

The Servant of India

EDITOR : P. KODANDA RAO. OFFICIATING EDITOR : S. G. VAZE.

OFFICE : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S HOME, POONA 4.

VOL. XIV No. 35. } POONA—THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1931. { INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK.	417
ARTICLES :—	
The Princes' Blackmail. By Observer. ...	419
Indian Official Salaries. By D. G. Karve. ...	421
Labour in India.—VI. By P. G. Kanekar. ...	422
OUR EUROPEAN LETTER.	424
REVIEWS :—	
The Theory of Interest. By D. R. Gadgil. ...	425
English Humour. By R. Sadasiva Aiyar. ...	426
Miss Mayo vs. Indian People. By D. V. A. ...	426
BOOKS RECEIVED.	427

Topics of the Week.

The Middle Way.

The agreement between the Congress and the Government of India on the question of Mahatma Gandhi's complaints regarding the Delhi Pact is creditable to both parties. It is essentially a compromise solution, neither party being able to maintain its original position in its integrity, but each resiling from it in part. The Government of India had to give up its contention that its decision is final and cannot be subjected to a fresh inquiry. And Mahatma Gandhi too had to abandon his claim that the Congress must be regarded as an intermediary between the people and the Government, the latter being under an obligation to take the sanction of the Congress for the application of coercive measures for the recovery of land revenue dues. Neither theory, as we said before, is sustainable in the extreme form in which it was put forward. But the Congress had a real grievance against the authorities which was capable of redress without inflicting humiliation upon the Government or without inflating the claims of the Congress. And such a middle course has been adopted. An inquiry has been agreed to, but the inquiry is to be conducted by an official, and is to be of an expert nature, the final decision still resting with Government. The inquiry is to be restricted to one question, viz. whether coercive measures were resorted to by Government in Bardoli taluka in order to exact payment of a higher standard than that which obtained in other cases of voluntary payment. If the official appointed to make the inquiry finds for the Congress, Government will naturally have to return the collections made under duress. If he finds for Government the Pact will be regarded as having been implemented on the official side. Mahatma Gandhi has really got all that he wanted and it is a matter of devout thankfulness that he took such a practical

view of the matter. For, abstention on his part from the R. T. O. would have been disastrous to national interests.

* * *

Hyderabad State Political Conference.

THE Indian public heard a good deal recently about the premier Indian State having made phenomenal progress in many directions during the last few years. Whether this description corresponds to facts or not, its subjects do not seem to enjoy the elementary civic rights of freedom of association and meeting. Else it is difficult to account for the recent session of the Hyderabad State Political Conference taking place at Akola rather than at some place within the State itself. Not that the people of Hyderabad who were responsible for organising this Conference were bent upon holding it outside the State limits. Far from it. Nothing would have pleased them better than if the State authorities had made it easy for them to hold it in the State itself. But Mr. R. S. Naik's presidential address makes it clear that the State authorities are not in a frame of mind which will tolerate any unfettered expression of their views by the State subjects, as is evidenced by their refusal of permission for the holding of this very conference in the State. This is very regrettable. It is time that the Government of the State took note of the democratic spirit of the times to the extent of removing the present very stringent restrictions on the holding of public meetings, which virtually make the holding of any meeting impossible. That His Exalted Highness's subjects should be compelled to remove themselves outside the State jurisdiction in order to give expression to their feelings about the State administration is a matter of disgrace to the ruler and his Executive Council. If Hyderabad had been blessed with a legislative council where such grievances could be authoritatively ventilated, such injustices would mostly have been impossible. No doubt the State boasts of an apology of a legislative council, of course with no power over the State purse and with but very restricted rights of discussion of public matters, the executive council owning no responsibility whatever to the legislature. The Conference therefore did well in urging that responsible government should be established in the State as soon as possible. The president drew pointed attention to the almost universal complaint about the State's educational policy. The complaint is that in spite of the fact that an overwhelming majority of Hyderabad subjects are non-Urdu speaking, adequate provision is not made for the teaching of Marathi, Telugu and Kanarese. The result is that though educational expenditure has increased, literacy has failed to keep pace with that increase. In all civilised countries the State welcomes the co-operation of private enterprise in the matter of educational expansion. In Hyderabad, however, curiously enough, all possible obstacles are thrown in the way of any private agency wishing to supplement the State's

efforts to spread education among the people! The State should have realised long ago that education was at the root of real progress and should have provided for mass education by introducing compulsory and free primary education. But there is yet no sign of any movement on its part in that direction. With a view to remove all possible ground for complaint that the educational policy of the State is not comprehensive, the remedy of the establishment of an Education Board, suggested by Mr. Naik, consisting of an equal number of popular representatives and members nominated by the State appears to be a sound one.

Hindu-Muslim Tangle.

THE need of a Hindu-Muslim settlement as a condition precedent to the harmonious working of any constitution, however perfect, that may be hammered out in London is so widely realised even in Great Britain that Mahatma Gandhi's failure to compose the Hindu-Muslim differences by mutual agreement has elicited sincere regret in English circles sympathetic to India. In giving expression to this feeling on a recent occasion the *Manchester Guardian* stresses the need of Mahatma Gandhi's presence at the R. T. C. if only to facilitate such a settlement. Whether now that he will be in London the prospects of a Hindu-Muslim *entente* have become brighter the next few weeks will show. As everybody knows, the deadlock between the two communities can be dissolved in either of the three ways—mutual agreement, reference of the dispute to an arbitration of neutrals or by the British Government coming to some decision on the point after consultation with leaders of all parties. Mutual agreement has of course been found impossible so that we are now thrown back only on the remaining two alternatives. The reference of the dispute to a neutral arbitration board presupposes an agreement in advance by all parties to abide by its decision, whatever it be. Whether the different communities in India are prepared to mortgage their future in this manner is more than one can say. This method of approach to the problem has been in the air for some time past; but it has not yet been seriously considered by any party, the general tendency being to look upon it more or less as a counsel of perfection. The other alternative of the decision of the problem by the British Government has its own advantages and also disadvantages but the *Guardian* prefers it to a neutral arbitration board being asked to intervene. Its reason is that such an outside body not being in any way responsible for the carrying out of its award would tend to be more impartial than responsible, while whatever decision the British Government might ultimately arrive at will have been come to after informing itself of the "conditions of the problem and the feelings of the parties." That method also has the additional advantage that the British Government, being responsible for effectuation of its decision, may be expected to try its level best to make it as acceptable to all parties as is humanly possible. On the other hand, it is no use concealing the fact that "the actions and motives of the British Government are always suspect in Indian eyes." But if Mahatma Gandhi and the leaders of different communities present at the Conference were to agree to bless such a compromise settlement by the British Government, it may, the *Guardian* thinks, go far towards a solution of our communal difficulty. But the question is: will they? If they can be expected to pull together to the extent of giving their blessings to a settlement, unsatisfactory though it may be from their respective communal viewpoints, that may be proposed by the British Government, why can they not in that case be trusted, by mutual agreement, to ask the British

Government itself to accept that as the greatest common measure of their agreement with a view to give it a fair trial for some time? This would be more in accordance with the principle of self-determination; while the decision of the problem by the British Government would have the appearance of a settlement being imposed upon an unwilling people by an alien Government.

Mr. Walchand's Ill-Considered Criticism.

Mr. Walchand Hirachand who represented the Indian employers at the last session of the International Labour Conference, and who walked out of the Conference hall as a gesture of protest against the appointment of a non-Indian as an adviser of the employers' delegate, said in the course of a speech at a meeting of the committee of the Indian Merchants' Chamber, Bombay, that as an employer he did not think that it served the interests of Indian employers to be connected with the Labour Conference. He considered, he said, that Indian labour leaders by going to Geneva got exaggerated notions of what labour had achieved and could achieve in other countries and wanted to press for legislation of an advanced type in this country. "This is not in the interests of Indian employers." The following comment by the *Leader* on this speech of Mr. Walchand Hirachand will be found generally to reflect Indian opinion:—

Mr. Walchand Hirachand is perfectly entitled to hold his own opinions and to give expression to them, but he is very much mistaken if he thinks that public opinion in India, including the section of Indians whom he was deputed to represent at Geneva, will endorse these views of his. Indeed, it is for the first time that we have heard a prominent Indian merchant expressing such views about Geneva. This International Labour Organization has already within the short period of its existence done much to improve the lot of the working classes, and has for that reason incurred the displeasure of those who, deriving their inspiration from Moscow, like to fish in troubled waters and find in discontented labour a great field for pursuing their activities. Let Mr. Walchand know that if India and other countries should decide to break off connection with Geneva and if the institution should languish for want of support, nowhere will it cause greater satisfaction than at Moscow... Frankly we regard Mr. Walchand's criticism of Geneva as very ill-considered.

Perhaps it is just as well that such an erratic representative of the employing classes kept out of the Conference. He really has no place in it.

Mr. Jamal Mahomed on Separate Electorates.

WE desire to draw the pointed attention of advocates of separate electorates to the following observations of Mr. Jamal Mahomed, M. L. A., on this subject in his presidential address to the recently held Kerala Muslim Conference:—

So far as my personal opinion goes, I have always been thinking that joint electorate with reservation of seats for Muslims in the best interest of the Muslims in particular and the country in general. The staunchest advocates of separate electorates concede that joint electorate is the ideal system and that separate electorate is resorted to only as a temporary safeguard against the consequences of the present and temporary state of inequality in the educational and economic advancement of the two communities. The only question is whether the reservation of seats is not a sufficient safeguard. I am of opinion that not only the reservation of seats will be an effective safeguard, but also that the joint electorate is much more conducive to the promotion of the interests of the Muslims than the separate electorates. In my

humble opinion the interests of the Muslims are much better secured by creating and promoting mutual trust and confidence between Hindus and Muslims than by any mechanical method and rule which after all cannot give you any majority in provinces in which you are in a minority. This mutual confidence and goodwill is best promoted by the introduction of the system of joint electorate under which a kind of unavoidable interdependence and need for mutual co-operation between members of the two communities are established and a situation is created in which neither community can afford to ignore and much less to be hostile to the other community. Under the system of joint electorate a member of one community will have to seek the franchise of the other and vice versa; and I am confident that if the system of joint electorates with reservation of seats is introduced it will avoid a great deal of misunderstanding between one community and another and will be conducive to the establishment of cordiality and goodwill between the various communities.

"National Economy".

THE Labour Party in England does not seem to be rent in twain; it rather appears to have cast out the members who have stuck to office in the so-called National Ministry. For most of the others seem to have joined the Opposition; and demands are pouring in upon Messrs. MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas to resign their membership of this or that party organization. This outburst of anger in the Labour camp is not hard to understand; nor is it without reason either. It is true that the country is faced with a grave financial crisis to overcome which would entail sacrifices on every section of the community. But one would have thought that in calling for sacrifices from the people the Socialist Government would still have

remained true to the principles for which it stands and have asked for larger sacrifices from those who are better able to bear the burden. But in the plan that they have adopted the brunt of the burden falls upon the poor and the rich escape comparatively lightly. The first class to be tapped should certainly have been the one who has benefited most by the fall of prices, viz. those who draw fixed incomes from government securities and those who draw fixed salaries. The real value of the interest receipts and salaries has risen enormously, and these two classes are the people who should have been laid under contribution in the first instance, but as a matter of fact the rentier class is wholly left out, while fixing the greater part of the burden upon the unemployed. Sir George May's Committee has recommended economies to the tune of £96 millions, two-thirds of which are to be effected at the expense of social services. If the method adopted in Australia had been followed, by which every class of the people and particularly the rentier class is made to pay, the Labour Party would certainly have supported the National "Government's" plans. In Australia "cuts are made in the pays of the state employees, in pensions, and in maternity allowances. Direct and indirect taxation is to be increased. Banks have agreed to reduce interest rates both on advances and deposits, and a Mortgage Relief Bill is to be introduced, giving mortgagees the right to appeal to a court for a reduction in the rate of interest." In England direct taxation is not to be increased and the rate of interest not to be lowered, with the result that the economies proposed press far more hardly on the poor than on the rich. It is not an effort, as claimed, by the May Committee "to save democracy from shipwreck," but, as aptly observed by the *New Statesman*, "to save oligarchy from taxation."

THE PRINCES' BLACKMAIL.

A NOVEL idea was mooted in these columns some weeks ago. It has set me a thinking ever since. Its possibilities must be carefully explored by those who are competent to judge. For, if found practicable, it promises to do nothing less than to rescue British India from the blackmail which the rulers of Indian States are conspiring to levy on it. The Princes have made it appear as if British India can never obtain self-government or anything like self-government except on a basis of federation with the States, and the States do not agree to federate with British India unless they are permitted to send nominees of their governments into the federal legislature. British India has thus no choice, so it is argued, between going without self-government and agreeing to the Princes' nomination, fatal though this latter alternative be to the democracy which we all wish to see established in India. Most British Indian politicians feel that they are really placed in such a cruel dilemma and that there is nothing for it but to give in to the Princes, hoping that at some future time the Princes may of their own accord introduce election.

THE THESIS.

It is a dreadfully black prospect for British India if indeed its future lies so completely at the mercy of the autocratic rulers of Indian States. But a writer in this journal has argued that it is not so

helpless as its politicians imagine. These can say to the Princes: "We shall have none of your federation if you will have no elected representatives. We shall then be content with such a measure of reform as will be secured without your aid." And the measure of reform that British India will get when it is thrown upon its own resources need not be very much less, in fact the writer contends need not be any less, than what is contained in the Sankey Report of the R. T. C. This is not a matter of speculation; for as a matter of fact we find (I am now pursuing the line of thought of your correspondent) that the Government of India in its dispatch on the Simon Report has itself proposed for British India reforms which in substance go as far as those proposed by Lord Sankey's Committee for federal India. The reserved subjects are the same in both, and the safeguards, broadly speaking, the same. The sphere of the government that is proposed to be turned over to popular control is thus nearly the same. It is true that the Ministers will not be technically responsible under the first scheme and will be so under the second. But when the restrictions under which responsible government will operate under the scheme of the Sankey Report are considered, it is a matter for doubt whether the responsiveness provided for in the Government of India scheme will not in practice yield more power than the so-called responsibility contemplated by the Sankey scheme. British India

may therefore take courage and demand election of the States' representatives as an essential condition of federation. If the Princes find that otherwise British India is determined to go ahead with its own reforms, they will agree to election, and then federation on a sound basis will become possible.

AN OBJECTION.

This is the reasoning. I have since been discussing it with several friends in order to discover any flaws that may be lurking in it. Of the two serious objections that have been urged to this I shall consider one on this occasion. It is said that the reforms recommended in the Government of India dispatch are not so liberal as assumed above. The dispatch no doubt proposes that, except in paramountcy over the Indian States, "defence, foreign relations, internal security, financial obligations, financial stability, protection of minorities and of the rights of the services recruited by the Secretary of State, and prevention of unfair discrimination," portfolios in all other subjects should be entrusted to elected members of the legislature who, in the Governor-General's opinion, command sufficient support in either house to enable them to carry through their measures. The Governor-General is not to interfere with these Ministers; the Instrument of Instructions is to give him a specific direction that so long as his Ministers continue to represent the legislature's wishes he should be guided by their advice. But they cannot be unseated by the legislature, and for this reason they cannot be called "responsible Ministers." When the Ministers are found to have lost the confidence of the legislature, it is left to the Governor-General to fill their places by other elected members who seem to him to command its support.

The critics argue that if these provisions were not qualified by others, then indeed it could be maintained with a show of reason that the Ministers under this scheme, though not responsible in the sense that they are not removable by the legislature, would still be amenable to popular control, and perhaps more so than when the Ministers are made removable on a non-confidence motion passed by a two-thirds majority in a joint session of the two chambers. But there are qualifications which those who express a preference for this scheme of the Government of India dispatch ignore. All the transfer of power recommended therein is subject to what the dispatch says in the section relating to Indian States, and in this section not only is paramountcy of the British Government taken right out of the sphere of the Government of India, but in all matters of common concern the power of ultimate decision is left with the Viceroy. All such matters will first be considered by a body, to be specially formed for the purpose, composed of representatives of British India and Indian States, but when no agreed solution is possible, the Viceroy will finally decide. That being so, the transfer of power contemplated in the Government of India dispatch becomes considerably limited in scope. The scheme adumbrated in this dispatch then has no advantage over the Sankey scheme; on the contrary, the latter has tremendous advantages over the former inasmuch as the sphere of government comprised in the

subjects of common interest also is to be transferred, according to the Sankey Report, to popular control, though this control will to some extent be neutralised by the States' nominees. Anyhow, this sphere is evacuated of the Britisher, and that is what we principally aim at.

THE ANSWER.

Such is the criticism that, I find from private conversation, is levelled against the proposition that, should the Princes prove intractable, British India should abandon federation and fall back upon the unitary scheme of the Government of India dispatch. The criticism would be decisive against the proposition if it were founded upon fact, but on turning to the dispatch I find that it is wholly unwarranted. Not considering immediate federation possible, the Government of India supported the Simon Commission's recommendation for setting up a Council for Greater India for the consideration of matters of common interest. But this body was meant only for the purpose of consultation, the final decision resting not with the Viceroy as the critics imagine but with the department of the Government of India concerned. The Simon Report says: "The views formed by the Council would be recorded in a report, which would include the record of any dissenting minority, and this report should be furnished to the Central Legislature as well as to the Chamber of Princes." Nothing more than "organised consultation" was sought to be achieved by this recommendation. The Government of India dispatch says: "We agree that the functions of the Council should be consultative only." There is no ground for supposing, as the critics do, that if after this consultation has taken place an unreconciled difference remains between the representatives of British India and the Indian States, the Viceroy will appear on the scene only to thrust the whole of the Council aside and impose his own views both upon British India and the Indian States. The Simon Commission did not propose the introduction of responsibility in any sphere of central administration; but the Government of India does, not of course in the technical sense, but in the wider sense of the legislature's control. And in the sphere in which this control is provided for subjects of common concern too are included, excepting, it need hardly be specified, defence and external relations. This means that in dealing with these subjects British India will consult with the States and try to arrive at a mutually acceptable solution. But in the event of such a solution not forthcoming, British India will tackle the matter for itself in its own way, and the authority for doing so is not the Viceroy, but the Governor-General as advised by the Minister in charge, i. e. the Minister himself as representing the legislature's wishes.

SOURCE OF MISCONCEPTION.

It is difficult to see how the critics could have been misled into supposing that the Government of India dispatch leaves all differences between British India's representatives and States' representatives on matters of common concern to the arbitrary decision of the Viceroy. The only explanation that occurs to me is that they have imported their impression of Sir

Leslie Scott's scheme into the consideration of the Government of India dispatch. The Butler Committee's Report thus describes Sir Leslie's scheme. It

"interposed between the Political Department and the Viceroy a council of six members, three Princes or state ministers, two English members with no previous experience of India, and the Political Secretary. This states council would become the executive body directing the Political Department. In matters of common concern to British India and the states this states council would meet the existing Governor-General's Council and endeavour to arrive at a joint decision. In the event of a difference of opinion the Viceroy and Governor-General would decide. In order to reconcile the Princes to the loss of sovereignty within their individual states numerous safeguards were devised which would have stripped the new body of any real power of effective action."

This scheme no doubt proposed to lodge in the Viceroy power of certification, but it was not allowed even to be put forward before the Butler Committee and was not therefore considered either by this Committee or by any other committee or by any authority. I believe that those who think that the Government of India dispatch on the Simon Report also proposed, while bringing a large sphere of government under the control of the legislature, to reserve a part of it for administration by the Viceroy are led to form this judgment by the impression that lingers in their mind from their perusal of Sir Leslie Scott's scheme. In no other way can I account for such a mistaken reading of the Government of India dispatch.

If what I have said above is correct, is there any reason why we should not insist on election of the States' representatives as an indispensable condition of federation, asking, in the event of the States not agreeing, that reforms on the line of the Government of India dispatch should be enacted for British India, of course with necessary improvements?

OBSERVER.

INDIAN OFFICIAL SALARIES.*

THE contrast between the extravagant salaries of the higher Government servants in India and the extraordinary poverty of the people has always been a matter of fierce criticism. So long, however, as most of these services were manned by Europeans, and the power to recruit and control them was vested in a Government formed mainly of these servants themselves, there was little chance that arguments based on justice or economy would prevail against authority and interest. The advent of Indianisation and responsible government in recent years has tended to make this question one of practical economic policy, and it may be hoped that under the constitution emerging from the Round Table discussions the necessary freedom to deal with the salaries of public

officials will be vouchsafed to the Provincial and Central Governments. The prospect of power, however, enhances the responsibility of public men in this country, and in dealing with the question of the services special knowledge of their conditions is essential. Principal Gadgil of the Gokhale School of Economics and Politics, has rendered a distinct service to all public workers in India, by publishing a scholarly brochure on the subject. Mr. Gadgil's treatment of his theme is severely impersonal and remarkably restrained. In fact, in this the first publication of the School, he has set a tradition which may develop that institution into a non-official secretariat for the service of India.

In the first half of his treatment of the subject Mr. Gadgil has dealt with the historical evolution of the services and their salaries. He has reviewed the results of all the authorised inquiries on the subject and has shown how very illogical was the basis on which the whole scheme of salaries was reared. The salaries of Executive Councillors served as a standard of comparison for the salaries of High Court Judges, and these latter for the other superior services in India. Now, as every student of comparative Governmental organisation knows, both these sets of posts are in a class by themselves and cannot be rightly taken as a basis for the salaries of services which are recruited from a more abundant and standardised market. In particular, the salaries of judges are necessarily high in view of the great responsibility of their task. The review of official policy in respect of the superior services, however, reveals many more facts, which deserve close attention. In fact it may be said that the whole history of that policy is a conflict between two contradictory principles, which it was never the interest of the British Indian Government to face. The first principle was of course that of competitive earning, and a scale of salaries had to be fixed which would attract first-class men from the British Universities. The other principle was that of equality of remuneration for similar services; this led to the Indian members of the services being paid the same salaries as their European colleagues, and moreover the scale of payments even in purely Indianised services had to be regulated by these high earnings of Indians in the superior services. The only rational method of getting out of this entanglement would have been to appoint Indians to all the services in large numbers, and fix for all services an Indian competitive scale. The services then would really have been 'Indian', and the European would have been an exception, to be paid, if his services were found to be essential, on an exceptional scale. But the political policy of the British administration was to look upon the higher services in India, as 'British' by rule and 'Indianised' as an exception. This naturally brought the principle of competition into conflict with that of equality, and for political, or as one Royal Commission has observed, 'sentimental' reasons, competition, i.e. justice and economy, were sacrificed to "equality". It is, therefore, not an exaggeration to describe these high salaries of the Indian

* *The Salaries of Public Officials in India.* By D.R. GADGIL. (The Author, The Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Poona No. 4.) 1931. 24cm. 50p. Rs. 1/-.

members of the superior services as their share of the "spoils". This description becomes all the more appropriate when it is remembered that the salaries even of the British members were not fixed exclusively on the principle of competition. As Principal Gadgil has pointed out with the help of comparative statistics, the salaries of superior services in India are not only relatively but absolutely the highest in the world. One of the poorest among the nations of the world is paying the highest absolute salary to its public servants! If this is not spoils, what else is?

In the time of Lord Cornwallis when the salaries of the Covenanted Service were first regularised, the principle followed was that the European services should be paid on a scale that would enable them not only to live in India in dignity and comfort, but would also help them to retire with a competence at the end of their service. In spite of the fact that now a stay in India is in no sense unattractive to the average European candidate the original high scale is maintained and in many cases enhanced. The principle of competitive salaries applies only to lower and menial service in India. The higher services are still not only on the basis of competition for the best European recruitment, but on the basis of a competence being possible at the end of the service. Whatever might have been the justification for this principle in the days of Lord Cornwallis, in later times its application is not to be differentiated from a spoliation, or to put it in the mild words of Principal Gadgil, an extravagance.

The suggestions made by Principal Gadgil for the future scheme of salaries are of fundamental importance. That the standard of comparison for the salaries of the various posts and cadres must be the lowest and not the highest service, is a very important point to work upon. It is no doubt true that democracy must purchase its servants on the same principle as other employers, and if it offers unattractive conditions the best talent would seek other channels of employment. In India the chances of such diversion would continue to be few for a long time to come and in any case the reasoning would apply to posts where exceptional merit is necessary. In a popular government attempt is made to secure these services as much as possible on a basis of patriotic, rather than professional, service, and in the few cases where that motive may not be trusted to be steadily available the necessary price has to be paid. No scale laid down for the employment of exceptional talent can, however, be utilised to regulate the rates of ordinary salaries. These must be controlled on the supply side by the competition among suitable candidates and their reasonable standard, and on the demand side by the urgency of employment and the financial position of the State. If these were considered together, the maximum figure of Rs. 500 laid down by the recent resolution of the Congress may not be found to be so far away from the mark as some critics have tried to make out.

A very complicated situation is presented by the position of the existing incumbents of the Services. We must start with a determination not to employ

any new people on the existing basis, and await the formulation of the new scales before permanent appointments are made. So far as the European members of the Services are concerned, arrangements, if possible, should be made with the Home and Colonial authorities to absorb them in the latter's services. Failing that, they should be given an option of continuing on salaries which would be newly fixed or retiring with a proportionate pension. This would of course not apply to those members of the Services, who would be required as experts for their respective jobs, and provided they are willing to serve under new conditions, they should be paid a salary on the basis of competition of men of their attainments. So far, however, as the Indian members of the Services are concerned I do not think that any theory of law, politics or justice would justify the national Government continuing to pay them a "salary" which is but a share of spoils paid to them by a foreign Government, and which is a veritable fortune as compared with the earnings of men of similar attainments employed in other than Government jobs. It is only fair, however, that these also should be given an option of retirement or continuance on the new scale. Their terms of proportionate pension, however, can be different from those of the European members. The alleged justice of the principle of equality between European and Indian members was always doubtful even under the British Government; under a national Government if we countenance extravagance behind that principle it would be nothing short of a crime against the impoverished taxpayer.

The time has come when all public men must study these questions of administrative reform from the scientific and comparative standpoint. So far as the subject of the salaries of public officials in India is concerned, Principal Gadgil's publication has removed their main difficulty, that of handy and reliable literature. All students of the subject and journalists should make it a point to read and ponder over the booklet. We trust that Mr. Gadgil and others associated with the School will follow up this attempt with similar authoritative publications on various public questions. These will be highly valued both by the interested workers and the general public.

D. G. KARVE.

LABOUR IN INDIA.

RESULTS OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION'S ENQUIRY.—VI.*

MINES, RAILWAYS, TRANSPORT SERVICES AND PUBLIC WORKS.

ABOUT 2,70,000 workers are employed in mines in British India including Burma. Coal mining accounts for two-thirds of all the employees in mines in British India (excluding Burma), the percentage of those working underground being 18. Apart from stone quarrying the only other mining industries which employ as many as 10,000

* Previous articles in this series appeared in our issues of July 23 and 30, and August 6, 13 and 27.

persons are manganese and mica mining. In manganese mines both recruitment and extraction of ore are entrusted to contractors who attract and retain their workers by a system of advances. The Commission found traces of the defunct Workmen's Breach of Contract Act in the terms of engagement and have, therefore, recommended that adequate steps be taken to apprise the workers of its repeal. Some 1600 persons are employed in the rock salt mines of the Punjab, the mines are owned by the Government of India and worked by the Salt Department. During the Commission's visit to Khewra, the most important centre of salt mining in the Punjab, they were struck by the poor health of the miners and their families among whom anaemia is prevalent. In 1922 Col. Gill, Director of Public Health in the Punjab, had pointed out defects in diet and a complete absence of sanitary arrangements, and no improvement in those conditions was observed by the Commission. Is it not really disgraceful that the workers' health should be so callously neglected in a concern owned by Government, which is expected to set a good example to private concerns? Oil fields both in India and Burma are given complete exemption from the operation of the Mines Act which would otherwise apply to them. In Burma there is an Oil Fields Act which is directed to the preservation of the oil sands and includes provisions for the prevention of fire, but is not designed for the protection of labour. The Commission have, therefore, expressed the opinion that the protection of the law in regard to rest days, hours of work, health and safety should be extended to workers on the oil fields. Sanitation in coal mines is unsatisfactory. Over 90% of the adult labourers in Jharia are infected with hook-worm, although illness is produced only in a very small proportion of cases. An investigation in Asansol area showed that 33% of the mines examined were infected with hook-worm larvae, that 73% of the male underground workers were infected as compared with 50% of the surface labourers. The colliery proprietors have to spend, directly or indirectly, substantial sums in recruiting. Most collieries recruit through a contractor. The cost of recruitment is in the neighbourhood of 3 to 4 annas per ton of coal raised, which is equivalent on the average to about 10 to 12 annas a month for every worker employed. If the conditions were sufficiently attractive there would be no necessity to incur this expense in these days of widespread unemployment. "Indeed, some of the money so spent", say the Commissioners in their Report, "would be more effectively invested in ameliorating the conditions of labour at the mines." In the Giridh field, which is largely held by the East Indian Railway, there is the system of service tenancy under which tenants have to render service for a certain number of days in the mine in exchange for the privilege of holding a plot of land at a low rent. The Commission recommend that for the future, the law should prohibit the creation of tenancies with colliery service as a condition of the holding. Service tenancy is clearly a device to hold down the workers and to deprive them of the freedom to bargain for fair wages. This system

emphasises the need for a Truck Act in this country. It is a common practice in the Jharia field to pay the workers on Sunday which is the weekly rest day and the Commission have rightly recommended that wages be paid on a working day. Also the Commission found on one of the fields that a miner in a day of 12 hours could produce no more than one small tub of coal. Such short output is due to deficiency of tubes, difficult working places, long leads, stone and shale or mechanical breakdowns. An allowance is not always paid on these grounds. The Commission, therefore, think that statutory provision is necessary to ensure that the worker, whose wages fall short from causes outside his control, shall not be penalised.

The Act of 1928 which introduced a 12-hour day has not been an advance on the then existing weekly limit of 60 hours above ground and 54 below ground. The Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly which considered the bill had decided to adhere to the 12-hour shift, recommending to Government that, after the Act had been in force for three years, the situation should again be examined to see whether an 8-hour shift could be introduced. The majority of the Commission have endorsed the recommendation of the Select Committee. Mr. Cliff, Mr. Joshi and Diwan Chaman Lall have dissented from this view and recommended that the present daily limit be reduced to eight hours. In view of the fact that some of the larger collieries are already working eight-hour shifts and other collieries are working ten-hour shifts and that at such collieries the attendance and the level of earnings tend to be higher than what prevail at collieries working longer hours, the minority view is fully justified. A reduction in the existing hours of work should prove beneficial to the owners as well as to the workers.

With a total staff of over 8,00,000, the railway administrations are the largest employers of organised labour in India. Naturally the working policy of these administrations with regard to wages and other terms of employment reacts to some extent on industrial labour conditions throughout the country. There is no uniformity of practice in the treatment of labour matters between the State-owned railways and the company-managed railways. Although the railway lines are far flung the supply of labour available locally is generally in excess of requirements, except in outlying areas where the local supply is supplemented by immigrants from distant parts. The Commission have made several recommendations for removing grounds for complaints of favouritism and bribery in recruitment, appointments and promotions. The Report also contains a paragraph dealing with the complaint of racial discrimination in railway service. This complaint has been a constant source of discontent and bitterness. "We believe it to be", say the Commission, "in the interests of all concerned that definite steps be now taken which will lead in a specified term of years to the progressive elimination of any form of discrimination as regards both appointments and promotions to all grades and classes, thus providing simultane-

ously for an increasing number of appointments and promotions of members of other communities (other than Europeans and Anglo-Indians). All communities would then know precisely where they stood and every year would thus see progress towards elimination". Many workers never receive any leave, although their duties require them to be on call every day of the year. The Commission were convinced that the leave rules were capable of further improvement and recommends continued examination of the whole subject in consultation with representatives of the workers. Under the new rules the grant of leave is subject to the exigencies of the service; it cannot be claimed as a right and may be withheld in cases of irregular attendance. The Commission concede that an employee's right to leave must naturally be subject to certain qualifications and limitations, but insist that these qualifications and limitations should be more clearly defined. In spite of the revision of wages the majority of the railway workers still receive very low wages. Of 7,59,000 employees on the twelve Class I railways, 4,08,000 or 54% are in receipt of less than Rs. 20 per month. The Commission have, therefore, recommended that the claims of the low paid workers to improved wage standards should continue to receive careful consideration from the Railway Board and the administrations concerned. The workers in the loco, carriage and wagon shops are practically all daily-rated. The Commission recommend that after twelve months' continuous service all employees should be monthly-rated and as soon as practicable made eligible for all the service privileges to which monthly-rated employees are entitled. There are disparities in wages and service conditions on the different railways and in their workshops. The Commission recommend the removal of these inequalities. No menial servant is allowed to subscribe to the State Railway Provident Fund on any terms. Different interpretations of the term 'menial' are found on different railways. The Commission justly recommend that on completion of one year's continuous service all employees should be eligible to join a provident fund, membership being optional for those whose emoluments are less than Rs. 20 but compulsory for all drawing Rs. 20 or over, instead of Rs. 30 per month which is the usual rule.

P. G. KANEKAR.

Our European Letter.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

GENEVA, AUG. 21.

THE POLITICAL ENIGMA.

DIPLOMATIC developments, not always open nor always calculated to strengthen peace, have been for some time the usual prelude to the meetings of the League Assembly. But this year the political storm which threatens to break over Geneva seems to have more than the customary violence if reports coming from various parts of Europe are to be trusted. It must be noted, in the first place, that the bankers' committee at Basel, to

whom the London Conference had handed over the task of investigating the financial situation in Germany and devising the necessary measures for its safeguard, so far as that can be done within its competence, has issued a report which is far from hopeful. In guarded but unambiguous language they have in effect pointed out, that unless there is such a change in the political situation as would enable Germany to obtain long-term credits, the financial panic, which starting from Vienna and Berlin reached the City of London and severely shook the position of the pound sterling, so recently, may be repeated again within six months' time when Germany will have exhausted her present credits.

There are three ways of retrieving Germany's solvency: 1. further and more favourable borrowing, which will hardly be possible except with the united support of the Powers. 2. recall of German investments abroad, not an easy undertaking in actual practice and, in any case, dependent on the consent and cooperation of the German stock-holders, and 3. suitable modifications in the War debts and Reparations settlement, a plan which will chiefly affect France and the United States and most difficult to give effect to owing to the unwillingness of the electorate in both countries to part with what is owing to them at a time of economic depression and financial stringency. Great Britain, who will be hardly affected anyhow, is not in a position to take initiative in this matter as she is far too much concerned at present with her own financial position and the difficulties of balancing the Budget, and as she is unlikely to interfere in anything touching America so closely as the War debts question. Nothing has been more significant in all the comment that followed the publication of the Basel bankers' committee's report than the obstinate silence of the United States authorities about the prospects of revision.

The first of these alternatives, long term credits to Germany, would therefore, seem to be the most practicable solution, but its success is dependent on an agreement between the Powers. The pessimism about the present situation arises from the fact that this solution has already been attempted twice, in Paris and in London, both times without avail, and yet the bankers at Basel could see no other way out of the difficulty.

Consequently, it is not surprising that in the last week or two there should have been many rumours that the French and German Governments have determined to talk over the prospects of an agreement exclusively between the two countries, either despairing of common action or preferring to avoid it for reasons that they know best. The Paris Press has been full of such hints. Monsieur Lucien Romer, writing in the *Petit Parisien*, says that a wall of mutual misunderstanding and suspicion has been raised between the two neighbouring countries owing to the belief in Germany that France is the relentless guardian of the status quo of the Versailles Treaty with all its severity and humiliations, and the feeling in France that Germany, out to upset all order, will not rest content until she has once more plunged Europe and all the world into chaos. The demolition of this wall must be the immediate object of the representatives of both countries, and it can only be done by constant, continuous and cordial contacts between them, which would enable each problem to be treated on its own merits and in accordance with the situation in which it arises. International conferences far too large in scope or dealing with issues which cannot be brought to immediate conclusion cannot achieve it.

Besides suggestions of this sort, there have been allusions in Paris newspapers in touch with Govern-

ment circles that there are important political differences between the French Premier and the Foreign Minister and that, Monsieur Laval has made up his mind not to go on with the inconclusive policy of Monsieur Briand and will take it upon himself to enter into direct negotiations with the German Chancellor. The French Government's official visit to Berlin, following the League Assembly in September, is on that account coming to be regarded as a diplomatic event of prime importance.

These impressions are further confirmed by reports coming from Poland which point to the existence of a state of tension in the Polish capital, owing to the widespread belief, or rather fear, that France has already concluded or is about to conclude agreements with both of Poland's not very friendly neighbours, Germany and Soviet Russia. A Franco-Russian pact of non-aggression is spoken of as already achieved, although still lacking official confirmation, and undoubtedly there has been of late much more than the usual amount of exchange of communications between Paris and Moscow.

The reactions on the German side to these various developments, if such they are, have not been quite clear, but the *Gazette de Cologne* published the other day an important article, which has all the appearance of a *ballon d'essai*. It says that the proposal to form an agreement (modelled on the Treaty of Berlin between Russia and Germany) between France, Germany, Italy and Great Britain, to be extended later so as to include Soviet Russia as well, has been well received in the countries concerned and it may be given effect to in the next few days. If this report is well-founded, it not only gives a certain significance to the rumours about the Franco-Russian pact but also to a recent statement of the German Chancellor that he was sceptical of big international assemblies. It may well be that France is willing to come to terms with Germany and has been concerned to limit the scope of Germany's activities in the direction of Moscow, and that, in the present circumstances, the German Chancellor is earnestly desirous of establishing an understanding with France.

A Franco-German accord is always to be welcomed as eminently conducive to peace, but European peace based on alliances of this kind may have the regrettable effect of putting off indefinitely the development of the new method of collective action for which the League stands. The old method of military alliances has left a trail of blood behind it which is not yet dry, not in Europe only but on other continents as well.

Reviews.

THE THEORY OF INTEREST.

THE THEORY OF INTEREST. By IRVING FISHER. (Macmillan, London & New York.) 1930. 22cm. 566p. 25/—

THIS book arose, so Prof. Fisher tells us in the preface, out of an attempt to revise the author's earlier work *The Rate of Interest* published in 1907. This has for a long time been out of print and a revised edition has long been in demand. The rate of interest has been a subject of special study on the part of Prof. Fisher and we may well state at the outset that this book of his will undoubtedly come to be considered as the standard work on the subject in English.

The book is divided into four parts. Part I—

Introduction—deals with the definition of such words as Income and Capital and the difference between money interest and real interest. Parts II and III expound the main theory, Part II doing this in words and Part III treating the same in mathematical terms. Part IV contains a general discussion on the application of Prof. Fisher's theory to certain particular aspects of economic life such as personal and business loans, money and prices, etc. It also contains a chapter in which Prof. Fisher answers the more important of the criticisms levelled against his former work.

The method followed by Prof. Fisher in his exposition of the problem is that of approaching it by a series of less and less simple approximations. The whole exposition is extremely lucid and it is—as usual with Prof. Fisher—amply illustrated by a series of tables, graphs and charts. The theory expounded is in its fundamentals the same as that of *The Rate of Interest*. It is still an "impatience" theory. Prof. Fisher has, of course, his own peculiar definition of the term "income." He defines it as the cost of living of a person. He thinks that for accounting purposes real income as measured by the cost of living is the most practical definition. And throughout the exposition the idea of an income stream of this sort is utilised. The varying prospects of future incomes modify the degrees of impatience and it is pointed out that in a money economy there is considerable possibility of a person modifying the character of his income stream by either borrowing or lending. It is the character and size of income streams that determine the degrees of impatience and it is shown that the general desire to maximise the utility of one's total income will bring about suitable lending or borrowing operations making the income stream flow in a uniform fashion. At this stage "productivity" is brought in. Prof. Fisher does not call it "productivity" but "investment opportunity". It is pointed out that the rate of interest will determine the way in which capital will be attracted to different types of investments. The comparative attractiveness of, say, forestry or manufacture depends on the rate of interest prevailing in the market. And though physical "productivity" is not admitted as the determining factor in the rate of interest, it is pointed out that the rate is largely influenced by the opportunities of investment available to the capitalists. The whole theory in its second approximation is elaborated into a series of principles. On the side of impatience the chief insistence is laid on the maximisation of desirability and on the side of investment opportunity, the maximisation of present worth at a given rate of interest. These two forces determine a rate which will exactly clear the market. In the third approximation it is however pointed out that with the admission of the element of uncertainty the clear-cut and quasi-mathematical character of these laws is lost.

In the fourth part there are to be found some particularly important chapters. Such, for example, are the chapters on the place of interest in Economics and on the relation of discovery and invention to interest rates. The discussion on the relation of interest to money and prices is, however, disappointing. It carries us no further than the author's exposition of the subject in his *Purchasing Power of Money*. And though Wickcell is mentioned in the bibliography no attempt is made to follow up the fruitful line of enquiry opened by him and recently followed up with success in Germany and England. This seems to us to be the most serious deficiency in an otherwise most excellent treatise.

D. R. GADGIL.

ENGLISH HUMOUR.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH HUMOUR.
PART I. FROM THE EARLY TIMES TO
THE RENAISSANCE. BY LOUIS CAZAMIAN.

(Macmillan, New York.) 1930. 21cm. 160p. 8/6.
THAT Playboy of the Modern World, "G. B. S." holds that "there is no more dangerous literary symptom than a temptation to write about wit and humour and that it indicates the total loss of both"—so echoing the Ciceronian dictum: "What a laugh is, by what means it is raised, wherein it consists, in what manner it bursts out, and is so suddenly discharged... even they who pretend to account for laughter know nothing of the matter". Indeed, so reluctant is Humour, that spiciest ingredient in life and literature, to yield its last secret to the psychological and literary analyst that one is tempted to take the view of the Knight of the Burning Pencil and the Roman orator as the last word of wisdom on the matter. In fact, one might have done so had not two recent books, Professor Cazamian's under review and Mr. J. B. Priestley's, by their striking successes, put both Shaw and Cicero in the wrong.

If Mr. Cazamian's initial definition, "that we make a thing humorous by expressing it with a certain twist, queer reserve, an inappropriateness, and as it were an unconsciousness of what we all the time feel it to be," does not take us beyond the hackneyed *mantra*, his paragraph on the conditions and effects of humour brings together scattered fragments of our knowledge in a fresh and striking manner: "A kind of mastery over one's feelings is thus among the conditions of humour; but that repression, that negative power is not of course sufficient; along with it there must be a positive virtue, the shrewdness that perceives the actual paradoxes of experience, and the agility that allows one to think on two different planes." Among the effects of humour are noticed our enhanced aesthetic enjoyment of the comedy of life when it needs our co-operation, the stimulus of unexpectedness, a rejuvenation of the common-places of actuality, the sense of a topsyturvy universe, and the delicious feeling of release induced by extravagance.

But the actual business of the book—which, by the way, is an amplification of lectures delivered at the University College of Wales—is done with the ease of scholarship that thoroughly knows its ground, and knows, too, how to subjugate the difficulties inherent in an unpromising theme—unpromising because before 1500, at which the book stops, there are more troughs than crests in the realm of humour—and make it go home in a popular manner. The author takes us through the faint, sporadic glimpses of humour, in the form of ironic under-statements, in *Beowulf* and the Old English Period, to specimens in Mediaeval French literature of *humour de finesse* or the restrained humour of sly and indirect allusion like *Roman de la Rose*, the satirical poetry of Ruteboeuf, the *Roman de Renart*, *Le Lai d'Aristote* etc., and the *humour of release* or the broad explosion of animal spirits as illustrated in the "chansons de geste" like *Montage Guillaume* and *Pelerinage de charlemagne*.

In "Humour Before Chaucer", we have a shrewd discussion of the view that English humour was born when the austerity of the Saxon was fused with the mirth of the Norman, leading to the sane conclusion that there was already a vigorous, though rough and untutored, stock of indigenous English humour which the example of French slyness and point but stimulated to a liveliness of fancy and grace. The chapter closes with a fine appreciation of *The Owl and the Nightingale*. The competent

survey of Chaucer's humour has but one corner where we find it difficult to follow the author—when he chooses to see humour in the enumeration (in the *Prologue*) of authorities known by the "Doctor of Physick", and of places that witnessed the Knight's exploits. The last chapter beginning with the anti-climax of the English Chaucerian's and the too explicit humour and ebullient spirits of the Scottish (particularly Dunbar), closes with Lyndsay and Skelton—leaving our literary appetite whetted and waiting for the promised second volume and the withheld *pièce de resistance*.

R. SADASIVA AIYAR.

MISS MAYO vs. INDIAN PEOPLE.

VOLUME TWO. By KATHERINE MAYO. (Cape, London.) 1931 20cm. 252p. 7/6.

AS the reader will easily guess, this book is supplementary to *Mother India* by the same author. It claims to be a digest of the evidence tendered before the Age of Consent Committee in this country. But the digest is not less onesided than its predecessor and is therefore unreliable. If the selection of evidence is made in order to establish the existence of the custom of child marriage in India, all we can say is that that fact is undeniable and did not need to be proved. Frankly we fail to see why Miss Mayo should have put herself to all the trouble of making this compilation. This apart, we have never been able to account for her new-found interest in India, for we do not know that it is more than four years old. If her object in giving so much time to a study of Hindu social conditions was merely to awaken Hindu society to the evils of child marriage she must be said to be doing a distinct service to this country and would be deserving of our sincere thanks. But in that case the whole tone of her writing would be very different. But, really, we are not left to imagine her object in writing these books. According to Rai Saheb Harbilas Sarda, M. L. A. who relies upon her own press interview given soon after the publication of *Mother India*, she herself disavowed all intention to help Indian social reform. Mr. Sarda further says: "She stated in clear terms that her sole object in writing the book was to make the Americans to look upon Indians as a people as bad as her book would make them out to be and not to regard them as a people who had made great progress in civilisation and culture." We must readily admit that the selection of quotations from the evidence is admirably suited to the attainment of the object which Mr. Sarda represents her as having in view. Incidentally, she must have found this trade of blackening the character of the people of this country very paying. Owing to the gross misrepresentation of Hindu society of which she was guilty in her earlier publication and which needed to be mercilessly exposed she received gratuitous advertisement in the whole of the Indian press with the result that the book found a large sale. The Indian Press however seems determined not to oblige her again, as the absence of any notice on a considerable scale of her present performance by it will show. This, we think, is a wise course. If it pleases any foreign writer to paint the people of this country in blacker colours than the facts warrant, we should not grudge that happiness to the writer, fully convinced that truth was bound to assert itself in the end. While we would be the last to discourage any attempt to cultivate opinion in foreign countries in favour of India we do not think so low of American intelligence as to think that the Americans are a people who would swallow anything, however fantastic, said about this country and its people. Even America, with the colossal ignorance

that must be prevailing there about Indian conditions, cannot be slow to see that a country which can boast of Mahatma Gandhi and Mrs. Naidu, to mention only two of our living leaders known to America, cannot be as backward as Miss Mayo would have her believe.

Our readers will naturally expect to be told something about the contents of this book. So far as one can see, the author's contention is that the Early Marriage Prevention Act with which Mr. Sarda's name will always be associated and which came into force on "April Fool's Day" last year is only a make-believe, that the real intention of those who voted for it is not to grapple with the problem of child marriage in India but to create a false impression on American opinion that Indians are making frantic efforts for acquiring fitness for swaraj, that all this new-found urge on the part of Indians for social reform is the result of the stinging criticism of Hindu society by such a friend of humanity as Miss Mayo! This thesis she tries to support somewhat as follows. Mr. Sarda's original bill was aimed at invalidating child marriages. If the Assembly had enacted it into law in that form, Miss Mayo would perhaps have believed that it had placed on the statute book "a law with teeth in it." (p. 204.) In the bill as it emerged from the Select Committee this provision had been replaced by one for making all breaches of the provisions of the measure punishable with fine. But we had better allow the author herself to make her meaning clear.

The Select Committee did as it was bid—dealt with Mr. Sarda's Bill—dealt with it silently, discreetly, thoroughly. So that the object that at last rolled back into view was no more a rough, coarse, provocative, hard-hitting fighter, but a show-window dummy so expertly built that, observed from afar and not too keenly, it looked alive.

This new Sarda Bill's teeth were all drawn. Its invalidating clause had been painlessly extracted. No power remained in it to trouble the land. (p. 207).

Those that are familiar with conditions in India, on reading this fantastic view of the author, are sure to exclaim: "A jaundiced person sees everything yellow." The facts of course are undisputed; it is the twist given to them by Miss Mayo to which Indian opinion will object. If only Miss Mayo knew more of the state of things in this country, she would, we are confident, take a different view of the operation of the Sarda Act than the utterly prejudiced one that she takes in this book. As a matter of fact the Sarda Act is acting as a wholesome restraint upon the tendencies of the orthodox and backward people towards child marriage and has been found to have considerable value, both positive and negative. It has considerably strengthened the cause of Indian social reform. It is a travesty of facts to describe the Act as a dummy as Miss Mayo does. Had it been so we would not have heard of any prosecutions under the Act. But now and again such cases are reported in the Press. No doubt their number is not very large; but that is due probably to the disturbed conditions of life in this country during 1930. But let that pass. If Miss Mayo had adduced any facts or arguments in support of her contention, it would have been easy to deal with her. But she does no such thing. That we are not alone in holding this view of her performance is clear from the following comments by the *Statesman*, a none too indiscriminate supporter of Indians:

There is not a line in her book in which she troubles about this. All she has done is to make the assertion. The Sarda Act came into force on the first of April 1930, and as this assertion is the basis of a lengthy book which is already on sale we can reasonably infer that Miss Mayo in America had already decided for herself last Autumn that an Act then a few months old

was not having any effect. This, it will be recognised, is a somewhat hasty judgment.

From the point of view of checking the evil custom of early marriage Miss Mayo obviously lays greater store by the social reform activities of foreign missionaries and the personal example of Indian Christians in this respect than the presence of this Act on the Indian statute book. We have never denied due credit to the missionaries for their beneficent activities in this country nor do we wish to deny that they can do much to further the object which the Sarda Act has in view. But to go further and say that their work is a more potent instrument against early marriages than the Act is, we think, to shut one's eyes to facts. In passing it should be noted that Miss Mayo stands up for freedom to the missionaries to go on with their work of proselytisation, if only to ensure thereby to the Hindu untouchables their rights as human beings by conversion to Christianity.

Her writings about India naturally lead one to suppose that Miss Mayo is a deep student of social problems in all lands, including her own. Whether she is known there as a social worker we do not know. But even if she be, we would take this opportunity to ask her to allow her own people have a greater share of her beneficent interest in the prevention of child marriages, which if the New York Superintendent of Schools report is to be believed, seem to be on the increase. According to this report, 552 pupils as against 483 during last year had to be struck off the register owing to wedlock. Of the 552 pupils, only four were, we are told, boys of ages varying between 16 and 14. So far as the girl students are concerned, we observe that in some cases marriages took place at the early age of 12 or 13, which is even lower than the age limit laid down by the Sarda Act. With such a redoubtable opponent of early marriage as Miss Mayo present, in America, in flesh and blood, one wonders how that country dares go wrong. Anyhow it is time the matter engaged her attention.

Before concluding, we wish to draw the author's attention to a few inaccuracies in the book. If she knew that Hoshangabad was not in Bombay but in C.P. she would not describe Mr R. J. Amardekar, the officiating District and Sessions Judge of the place as "a member of the *Bombay Bench*." (p. 63.) We do not know that Mr. N. S. Phadke, the well known author of *Sex Problems in India*, is a Doctor. (p. 199.) On p. 213 she confuses Mian Mohammad Shah Nawaz with Mrs. Shah Nawaz. This has led her to believe that Mr. Shah Nawaz who was a member of the Assembly and of the Age of Consent Committee was also "a marked figure in the London Round Table Conference". May we tell her that this "marked figure" was Mrs. Shah Nawaz? But whatever one may think of the contents of the book, one cannot but appreciate the painstaking industry and the exemplary thoroughness Miss Mayo has brought to bear on her task.

D. V. A.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

I. L. O. STUDIES AND REPORTS.

- Freedom of Association. Vol. V. (A. 32.) 1930. 24cm. 461p. 5/-
 Studies on Industrial Relations. (A. 33.) 1930. 24cm. 263p. 5/-
 Unemployment and Public Works. (C.15.) 1931. 24cm. 186p. 5/-
 Unemployment Problems in 1931. (C. 16.) 1931. 24cm. 280p. 6/-
 Unemployment Problems in the United States. By H. B. Butler. (C. 17.) 1931. 24cm. 112p. 2/6.
 Wages and Regulation of Conditions of Labour in the U. S. S. R. By S. Zagorsky. (D. 19.) 1930. 24cm. 212p. 4/-
 Principles and Methods of Wage Determination in the Coal-Mining Industry. An International Survey. (D. 20.) 1931. 24cm. 104p. 2/6.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

SIX-AND-A-HALF PER CENT.

TREASURY BONDS, 1935.

Repayable at par on the 15th September 1935.

May be purchased on and from the 15th September 1931 and until further notice at the Imperial Bank of India, Treasuries and at Post Offices.

The purchase price of a Treasury Bond for Rs. 100 purchased on any date from the 15th September 1931 to the 19th September 1931 is Rs. 100. Thereafter the price increases by 2 annas per cent. weekly. Each increase in the purchase price represents the amount of interest which accrues weekly on the Bond. The Bonds bear interest from the 15th September 1931. The purchaser gets a full half-year's interest on the 15th March 1932 irrespective of the date of purchase.

6 per cent. Bonds, 1931, will be accepted at their full maturity value in payment of the purchase price of 6½ per cent. Treasury Bonds, 1935.

Treasury Bills which have matured will be accepted at their maturity value in payment of the purchase price.

Brokerage will be paid at the rate of 1/16 per cent. to recognised bankers and brokers in respect of applications bearing their stamp.

For further particulars, see Government of India, Finance Department, Notification No. F. 3 (14)-F/31 dated the 1st September 1931, or apply to any Local Head Office or Branch of the Imperial Bank of India, or the office of the Controller of the Currency, Calcutta, Deputy Controller of the Currency, Bombay, and the Accountants General, Madras and Burma, or at any Government Treasury or Post Office.