any deduction being made for width of cloth. ”

Therefore, it is very difficult to compare our system with theirs, because their system is radically different from ours.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The quotation refers to doobby dhoties ?

MR. BAKHALE :—No, to Plain Dhoties.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—They are getting an allowance for the plain sorts ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Yes. I should also like to draw your attention to one important paragraph at page 28 of the Lancashire List :—

“ Dobby Dhoty or Dhoties with a plain stripe weave to be paid as per Stripe List (see Clause 22) with percentages for Dobby Dhoty or Dhoties extra.

When the above cloths are made with finer dented reeds at the side than the centre of the cloth, 20 per cent. extra shall be paid :—

This means, *vis.*—

Over 16 ends in the border 50 per cent. to be paid.

16 ends and under with Calcutta heading 40 per cent. to be paid.

Plain Dhotie border 30 per cent. to be paid.

16 ends and under with Madras and Bombay headings 50 per cent., and extras for all headings as previously agreed upon.”

I only want to draw your attention to this paragraph and also to the several allowances that they are giving for different headings. But, as I have just pointed out, as their list differs materially from ours so far as dhoties are concerned it is not quite fair to compare the two.



It is not quite fair. So far as dhoti and sari allowances are concerned I think I have said what I have to say. But in this connection Mr. Rajab has put in a note on page 18 of his list—the second note. It is stated there.

“ Scale of allowances for warp of finer counts. These allowances will be available on plain, dobby, drop-box sorts and not on dhoties and saris :—

For 28s upto 32s including	25 per cent. to be added.
Above 32s	35 per cent. „ „

As regards this our list does not contain any warp allowances. Mr. Rajab has suggested that under the existing conditions it is necessary to have warp allowances given by him for dhoties.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—This is not a warp allowance. This allowance is for heading and border.

MR. BAKHALE :— Is it not a fact that you have given different allowances for different counts?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—So far as 30s is concerned we have given you a higher allowance for 30s made from Indian cotton and a less allowance for the same made from mixing with Uganda.

MR. BAKHALE :—You have given 10 per cent. for counts below 28s warp. 15 for 28s and 32s made from Indian cotton.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—These are plain dhoties. The allowance is for heading and border. In finer counts there will be more ends drawn as regards border dhoties and therefore we make a higher allowance, because the reed will be finer.

MR. KHAREGHAT :—This note does not relate to dhoties because it excludes saris and dhoties from it.

MR. BAKHALE :—I think I have finished so far as dhoties are concerned. But I wish to deal with a small point.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—As much has already been said I wish to be brief. The main point is that we have made a reduction as regards columns 2 and 3. Of course we have made a reduction. This is due to the revision of the whole basis. We have increased the width allowance and therefore as far as wages are concerned even with the lesser allowance here the weaver will get the same wage as before or even more. We will supply the figures with regard to Fazulbhoy Mill where they have to pay 29 per cent. more in certain cases. As Mr. Bakhale pointed out they will get less in some cases. Where we have made

reduction there the production is very little. The large amount of production of dhoties come under the first column. The other day Mr. Stones told you that our dhoti production might be taken as 10 per cent. for the 2nd column and 5 for column 3. As regards finer dhoties it is being introduced. Perhaps it may be from 20 to 25 per cent. Even then the main production from 60 to 70 per cent. comes under the 1st column. Therefore as regards dhoties as such there is no reduction, because we have altered the width allowance. As far as narrow widths are concerned, there is no reduction, although there is reduction apparently. By adding another column we have revised this reduction also. From  $2\frac{1}{2}$  to 3 inches we pay 15 per cent. On the old basis it would have been 17 per cent. Similarly over  $3\frac{1}{2}$  we give 20 per cent. That means that in the case of 3" it will be less but in the case of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  the allowance will be the same as before. I may now refer to columns 2 and 3. So far as over  $3\frac{1}{2}$ " is concerned there is no reduction. There also the principle is that as we go on to wider borders there is harder work. Therefore we have not made any reduction there. That is the reason why we have added an extra column.

Then as regards Uganda cotton, I think it is quite fair as we spend extra money on it and we give facility the weaver should not get all the advantage which may accrue from the use of a good quality of cotton. That is your point also. Then we have given the figures to you as well as to the other side which will give an idea as to the wages that weavers will get under the revised scheme.

Another point made was that the weaver would not understand whether it is Uganda cotton or any other cotton. They themselves have pointed out that the weaver would not understand unless the scheme has been worked out. Mr. Stones pointed out that even in England all weavers do not know it. The particulars have to be specified. We will specify all particulars and the trade union officials can easily get the particulars whether it is Uganda or Indian cotton and so on. From the mixing room right up to the spinning department there will be people to tell at once whether it is Uganda, or mixed cotton or India cotton. There will be no trouble about it at all.

**MR. BAKHALE** :—I forgot to bring to your notice.....

**MR. SAKLATVALA** :—As regards finer counts such as 50s, 60s their conditions may differ. Therefore we are not going to apply the standard scheme. Perhaps the solution will be that a weaver can work 4 looms. Mr. Rajab has worked 4 looms.

**MR. RAJAB** :—Not on 50s. Not a single mill is turning out 50s. I have done it on 24s on narrow looms.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**So, easily 50s and 60s can be worked on four looms. That will be the solution for 50s and 60s. At any rate we may make it clear that we will not apply this scheme over certain counts such as 40s warp and 60s weft which will give an average of 50s. It may be 40s or 42s warp and this point may be settled later on. If the average count goes beyond that, this scheme will not be applied. What the other scheme will be is a point which may be developed later.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**Are there many mills ?

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**Only one mill. In Ahmedabad they are doing it considerably and it is likely that Bombay also will follow suit. 50s, 60s, 70s, 80s and 100s these are exceptional and we have to provide for it.

**MR. BAKHALE :—**Just one point about the dhoti allowance. That is as regards the extra allowance for doobby dhoties width allowance. They have now graded the list of shafts. There is another doobby list. In the original list they simply stated :—

“ Upto 16 shafts	...	12% to be added.
Over 16     ,,	...	20%     ,,     ,,

In this connection I should like to draw your attention to the width allowance on doobby dhoti which Mr. Rajab gives.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**The basis is different.

**MR. BAKHALE :—**Then we prepared our standard scheme. We suggest that up to 16 shafts 12 per cent. to be added and over 16 shafts 20 per cent. to be added. This demand of ours was acceded to in its entirety in their modified list and they have given in the amended list 12 per cent. upto 16 shafts and 20 per cent. over 16 shafts. Now, they have gone back and again have a scale which actually reduces the allowance for lower shafts. We are not agreeable to that. Mr. Rajab has stated in his statement that this allowance as on the printed scheme should be given.

**MR. SAKLATVALA :—**The whole shaft allowance has been reduced. They wanted us to go on the English basis. They cannot have it both ways. As I said the whole scheme is based on the fact that the cut will be nearer 7½ per cent. With that idea we have revised the whole scheme. I may tell you for your information that I was talking to my weaving master this morning. He may be right or wrong but he is definitely of opinion that the revision as it is is not going to effect a reduction of 7 or 7½ per cent. but on the other hand there may be an increase from 1 to 2 per cent. on the present standard in the whole industry. So, we cannot go on increasing the allowances. We have to be more careful. If at any time a case is made—you can put up particular sorts—the question will

be considered. If instead of giving a cut there is actually an increase, what are we to do? We have to revise the whole scheme again. If it is an increase to that extent we have to revise it.

MR. BAKHALE :—There we do not have to take into consideration the condition of the industry.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—When it is to be revised then is the proper time to go into these allowances to find out whether a reduction is necessary or an increase is necessary.

MR. BAKHALE :—We are not asking you to add to the cut.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The circumstances have changed. We have revised the whole thing and you still want this 10 and 20 per cent. to be retained. Here also as you yourself pointed out we met you because not so much these allowances were really necessary but with a view to come to a compromise.

THE CHAIRMAN :—That is finished.

MR. BAKHALE :—There is another point. This occurs on page 1 of the spinning section. It says :—

“No further bonuses to be allowed as the existing bonuses have been consolidated in the rates of wages fixed.”

I want to get the information from Mr. Saklatvala whether it was not a fact that some workers in his mill at Kurla got railway passes.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I do not think they get it now.

MR. BAKHALE :—Spring Mills?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—They stopped it.

MR. BAKHALE :—Attendance bonus?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—The 1923 and 1926 figures include the attendance and efficiency bonus and we based our figures on them. In the case of weaving there is no bonus at all.

MR. BAKHALE :—I should like to draw your attention to note No. 5 on our standard scheme. We say here :—

“Where standard conditions of work and machinery do not prevail and where workers suffer by bad materials and conditions, fresh percentages to be added over the standard rates. The percentages to be determined by the Joint Committee.”

We are not immediately concerned with this because after the scheme comes into operation we have to find out where bad materials are used.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We have done it—subject to conditions. The conditions are bad in certain mills. That will be gone into.

MR. BAKHALE :—Do you want to specify it and make it clear ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—This is particularly referred to in the rules. Any complaints can be brought by the other side. Not only that, when this comes into operation we can get the particulars from our members and settle all these disputes at a later stage.

THE CHAIRMAN :—You say that it is not necessary to say anything about it now ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Yes.

MR. BAKHALE :—What is to become of the leave rules ?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—That has been discussed : that leave will be granted to an operative, a register kept and a copy of that will be given to the man when he goes on leave. If he asks for an extension even after two months he will be allowed to join after the expiry of the period.

MR. BAKHALE :—I thought we were considering the possibility of laying down some definite rules by which a worker will be entitled to get some leave. I think that was the point before the Committee.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—Are you referring to gratuity, pension and such things ?

MR. BAKHALE :—Those are national problems ; leave rules is not a national problem.

THE CHAIRMAN :—They have gone so far as to provide for the worker's being granted leave up to two months. Of course, there may be further requirements, which you may ask for. We can hardly go into the matter further at this stage. You are getting the opportunity of having a Labour Commission, and this question can be gone into further by them.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We have got efficiency figures for the frame department. We will hand them over to Mr. Bakhale first and hand them over to the Committee later on. You will find that, as far as the frame department is concerned, in the higher counts, for 3 hank roving and over, the efficiency we have provided is rather on the low side. Many mills exceed that efficiency very easily. Where we provide 82, many mills show as high an efficiency as 90 and 91. On the lower side, we might be able to drop this by 1 per cent. or so, and in our book we have taken 10s to 12s counts, but I think there also another

classification will have to be made, so that the very lowest counts do not suffer. I think we can easily do that in consultation with the other side. We will let you have the figures to-day.

MR. BAKHALE :—What about reeling? You have given us the figures?

MR. SAKLATVALA :—We have given you the wages.

MR. BAKHALE :—I think I must show it to Mr. Dange.

Perhaps, Sir, we may require to come to you once or twice, just for a short sitting.

THE CHAIRMAN :—If there is any necessity, you can inform the Secretary and we will see about it.

I take it this is our last public sitting. Before we adjourn, I should like to say that we are very much obliged to you, gentlemen, for so ungrudgingly giving your time to assist this Committee, and we fully recognise the assistance we have had from your discussions. I think I may add that, whatever may be the outcome of our report, at any rate this Committee has had some utility in bringing the two sides to-day closer together than in October last.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I fully endorse your remarks that the two sides have come very much closer to-day than they were before. What I find is that at the bottom of the whole thing there is nothing but a good deal of misunderstanding and distrust on the other side.

MR. BAKHALE :—Both sides.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—It may be both sides. I think the atmosphere has certainly changed considerably. I must also say that whatever was said at this table was of course said in our representative capacities. I have said things, simply as voicing the views and opinions of the Millowners' Association, and not my personal views. I must also thank Mr. Bakhale that the discussions especially our private discussions, were conducted in a spirit of good-will, and for this result we are indebted to the Committee. You have allowed a good deal of latitude to both sides, also a great deal of indulgence and, if I may be permitted to say so, you have shown an amount of patience which is certainly worthy of admiration, as you were obliged to wade through a mass of figures and technicalities which bore even our own men.

MR. BAKHALE :—On behalf of the Joint-Strike Committee, I join with Mr. Saklatvala in everything that he has said about you and your colleagues. I was not present here when the enquiry began, and I was rather at a disadvantage. But I must say that you were very kind to me personally and to the Joint-Strike Committee, and gave us every possible assistance that we wanted.

from the Committee. Not only that, but you gave us, although we may not have deserved it on certain occasions, adjournment after adjournment, in order to meet our convenience, and we are really very grateful. I am particularly asked by Mr. Joshi to convey his gratitude to you and to your colleagues for the help that he got when he was sitting here. I again thank you and your colleagues on behalf of the Strike Committee, Mr. Joshi and myself for all that you have done for us and for the working classes in Bombay. I hope your report will be such as will satisfy the workers and also the employers.

As this is possibly the last sitting that I am able to attend, as I have to go out for certain other business, I should like to make one request on behalf of the Strike Committee, and it is this: We would be very grateful if you could recommend to the Bombay Government to publish the proceedings of this Committee. There is the Whitley Commission coming and the very valuable material in the evidence before the Committee will be very useful to that Commission and to the public also hereafter if the whole of the proceedings are published by the Bombay Government. We should be very grateful if you could make that recommendation to the Government of Bombay when you make your Report.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**On behalf of myself and my colleagues, I thank you very much for the remarks that Mr. Saklatvala and Mr. Bakhale have been good enough to make about us. We are all very glad that the proceedings have been conducted so harmoniously as they have been, and we shall be very glad to take into consideration the suggestion Mr. Bakhale has just made.

---

---

*Friday, 8th March 1929.*

---



Friday, the 8th March, 1929.

The Committee met at the Town Hall, Bombay, at 11-15 A. M.

Present :—

THE CHAIRMAN.

MR. KHAREGHAT.

MR. KAMAT.

---

MR. STONES :—The position is that since the resumption of work in October, this group has been singled out by the Bombay Girni Kamgar Union to impose higher standard where these mills were paying less than the rate in other mills. Of course nothing is done in the case where the wages are much higher than the standardisation rate. Now that the Mill is paying them the March 1927 rates, the Sizers struck work demanding the daily wage terms that is to say the monthly wages as in the standardisation list. The mills maintain that they are paying the same wage as in March 1927. The operatives are bound by the agreement of October 4th until the report of this Committee is made public.

MR. GREEN :—The Sizers of the Pearl Mills did not resume work after the recess hour on Saturday February 23rd. In the morning of the same day the men complained of having difficulties with their work in sizing "Calcutta" Dhoties. It was pointed out to them that the same work was going on in all our other mills and there was no more difficulty at their mill than at any of the others.

Fazulbhoy Mills Sizers did not work fully from February 25th and on the 26th all the Sizing machines were stopped and the department was closed. There was no complaint from the men of this mill and the Sizing Jobber explained to the management that the sizers had struck work in sympathy with the men of the Pearl Mills.

Palaney, Currimbhoy and Crescent Mills Sizers stopped work on the 25th February and no complaint about their work was made to the management. The Jobbers at these mills said "the men had no complaint but had stayed away from work owing to having been threatened by the Sizers of the Pearl Mills.

The Premier Mills Sizers stopped work on the 27th February and it was reported to the mill management that the reason for this was that the men had been threatened by the strikers of the Pearl Mills and that one of their number had been severely beaten by the strikers.

Madhavrao Scindia Mills Sizers stopped work on March 2nd complaining that they had been threatened with a severe beating if they continued working. The strikers of the Pearl Mills were joined by others of the various mills on strike and they attempted to prevent the Sizers of the Mathuradas Mills from attending work. They were told by the men of the Mathuradas that they were quite willing to stop work providing the strikers could guarantee to pay them the same rate of wage that they were receiving from the mill agents.

In order to keep up with beams at the mills where the Sizers were on strike we had beams sized at the other mills of the group which were working, but after a few days these mills refused to size any beams but their own, as they stated that they had been threatened with a severe beating if they continued with this work; and the drawers of the mills where the sizers were on strike refused to draw beams which had been sized outside their own mill. A shortage of beams was the natural result of the strangle hold which was being asserted and at the Fazulbhoy Mills 16 looms out of a total of 1980 were stopped for beams, and the weavers complained of a shortage of work and went on strike from the 4th instant although at the very time this occurred we had 350 looms stopped for weavers who had not resumed work since the riots and we gave the weavers who were short of beams the option of going on looms where there was no shortage of beams.

The same excuse was made by the weavers of the Currimbhoy and Pabaney Mills and they also stopped work from the 5th instant.

We have not had a full complement of weavers at any of our mills since the resumption of work after the riots.

The trouble started through the Sizers demanding instead of piecework wage a fixed wage of Rs. 55 plus 70 per cent., *i. e.*, the standard of the Standardisation Scheme. The two rates in this respect are 1. a definite piecework rate and the other is a fixed wage of Rs. 50 + 70 per cent and after two years of satisfactory work a rise to Rs. 55 + 70 per cent. We have never had any complaints except verbal complaints from the men and after the complaints have been looked into we found that there was absolutely no difference between the rates paid and the rates in 1927 and in our opinion there was no occasion for complaint about the agreement that was arrived at on 4th October 1928 being violated.

MR. WATTS :—When we paid before on piecework rates, it was working satisfactorily for everybody concerned, but recently there has been some little difficulty in regard to the men earning the same pay at some of our mills owing to our having introduced new qualities.

All our mills are not situated alike and are not paying alike. The men pick up that mill which pays a higher rate and they demand the wages paid in that mill. They do not pick the mill that pays a lower rate, but take the mill where the pay is higher.

MR. DANGE :—It may be technically right that the rates that are being paid to-day for a certain variety of cloth are the same as they were in 1927 March. But then the wages of the piecework are affected by the preparation and the character of production in the mill. For example if the mill was paying a lower rate for a higher count of cloth, and a higher rate for a heavy sort and if the lighter sort had a smaller proportion on the whole, in the sum total of production the worker was compensated for the low wages on the higher counts by the surplus production of the heavier sorts. That was the state in the industry in 1927. But when the proportion is altogether changed, when newer patterns that are invented and lighter sorts are taken up, as a greater part of the production in the mills at the lower rates which prevailed, this means a decrease in the wages of the worker and this is the main complaint of the Sizers and weavers also in these mills, and this is causing similar troubles and small strikes. Therefore we have made a demand that we should be paid fixed wages instead of the piece-rates or the rates should be allowed on a higher proportion. If they insist only on paying the 1927 rates then we could as well insist on their maintaining the same quality of production as existed in 1927. They could even now get a wage of Rs. 94/- if they manufactured certain sorts which were manufactured in larger proportions in 1927, but which are now going out of date. For example, Dhoties, Fancy Borders, etc., all these changes in patterns are all affecting the earnings of the Sizer as these do not conform to the character of production in 1927. So exactly sticking to the wording of the agreement, it might be that they are paying the rates of 1927, but the earnings of a large number of Sizers are adversely affected on account of the sorts now being introduced.

From the tabular statement of the earnings of Sizers it is very risky to form any conclusions. We have discussed this point when we settled the minimum wage for the Sizers and the question is whether they do 8½ hours full work or overtime work or whether they were supplied with full work or not, and so a mere statement or table would not help in arriving at a conclusion whether the earnings have fallen or risen. For example, the Sizers' earnings of 1929 which are put forth as a basis for discussion on some of the points in the Standardisation Scheme by the Association of the efficiency shown in 1929 will be very dangerous for comparison because in January the workers had a tendency to put in more efficiency because there was a prolonged strike and they had to make up for the lost earnings.

I do admit that the Industry has to change its character of production every time and therefore the rates also have to change. We can show you that even after the agreement was signed the Millowners of their own accord have in several instances increased rates which they had put down.

**MR. KHAREGHAT :—**Do you mean rates proposed in the Standardisation Scheme.

**MR. DANGE :—**Not as proposed in the Standardisation Scheme, but as they were existing in 1927 and as they were introduced in 1928 or in any other companies.

The Committee retired at this stage for consultation.

**THE CHAIRMAN :—**We think it is clear that the rates at present being paid to Sizers in the mills of the Currimbhoy group which are at present on strike, are the same as were paid in March 1927, and that accordingly the demand that instead of these rates, the rates that are proposed to be paid under the Standardisation Scheme should be paid to them would be contrary to the terms of the agreement of the 4th October 1928. The agreement is express on that point and we have already held in the case of the Madhavjee Dharamsey Mill that the rates of March 1927 must be paid pending the submission of our report. It is urged by Mr. Dange as an excuse that there has been some variation in the kind of work that the Sizers have to do compared with that they had to do in, say, March 1927, but clearly that cannot be held to be sufficient to justify other rates being fixed for men contrary to the terms of the agreement of October 1928, and in fact we find from the statement that has been put in as to earnings of Sizers in various months that except in the Pearl Mill the earnings do roughly correspond to what the Sizers were actually getting in March 1927. In the case of the Pearl Mill there has been trouble and possibly the efficiency was not the same in January 1929 as it was in March 1927, and it is also stated that the Calcutta Dhories about which the men complain are also being sized in other Mills. In the circumstances we have no hesitation in holding that there has been a breach of the agreement of October 1928 in the case of these particular Mills.

---

---

*Saturday, 9th March 1929.*

---

---

Saturday , the 9th March, 1929.

The Committee met at the Town Hall, Bombay, at 11-15 A. M.

Present :—

THE CHAIRMAN.

MR. KHAREGHAT.

MR. KAMAT.

---

MR. MALONEY :—The figures for July 1927, which we have in our possession for a certain number of mills, were examined by Mr. Bakhale with the figures of the same mills for January 1929 and Mr. Bakhale has agreed that on the whole the efficiency in July 1927 was higher than in January 1929. Of course in isolated instances in particular mills there are cases in which the efficiency of July 1927 was lower than that of January 1929, and Mr. Bakhale is prepared to agree to the introduction of the efficiencies which we have suggested for a period of three months, at the end of which time changes may be made in the light of experience gained in the meantime.

MR. BAKHALE :—I went into the figures for July 1927 and compared them with the efficiency figures for January 1929 and I found that while the figures were more or less the same, in some cases the figures for July 1927 were higher and in some cases they were lower, and I am unable to make up my mind one way or the other. I think we are nearing the end of our work and I must take up some responsibility, and I am prepared to say this much that I am agreeable to work up the efficiency figures for three months and then both sides should agree to revise the figures if experience proves that it is quite necessary to do so. I may also at the same time place before you Mr. Dange's view that the efficiency figures for lower counts up to 17s may be workable and acceptable to me and to him also, but the modified efficiency figures for higher counts from 18s onwards should be the same as laid down in the Standardisation Scheme and should not be as modified by the Millowners' Association subsequently. This, I think, I may place before you for your serious consideration.

MR. KHAREGHAT (TO MR. MALONEY) :—About Mr. Dange being agreeable to the efficiency figures for lower counts only, do you think that your figures should stand as a whole?

MR. MALONEY :—Certainly.

MR. DANGE :—I agree with Mr. Bakhale's view point.

MR. SAKLATVALA :—I may just point out one thing as regards Mr. Dange's contention that we have taken 1929 January figures. In fact this was purposely done because when we go back to 1927 figures Mr. Dange also says that since then the character of production has changed. We want to bring conditions up-to-date so far as efficiency is concerned so that the question may not be raised that we have gone on new counts or lower counts. That is why we have taken 1929 figures.

After some further discussion on the same point, the proceedings terminated.