

The Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA 4.

VOL. XVII, No. 29. }

POONA—THURSDAY, JULY 26, 1934.

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

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	337
ARTICLES :—	
Protection to Iron and Steel.	339
How Best to Prove Unacceptability	340
Self-Determination of the States' People. By A. V. Patvardhan.	341
OUR LONDON LETTER	342
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
Millowners' "Wage Reduction" Scheme— Mr. Bakhale's Views.	343
CORRESPONDENCE :—	
Kicking the Ladder. By P. B. Khare.	347
BOOKS RECEIVED.	347

Topics of the Week.

Obstruction ?

THE *Indian Social Reformer*, in its issue of 21st July, draws the following distinction between the policies of Congressmen and non-Congressmen in the Assembly. "While the Congress means to do nothing but oppose in the Legislative Assembly, non-Congress members, although in opposition, will be free to introduce and support such measures as are in line with the national programme not contained within the four corners of the Congress programme." It is true that the main objective of the Congress in fighting the elections will be not to improve the administration or to bring about economic or social reform, but to save the country, if possible, from the proposed constitution. But if the *Reformer* implies that Congress members will pursue a policy of indiscriminate opposition to Government measures, which the old Swaraj party professed to follow but did not follow, our contemporary is wrong. For there is no evidence, in the form of a pronouncement by any recognised leader of the Congress, to show that the members returned to the Assembly on the Congress ticket will practise obstruction. On the contrary indications are that the Congress policy will be the same as that of the other parties, viz. support of good and opposition to bad measures.

* * *

Don't give up the Sponge!

AS to the attitude towards the new constitution, the difference between some sections of progressives and Congressmen will be merely this: the latter are very optimistic but the former may be pessimistic about defeating the White Paper policy, though both are equally desirous of doing so. What the *Reformer* itself recently said about the Hoare proposals typifies the position of some prominent nationalists who do not belong to the Congress. "We are unconcerned about the future of the White Paper. If it dies, well and good; if it lives, there is nothing further to be said about it. What cannot be cured must be endured." Our contemporary wrote in this sense not long ago. The Congress too will probably endure if it must; but it will not let you speak about it, because it is not so hopeless as some non-Congressmen are about effecting a radical cure. "Let us make a supreme effort," the Congress says to the country, "to cause the White Paper to die. We are determined to kill it even if this means *status quo*; and we will kill it." Now those who are not hopeful about the country's ability to compass the death of the White Paper but would not exactly go into mourning if somehow this result came about need not quarrel with the Congress or put unnecessary impediments in its way. We do not mean at all that the *Reformer* does so, but several nationalists do, and frankly we are unable to understand their position. They throw in their hand before the game begins.

* * *

The Other Side of Non-Interference.

AGREEING wholeheartedly with the "hands off the States" policy urged upon British India by the Mahatma, *United India and Indian States*, the champion of Indian rulers, presents to him the other side of the shield as follows:

If the policy of the Congress as mentioned in Gandhiji's letter is one of non-interference, the practice of allowing delegates from Indian India to participate in the open Congress in the discussion of matters affecting British India and even on purely political issues, and to vote upon them, cannot be correct. We think, therefore, that it cannot be accurate to say that the Congress is now following a policy of non-interference in the affairs of the States—a policy which Mahatmaji describes as "wise and sound"—except in the sense that there are no political activities of the Congress now directed against the administrations of the States. But reciprocity requires that—if you get the help of subjects of Indian States for

the struggle in British India, if you allow them to vote on political issues in the deliberations of the Indian National Congress and recruit them in movements like the Civil Disobedience movement—you should in turn help subjects of Indian States in the same way in their own domestic political difficulties with their administrations.

United India then calls upon the Mahatma to see to it that "the Congress policy and practice are made to accord" by keeping the States' people clear of agitation in British India as he is trying to keep British Indians clear of agitation in the Indian States. Who can deny that our contemporary's reasoning is perfectly sound?

* * *

Gandhiji and the Princes.

SAYS the *Bombay Sentinel*:

It is inequitable that the States' peoples (after being impressed into British India's service) should now be left in the lurch, to shift for themselves as best as they can, because Mahatma Gandhi no longer has any use for them or their services.

What surprises us most is Gandhiji's undeserved solicitude for the Indian Princes, whose autocracy and despotism have not abated in any way and who are still carrying on with their old ways without any check from outside. Why should the Indian Princes not be told that their peoples will not tolerate any further their antiquated and irresponsible ways of ruling them? Should the States' peoples agree perpetually to be tyrannised over by their Princes and should the Congress remain silent and supine in the face of the suffering of the States' peoples?

Gandhiji must realise that whatever may be his own view in the matter, or that of his immediate lieutenants, there can be no difference of opinion in the rank and file of the Congress and that they insistently desire the Congress to intervene and help their fellow-Indians across the borders.

* * *

Indian Sandhurst.

THE proposed amendment of the Army Act which was discussed in the Assembly last week and which is now being examined by the select committee is intended to deal with the situation created by the establishment of an Indian Sandhurst. The Indian Army had so far only two classes of officers: (1) the British or Indian officer who was trained in Sandhurst and (2) the holder of the Viceroy's Commission. To these two categories would now be added a third, that of the officer trained in the military college at Dehra Dun, whose existence will be legally recognised by the new piece of legislation. Public opinion, being suspicious about the bona fides of the Government in regard to the Indianisation of the Army, naturally reads into the new Bill a subtle attempt on their part to assign to the new class of Indian officer a lower status than his British counterpart. But the assurance was given on behalf of Government that the new type would enjoy exactly the same powers and privileges in regard to the Indian Army as those enjoyed by the British officer. The wording of the two kinds of Commissions would also be exactly alike, though the one to be granted to the product of Dehra Dun would, as in the Dominions, be signed by the Governor-General, and not by the Secretary of State on the King's behalf as is the case at present. The new type of officer would receive the salary which the British officer receives in his own country and his leave rules would take account of the fact that he, being a son of the soil, would not have to spend much time in travelling in order to go home

on leave. So far as we can see, there appears to be nothing in this to which objection can legitimately be taken. It stands to reason that the products of Dehra Dun, being born and bred in India, should receive no overseas allowance. There is also no reason why they should be given as long a leave as is admissible in the case of the British officer. But in the eyes of some there cannot be equality of status in the absence of an equality of pay; and such people are not likely to welcome the new measure. But if, as we hope, the new Bill is nothing beyond an attempt to legalise the state of affairs as it would be a few months hence, when the first batch of Indian officers is turned out from Dehra Dun, Indian opinion need not raise any needless obstacles to its passage. In this view of the matter, the plea for its postponement till after the introduction of the Hoare constitution raised in the Assembly is also equally meaningless. For if the Bill is not enacted before the year closes, the first batch from Dehra Dun would have to be given the King's Commissions to which there seem to be obvious difficulties.

* * *

Factories Bill.

THE third reading of the Factories Bill was passed by the Assembly last week. The Bill seeks to carry into effect some of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Labour which reported three years ago and though the provisions of the Bill cannot obviously be wholly satisfactory to labour, it can hardly be doubted that it constitutes a sincere attempt on the part of Government to ameliorate labour conditions in India. It provides for a 54-hour week which has been very condescendingly agreed to by Mr. Mody representing the employers as a gesture of good-will towards labour. Does it not follow that, left to themselves, the employers would work the poor labourer much harder? It is needless to point out that this ill accords with the trend of civilized opinion on labour problems and emphasises the need for a rigorous enforcement of the Factory law. Unless and until the employers become convinced of the desirability of a 54-hour week, a vigilant eye must be kept on any attempts to violate the spirit, if not the letter, of the new legislation in the matter of hours of work. For our part we would prefer a 48-hour week and we think the Assembly lost a golden opportunity of giving a more tangible proof of its solicitude for the welfare of labour when it rejected an amendment aiming at the introduction of a shorter week in India.

But while this legislation, when enforced, will effect a considerable improvement in labour conditions in British India, it leaves the States absolutely unaffected. In a large majority of them State control of factories is conspicuous by its absence, with the result that industrial enterprises thinking of nothing else but fat dividends are showing an increasing tendency to migrate to State territory. There they are not bothered by any regulations about hours of work or days of rest or even the employment of child labour. The protection of labour in factories situated in the territories belonging to the States is a responsibility, which though primarily resting upon the rulers of States, cannot be lightheartedly disregarded by the Government of India. And we strongly support the request made to them in the course of the debate on the Bill by more than one speaker to use all their good offices for the purpose of making the States realise their responsibility for the well-being of labour within their jurisdictions. It is to be hoped they will take up the question with the rulers of the States without avoidable delay.

* * *

PROTECTION TO IRON AND STEEL.

THE report of the Tariff Board on the Iron and Steel industry published during the last fortnight follows lines already laid down in the former enquiries of the Board regarding this industry. A quantitative study of the conditions in the iron and steel industry in India is rendered comparatively easy by the fact that it is in effect a one-firm industry. The Tariff Board have made the usual study of the technical equipment and efficiency of the Tata Co. and made the usual estimates regarding the present and future works costs. The Board has then gone on to determine the prices at which competing products can be landed in India ex-duty and have thus arrived at the degree of protection necessary for maintaining the Indian industry in a healthy condition. The Indian iron and steel industry enjoys a special advantage with regard to pig iron production—an advantage which the Tariff Board calculate at Rs. 8 per ton in comparison with Continental producers. The Indian industry is also, we are told, fairly well equipped and is managed with more than average efficiency. It is thus obvious that it should not stand in need of protection any longer. The Tariff Board admit this and base their recommendation for continued protection for another period of seven years on the fact that the prices charged for Continental steel in the Indian market are unduly low and that in effect these goods are dumped.

This may be so; and there would be a general agreement that important established industries of any country must be protected against this sort of unfair competition by its Government. Unfortunately, however, this charge of dumping is not adequately examined by the Board anywhere in its report. Continental steel has been sold cheaply in the Indian markets over a series of years and if a charge of dumping is to be substantiated it must be proved that the prices charged in India are specially lower than those in the home or other markets. The question is an important one. For if the view of the Tariff Board is correct then the Indian iron and steel industry may be held to be an industry that can now dispense with protection as against ordinary competition, and that it does require protection to-day is the result merely of abnormal conditions. In that case, however, an elaborate scheme for a seven-year protection seems uncalled-for. It cannot be imagined that any industry, however strongly entrenched, can go on following a dumping policy on a large scale for a long period or that it will follow such a policy once it realises that foreign Governments take prompt measures to protect their industries from its effects. On this basis, therefore, it seems clear to us that a lengthened and elaborate protective regime gives excessive protection to the industry concerned. Such a case would best be met by conducting a direct enquiry into the fact of dumping and giving the executive powers to take adequate steps against it. This is a fundamental point in which we fail to agree with the attitude adopted by the Tariff Board. The older methods of determining the difference between prices

of competing and home industries were proper when the home industry was taken to be an "infant industry." They are not adequate, however, when the basis of protection is changed.

It will be realised that this is all the more important when we consider that the protective scheme now proposed is in effect directed entirely against Continental, i. e., non-British imports. The duties recommended to be levied on British goods are nowhere larger than 10 p. c., while those recommended against the Continental imports are higher than those recommended by the Board in 1926 in the case of structurals, bars and galvanised sheets and lower only in the case of plates and black sheets. The protective duty recommended for structurals is higher even than the existing specific duty. For rails, fishplates and sleepers, where no discrimination obtains, an entire abolition of the protective duty is recommended. In effect, therefore, the position is left largely unchanged and the burden on the consumer of Continental steel continues to be heavy.

The Board base their scheme of differentiation on the same grounds of convenience on which it was originally proposed in 1926; they have examined, however, specifically the supplementary steel agreement effected at Ottawa and the possibility of its continuance. The Board finds that the agreement has worked fairly smoothly so far as the exports to U.K. of pig and foundry iron were concerned. In the opinion of the Board this part of the agreement was also of some benefit to India. The galvanised sheets agreement did not, however, work smoothly and the machinery provided for in the agreement specially failed in maintaining the stipulated minimum price for the consumers. The Board find that it is no longer necessary for the galvanised sheets agreement to be continued, but they still recommend the continuance of preferential treatment to British galvanised sheets. This they base on the expectation that the preference will induce British authorities to continue the preferential treatment of Indian pig iron. The Board state in the report that the Tata Co. has already received notice from U. K. producers that they desire to change the terms of the agreement and that the attitude of U. K. regarding the future is uncertain. In the circumstances it seems to us premature to confer this concession on British galvanised sheets. It was because the cotton and the iron and steel preferences were given in advance that they could not be made to weigh properly at the time of the Ottawa agreement. The galvanised sheet preference, therefore, ought not to be given away unless we make sure of securing an adequate return. It is interesting in this connection to note that the Board have had occasion to take exception to the policy of the British National Federation of Iron and Steel Manufacturers in granting rebates on exports to India as leading to an upsetting of the careful scheme of protection formulated by the Board.

We may also consider briefly an issue raised by the Tariff Board's discussion of freight disadvantages.

The Tata Co. claims that on account of the long road haulage involved before its products can reach many parts of India a special allowance should be made over and above the fair market price on which to base the extent of protection. The Board, though differing from the Co. in its estimation of the extent of this disadvantage, has allowed the claim in principle. The steel industry in India is highly localised and is situated, from the point of view of important provinces like Madras, Punjab and Bombay in an awkward place. The Tariff Board contemplate the possibility of another steel works coming into existence; but physical factors so govern the situation that even if a new work comes into being it must be situated in the same area as the Tata Co. Now the claim of the Tata Co. implies that it considers the whole of India as a market that should necessarily be guaranteed to it. Such a claim was examined by the Tariff Board in connection with the cement industry some years ago and held untenable. The fact that re-rolling mills have come into existence in India during the last few years and that they largely use imported billets shows how heavily the costs of transportation bear on consumers far from Jamshedpur. The charge becomes specially onerous in case of subsidiary industries using imported Continental steel and poor consumers of such products as galvanized sheets. The Tata Co. supplies only a small proportion of the total Indian demand for galvanized sheets. Given a fair expansion of the industry with plants with economic production there is no justification for giving the Company the monopoly of a market beyond these limits. As a matter of fact in cases like that of galvanized sheets we have always favoured a method like the subsidy as against the general protective tariff. That India is one customs area should not be allowed to obscure the fact of the wide areas and diversity of the markets therein and the claim to protection of an industry must be considered in relation only to that part of India to which it can economically supply its products. This consideration is, of course, specially relevant to highly localised basic industries like iron and steel. We consider, therefore, that the unqualified admission by the Tariff Board of the freight disadvantages claim is unjustified and bears heavily on the more distant Indian markets of the Tata Co.

HOW BEST TO PROVE UNACCEPTABILITY?

THE one object of the Congress in contesting the ensuing Assembly elections is to demonstrate to His Majesty's Government how utterly unacceptable to the country the reforms proposals contained in the White Paper are. This object can best be achieved, it apparently thinks, by the Congress candidates capturing as many seats as they can. In making this assumption and in proceeding on this basis we are afraid the Congress is not going about the business in the best way possible.

If it were the case that the proffered reforms were acceptable to all the other parties but unacceptable to the Congress, the Congress would be perfectly entitled, and indeed it would be its duty, to show by fighting the elections on this issue and winning a majority of seats that the country was with it rather

than with the other parties. If it were the case either that, no matter in what way public opinion expressed itself, we could rely upon Government giving effect to it in their measures, even then the Congress would be right to go its own way in the electoral contest, without thinking of co-operation with other parties.

But neither of these premises is correct. All the progressive parties in the country are agreed in holding that the White Paper proposals are unacceptable and are quite willing to give an authoritative expression to this opinion in the Assembly without fear of consequences. Nor is Government in a mood to treat the Congress, however largely representative it may in fact be of the country at large, as more than a faction. Even if the Congress should therefore be able, in virtue of the numerical strength of its own members, to carry a resolution in the Assembly condemning the White Paper, Government would still try to impose the White Paper constitution upon the country on the plea that the Congress alone was hostile to the reforms but that other parties were favourable. It is clear from this that if the Congress wishes to have the proposed reforms scrapped, in order that the stage be cleared for reforms of the kind desired by the people, it must take care to leave no excuse for Government to pretend that non-Congress parties are behind the Hoare scheme, though they might not have pulled their full weight in elections.

We are glad to find corroboration of this view in a leading article in the *Tribune* of Sunday last. Commenting upon Mr. Vallabhbhai's recent speech in Bombay, in which he pleaded for the return of as many Congressmen as possible to the Assembly in order to maintain the prestige of the Congress in the trial of strength which, according to the speaker, was to take place between it and Government in the elections, our contemporary generally supports the plea but makes two "essential and vitally important reservations," the first of which it sets out as follows:

But having said this, let us hasten to make it clear that it would be a grievous mistake for the Congress to look upon all other parties in the country as prospective or actual adherents of the Government, to fight all of them single-handed at the election, as if they were so many limbs of the Government. Such an attitude would not only involve grave injustice to the non-Congress progressive parties in the country, but be supremely inexpedient. Nobody can deny that on the major issues now before the country, the White Paper and the policy of repression which the Government has been following these two years and more, the progressive sections of both the Liberal party and the party of independent Nationalists are in fundamental agreement with the Congress; and if it is, indeed, the case that the Congress is entering the Councils with the principal object of giving a fight to the Government over these issues, surely it stands to reason that it should not adopt an attitude of uncompromising hostility to candidates representing these groups of the non-Congress progressive parties.

The idea that even an indifferent Congressman is better than the best Liberal or Independent candidate is as essentially wrong as the idea once attributed to a distinguished Muslim leader that the worst Muslim was better than the best non-Muslim. In our opinion justice requires that no front rank Liberal or independent Nationalist candidate should, in any case, be opposed by an indifferent Congress candidate if there is a reasonable assurance that the former will join the Congress in rejecting the White Paper and condemning the repressive policy. And this is also the course that expediency dictates, because it is perfectly certain that constituted as the Legislatures are, it is impossible for the Congress to capture an absolute majority of seats either in the Assembly or in the more important of the provincial Legislatures. Sooner or later

an alliance will have to be formed, and the sooner it is formed the better for both the Congress and the country.

While we are in complete agreement with our contemporary's conclusion, we have no wish to rest it on the ground of justice as our contemporary does. It would not be unjust at all for the Congress to get as many Congressmen elected as possible even when on the reforms issue non-Congress politicians of advanced views are at one with them. It is quite fair for every party to play its own hand. What would be not only unjust but dishonest is to indulge in misrepresentations of the motives and programmes of other parties. "A vote for a non-Congressman is a vote for Hoare" is clearly such a misrepresentation, and there is no doubt that some Congressmen are guilty of similar gross distortions of facts. Such behaviour merits the severest condemnation of all decent-minded people. But if the Congress, without resorting to dishonourable tactics like these, sought the voters' suffrages for Congressmen in preference to other progressives who thought alike on the question of reforms, it would be perfectly within its rights to do so.

Only it would be very short-sighted. For, after all, what the Congress seeks to prove by winning the election is not that the reforms are unacceptable to it but that they are unacceptable to the people in general. Of course it can contend that because it has obtained a larger number of seats than other parties, it represents the country and that if it rejects the reforms, the country as a whole rejects them. This is thoroughly sound logic, but politically it is not quite so effective. For it will give Sir Samuel Hoare an opportunity, which we are sure he will exploit to the full, of representing to the world that the Congress has always been an anti-Government organisation and that it would be to India's interest to ignore this body of intransigents and confer upon India the liberal reforms which he is contemplating in spite of Congress opposition. England must not swerve from her path of duty and allow the Congress in its cussedness to balk the Indian people who are easily misled of the swaraj that is intended for their benefit.

To stand back when one can rush forward in glory is a difficult matter, but the country's interests sometimes demand this kind of self-sacrifice. If it can be proved that the reforms are unacceptable, not only to an Assembly composed as to a majority mainly of Congressmen, but to an Assembly composed of all the progressive parties in the country who hold diverse opinions on other matters but are united as one man in fighting the reform proposals, none can deny that it would be far more difficult for Government to foist upon India the constitution that it has framed without effecting thorough-going improvements therein. We would therefore suggest, if we could be sure of our motives not being misunderstood, not only with the *Tribune*, that an indifferent Congressman should not be preferred to a sound Liberal or Independent (sound, that is to say, on the reforms issue), but that a sound Liberal or Independent should as a matter of deliberate policy be preferred to a sound Congressman, and the Congress should actively help put in as many non-Congressmen as possible, so that it can be demonstrated beyond peradventure that A MODERATE INDIA AS WELL AS AN EXTREMIST INDIA DECLINES TO ACCEPT (to use the formula suggested by the *Tribune*) THE WHITE PAPER PROPOSALS. It would be the best possible challenge for this country to throw down to Sir Samuel Hoare. Let him impose his constitution upon a united India if he dares!

SELF-DETERMINATION OF STATES' PEOPLE.

AT the back of all the questions that the people of the Indian States have taken up with Mahatma Gandhi is the fundamental question whether he and the Congress will let the States' people speak for the States in the Constituent Assembly which the Congress intends to set up for formulating the future constitution of India. If this is allowed, the particular questions that they have raised, like the election of the States' representatives in the federal legislature and the guaranteeing of fundamental rights will be solved to their satisfaction without their having to fight separately for them.

The Round Table Conferences contained representatives of the people and the Government in British India and representatives of the Governments of the Indian States. There were none at these Conferences who could be regarded as spokesmen of the Indian States' people. No one bothered at any stage to point out this obvious deficiency, not even Mahatma Gandhi. The Liberal leaders were attacked roundly in the Congress press when they attended the first Round Table Conference in 1930—without the Mahatma, who was asked but did not choose to go to the Conference. The Congress press, however, had no fault to find with Mahatma Gandhi who attended the second Round Table Conference in 1931—without the States' people, who were willing to go to the Conference but were not asked. Apparently Mahatma Gandhi accepted fully the legalistic view which the Governments both in British India and Indian India put forward, viz. that in autocratically governed States the people there in had no place in such constitutional discussions as were to go forward.

But the Constituent Assembly should change all this. For the underlying idea of this gathering is that in framing the constitution the people alone are to have a voice, the part of Government in this business being merely that of implementing the decisions at which the people may arrive. So far at any rate as British India is concerned, the position is perfectly clear. The Constituent Assembly will be elected on the basis of adult suffrage or something near it; it will produce a constitution which, in its opinion, ought to be brought into force in British India; and finally it will lay this constitution before the British Government asking it to give effect to it.

If it were a constitution for British India alone that was thought of, the Constituent Assembly would be composed of British Indians alone. But an all-India federation is being contemplated, and the Constituent Assembly will have to consist of the States' representatives too. The point has not been explicitly stated, but it is inconceivable that the representatives of the Indian States on the Constituent Assembly will be the rulers or their nominees. They will, by a parity of reasoning, have to be elected from among the States' people on the same system of franchise as will be brought into force in British India. An all-India federation will be possible only if there is agreement between British India and the Indian States, but the parties to the agreement in this case will be the people in British India and the Indian States. The rulers in the Indian States will play no part in the preliminary consultations, but they will be called upon like the rulers in British India to carry into effect the arrangements that will be mutually agreed upon by the peoples in the two halves of India.

The idea of the Constituent Assembly necessarily implies all this, though it is a question whether the Congress leaders who propound it have fully grasped all its implications. I would

suggest to the workers in the States' people's cause not to worry too much about election and other specific issues, but to concentrate on this broad question. Let them ask the Mahatma to state in public what precisely the Constituent Assembly signifies, so far as the States' people are concerned. Whom will he admit into this Assembly as being entitled to speak on behalf of the States? If he will admit the people and the people alone, he will have to concede not only election and a Bill of Rights, at which he appears to boggle so much at present, but many more things besides. And the principle of non-interference, which he now invokes, in the affairs of the States will also be thrown to the winds, almost without his knowing it.

For the agreement that will be arrived at between the people in British India and the Indian States will have to be enforced by the Governments in these territories. This will not come about without a struggle, and this struggle will necessarily have to be carried on conjointly by the people of both Indias. It cannot be that the British Government will be tackled by the British Indian people alone and the States' Governments by the States' people alone. The existing isolation between the two peoples, which the Mahatma too along with the Princes wants to perpetuate, will thus no longer be possible, and the States' people will get all they want — without the Mahatma being made to recant in public all the fallacious statements which go so much to swell the debit side of his account.

A. V. PATVARDHAN.

Our London Letter.

(BY AIR MAIL.)

(From Our Correspondent.)

LONDON, July 13.

INDIANS IN ZANZIBAR.

THE legislative disaster that has just befallen, with a devastating suddenness, the Zanzibar Indian community must have come as a shock to Indian opinion, as it has to the few experts in this country on matters relating to Indians overseas. If there was one spot within the British Imperial sphere of influence where it was believed that Indians might expect to enjoy conditions of peace, quiet, and security, it was surely Zanzibar, with which place they had had an honoured connection of several centuries' duration. Africans, Arabs and Indians, each performing an independent and mutually advantageous function, had lived side by side under the rule of the Sultans for generation after generation. The Indians had played a commercial role of the greatest distinction, decade after decade. It is, however, apparently another case of bad currency driving out good, and the evil racial example constantly being set by Kenya was bound, sooner or later, to spread to the adjacent territories. Uganda and Tanganyika have already been tainted with the Kenya influence, and now it has attacked the Zanzibar Protectorate. It is no fault of the Sultan who is himself little more than a figurehead, and is virtually obliged to sign the decrees put before him by the local British administration, after having obtained nominal sanction for them in the official-ridden Legislative Council.

It would appear that for some time past the white population of the Protectorate, or at any rate a section of it, has been casting longing eyes upon the control of the clove industry, with a view to the establishment of a virtual monopoly. If Mr. B. H.

Wiggins, formerly Attorney-General of Zanzibar, and the only unofficial English member of the Legislative Council, is right (and there is no reason to doubt his statements or his bona fides), it is clear that, as he stated in the Legislature, in the debate on the Alienation of Land Bill, "the present Government during this three years has been either consciously or subconsciously definitely anti-Indian. This feeling has increased each year until we have reached the climax of the introduction of this Bill." It is difficult to believe that this anti-Indian sentiment would have progressed to the present point had it not been for the deliberate effort promoted from Kenya to prefer British commercial interests over the rival Indian interests. Much, therefore, of the talk of protecting the welfare and the interests of the African and Arab landowners from the deprivations of the wicked Indian moneylenders, bears a painful resemblance to the hypocritical eyewash with which we have become so familiar in the course of Kenya history during the last twenty years and more.

The local Indian community has naturally turned to the Indians Overseas Association in London for help in this crisis, and its President, His Highness the Aga Khan, is naturally very deeply concerned in the matter. I am in a position to state that urgent representations have this week been made to the Imperial Indian Citizenship Association and other organisations in India, both party and non-party, urging that the matter should be dealt with as one of emergency and in a strictly non-party spirit, with a view to making a nation-wide protest through the Government of India to His Majesty's Government against legislation calculated to ruin the economic position of the Zanzibar Indians, to promote racial friction in a place where it has been hitherto happily absent, and to impose fresh humiliation within the Empire upon India. So soon as it is known what steps in aid are being taken at Simla, I understand that corresponding measures will be taken here in the proper quarters. The principal difficulty in the way of immediate action is the fact that events in Zanzibar have taken place with such unreasonable rapidity that the fullest information on the subject can hardly yet have reached either India or this country, and that here with the rapid approach of the end of the session and the concentration of public attention upon many matters of major importance, it becomes increasingly difficult to obtain the ear of the Government and to secure the collaboration of friendly men in public life.

Fortunately Mr. Beharilal Anantani, the public-spirited Hon. Secretary of the Zanzibar National Indian Association and the Editor of the *Zanzibar Voice* is now in London on private business, and can be of the greatest assistance in the present situation.

DIEHARDS AND MANCHESTER.

The President of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce has received a requisition for a special meeting of the Chamber from 148 members, who think that the original draft of the Chamber's evidence before the Joint Select Committee should have been adhered to. The requisition asks for a special meeting to consider the following resolution:

"That the original proposals of the Chamber for safeguarding British trade in India, as tendered to the Joint Select Committee, but not hitherto submitted to the members of the Chamber as a whole, are hereby reaffirmed as vitally necessary for the preservation of such trade and as expressing the true opinion and needs of Lancashire business interests. That a copy of this resolution, with a statement of such safeguards, be forthwith forwarded to the members of the Joint Select Committee and to His Majesty's Ministers."

Mr. Bond, the President, in his address to the half-yearly meeting of the Chamber, this week, had no

difficulty in obtaining the unanimous support of his fellow-members for his effective condemnation of the breach of confidence committed by certain members of the Committee who had divulged to outsiders selected portions of the Committee's proceedings, which enabled them to encourage Mr. Churchill to make his attack upon Sir Samuel Hoare and Lord Derby, which subsequently resulted in an investigation by the Committee of Privileges. The Chamber unanimously confirmed the decision not to print and publish the papers which the Committee of Privileges declared in the public interests should not be printed.

THE JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

The Joint Select Committee is going through a usual committee procedure in the preparation of its Report. It is virtually impossible at the moment to say, with any degree of authority, when the Report will appear, but from indications that have appeared during the week, there seems to be renewed hope, in well informed circles, that the Committee will be able to produce its report by the end of October. Certainly those members who have been most closely associated with Indian affairs within the last few years are not in the least likely to be any party to unnecessary delay in the accomplishment of a task that has occupied so much of their energies and efforts. In official circles, too, it is learnt that every effort is being made to expedite the technical side of things, and I should not be in the least surprised to find the Bill embodying the Government's proposals appearing within a very short time of the production of the Report, and passing through its preliminary stages in Parliament before the end of the year. Every effort will presumably be made to keep to the rough programme which the Government are believed to have outlined for themselves in order to ensure the passage of the Bill with the minimum of delay. There are many reasons for this, chief among them being the time factor. The year 1935 will be a critical year for the Government. It will be primarily an India year and the Government will have to play for safety to the maximum extent possible. The diehards will at every stage try to wreck the scheme and the Government's main anxiety will be to retain the confidence of the bulk of the members of the Tory Party, without which it will not be possible to get the Bill through the House of Lords. This will undoubtedly mean certain compromises which are bound to be distasteful to Indian opinion in almost all active political quarters. These compromises will, in the first place, find themselves in the Report of the Joint Select Committee, and they may ultimately have to be substantially embodied in the Bill itself, if Mr. Baldwin is to succeed, as he expressed the hope at Bewdsey, in carrying a united Tory Party at the General Election due in 1936. A well-informed authority expressed the view this week that the Government would be likely to go to the country upon a favourable Budget. All kinds of extraneous matters are bound to be dragged into the controversy at the polls, in order to prevent the return of the Socialists to power. We may, therefore, anticipate all kinds of irrelevant alarms and excursions in order to secure what is euphemistically called "another National Government," and the Party managers will therefore do their best to have the Indian question well out of the way before the General Election. Thus the chief question during the next few months is whether they or the diehards will display the greater political astuteness. So far as the diehards are concerned, they will be entirely unscrupulous in seeking and using opportunities to embarrass the Government.

INDIA AND THE I. L. O.

Mr. Harold Butler's lecture to the East India

Association this week on "India and the International Labour Organisation", with the High Commissioner in the chair, was an interesting and suggestive effort, as will be observed when the text of the address reaches India. Mr. Butler had to steer a middle course between official responsibility and personal opinion. Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra was entirely non-committal, and Mr. Clow, Joint Secretary to the Government of India in the Department of Industry and Labour, had to make it perfectly clear that in putting forward the suggestion that the International Labour Conference might occasionally meet outside Europe, he was doing so entirely upon his own personal responsibility. He succeeded, however, in putting forward the view that one of the difficulties under which Geneva laboured was its inability to get away from a Western European industrial atmosphere. This is largely due, among other things, to the relative paucity of the Asiatic personnel at the I. L. O. Sir Homi Mehta put the well-known Indian millowners' point of view regarding the inefficiency of Indian labour, and Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, who declared himself a convinced Genevist from his recent experience at the Conference and his recognition of the service rendered by the Organisation as a sound-board for Indian labour, exercised admirable self-control in refraining from an onslaught (verbal, of course) upon Sir Homi. Mr. Erulkar, the President of the Indian Chamber of Commerce in Great Britain, also spoke in complimentary terms of Mr. Harold Butler and the service rendered by the Organisation to Indian interests.

Mirabai, who spent the weekend at Birmingham explaining her mission to friendly groups there, has been in touch with the India Office in an informal way, and I understand that Miss Agatha Harrison, yesterday, had the opportunity of a short talk with the Secretary of State for India. Doubtless she took the opportunity, as she has done at various functions given in her honour since her return, to place before Sir Samuel Hoare some of the matters and personalities that have come under her observation during her recent tour in India. Miss Muriel Lester, too, has been busy meeting a number of friends since her return to London and in preparation for a further visit to the Far East in October.

Miscellaneous.

MILLOWNERS' "WAGE REDUCTION" SCHEME.

Mr. R. R. Bakhale has issued a statement to the press with regard to the scheme of standardised wages put forward by the Bombay Millowners' Association. He says:

THE main features of the scheme of the Bombay Millowners' Association for the payment of wages are as follows:—

- (1) Consolidation of wages of the time workers by amalgamating the basic rates and the dear food allowance. All the mills in Bombay belonging to the Association are ordered to effect such consolidation at the earliest possible date.
- (2) The Association has prescribed minimum consolidated rates of wages for the time workers, below which none of its local mills is allowed to go. These minimum wages have come into operation from the 1st of July.

- (3) In the case of piece workers, there is neither the consolidation of wages nor the fixation of minimum wage. Their basic rates will continue to be in the same chaotic condition as hitherto; but the standard dear food allowance of 80% which the workers have been getting since 1920, has been reduced from the 1st of July to a minimum of 35% below which no local mill of the Association is permitted to go.
- (4) After the introduction of a 54-hour week, the minimum dear food allowance will be increased from 35% to 40%.

A HYBRID SCHEME.

There is no one feature of the scheme which is common to the whole industry. It may be called partly a consolidation of wages scheme and partly a minimum wage scheme; but it is not a standardisation scheme. It is indeed a hybrid combination of several factors the cumulative effect of which is an all round reduction in the earnings of the workers in almost every occupation of the textile industry. The Labour Office Report has shown that, as compared with July 1926, the earnings had been reduced by 16.94% by December, 1933. The scheme of the Millowners' Association has further reduced the earnings in those mills which will be put on the minimum rates, by 7.7% in the case of time workers and by 20% in the case of piece workers. Thus between July 1926 and July 1934, the earnings of the time workers on the minimum wage basis and those of the piece workers on the basis of minimum allowance, assuming that their basic rates are not disturbed, will have been reduced by 24.64 per cent. and 36.94 per cent. respectively :

IMPLICATIONS OF THE SCHEME.

To understand clearly the full implications of the scheme, it is not enough only to know its main features. It is equally essential to examine what is permissible under it even though it may not have been prescribed by it. In the first place, the consolidation of the basic rates of wages and allowance partially gives effect to the recommendation of the Fawcett Committee. It is confined only to the time workers whereas the Committee has recommended consolidation for the whole industry. In the absence of a time limit, one does not know when even this partial consolidation will fully come into operation. Those who are familiar with the employers' methods of wage cuts, may not be surprised if the delay is intended firstly to ascertain the number of workers and mills that may be affected by the minimum wage proposed and then to effect the consolidation on as low a level as possible. Secondly, though the scheme prescribes minimum consolidated wages for the time workers and minimum allowance for the piece workers, it keeps the mills, which are paying above these minima, in a nebulous condition. The scheme does not say that such mills shall maintain the present high rates of wages and allowances; nor does it say they shall come down to the minimum. But the scheme does not prevent those mills from coming down even to the level of the minimum. Perhaps the Millowners' Association proposes to continue the policy which it has followed since March, 1933, viz., to permit the mills which are at present paying more than the minimum rates of wages and allowances, to bring down their rates and allowances mill by mill as it suits their convenience so as to prevent joint resistance by the workers. When, for example, 23 out of 38 mills with unrationalised occupations begin to pay their ring spinners minimum time rates and when 16 of such mills pay a minimum allowance of 35 per cent. the temptation for the mills paying

higher rates and allowances to reduce them becomes difficult to resist. The scheme should have provided that there shall be no levelling down. It should have also provided for levelling up the wages either to the highest level at which some mills can pay and are paying today (and, therefore, other mills also can pay, if improved in other directions) or at least to the average level. The absence of such provisions creates scope for the maximum and the average levels tending to become the minimum and the risk of the higher wages being reduced.

LOOPHOLES TO EVADE THE EFFECT OF MINIMUM ALLOWANCE.

Thirdly, fixing the dear food allowance at 35% as the minimum has neither consolidated the wages of the piece workers nor provided a minimum wage for them. It is difficult to understand the object that is sought to be achieved by arbitrarily fixing only the allowance at a certain minimum unless it be to reduce at one stroke the earnings of the workers. The consolidation of the wages of the time workers on the minimum basis creates uniformity at least at the bottom, though the minimum that has been fixed is neither adequate nor fair and reasonable. Fixing the allowance at the minimum level does not achieve even this uniformity at the bottom because the basic rates which have caused serious heart-burnings in the past owing to their disparity which has been sharply criticised by the Tariff Board and other authoritative bodies, are not at all touched. On the other hand, fixing the allowance at a minimum without any consideration to the total earnings has created anomalies of a serious character which will annoy not only the workers but even some of the employers who may be adversely affected. This can be better illustrated by the following table :—

Average daily earnings in mills paying dear food allowance at

30%	35%	40%	45%	50%	55%	60%	67%
1-14-5	1-6-8		1-0-9	1-7-2	1-6-7	1-4-10	1-7-6
1-10-4	1-4-1		1-4-1	1-7-4	1-8-11	1-9-10	
	1-15-0	1-14-10	1-4-11	1-8-11	1-9-1		
	1-13-10				1-9-8		
					1-10-10		

The following important points emerge from this table :—

(1) The percentage of allowance bears no relation to the earnings.

(2) The two mills paying 30 p. c. allowance will be forced to increase their allowance to 35 p. c., even though the earnings in them are higher than in most of the mills paying an allowance of 45 p. c. and more. In order to enable them to compete in the market, these two mills may be compelled to reduce, which is not disallowed under the scheme, their basic rates so as to bring the total earnings in line with those in other mills.

(3) The last two of the four mills paying 35 p. c. allowance may be similarly compelled to reduce their basic rates, even though they are not required to increase their allowance. But their earnings are considerably higher than most of the other mills paying more allowances.

(4) The mill paying 40 p. c. allowance and other mills paying more allowance, may be tempted to reduce it on the ground that it is higher than that in other mills, even though the earnings are lower than those in others. They are also not prevented from reducing the basic rates.

The different methods of reduction which have been indicated above are all permissible under the scheme. The net result of fixing the dear food allowance at a

minimum without touching the basic rates and without prescribing any limit below which the total earnings of the piece workers shall not be allowed to go, will, therefore, be that the wage position of the Bombay textile industry will continue to be more chaotic and anarchical than before and that the reductions that may ultimately take place may be found to be much more than can be anticipated at present.

EFFECT ON THE EARNINGS.

With these inherent defects in the scheme, it has become very difficult to ascertain its full effect on the earnings of the workers. A well-thought out scheme for the payment of wages generally starts on the basis of an average wage which a worker in every occupation is expected to get. The 1928 standardisation scheme of the Millowners' Association was framed on this basis and was thus able to secure, with some modifications, the approval of the Fawcett Committee. The present scheme has no such basis and, therefore, the average wage for every occupation in the industry cannot be ascertained until it is seen how the mills paying higher rates and allowances than the minima laid down, react to the scheme. The Millowners' Association, however, has claimed that, as a result of the introduction of the scheme, the wages in a number of mills will go up. The claim is unfounded and must be resisted. It can be asserted without any fear of contradiction that under the new scheme there is hardly any occupation in the industry the earnings in which will be above, or at least equal to, those prevailing before March, 1933, when the reductions began to be made. Moreover, it is the number of workers affected, and not the mills, which should form the basis of wage comparisons; but this number is not available today. If the millowners' claim is made for the whole industry, it is absurd for the simple reason that the scheme is not based on any average wage figure for any occupation and, therefore, no comparison with the past wages is at present possible. If, however, the claim is confined only to those mills which have to go up to the minimum level, it cannot be accepted without serious qualifications. Take, for example the piece workers. Only 7 out of 38 mills with unrationised occupations will be required to increase their allowance to the minimum of 35%. But it has already been shown that raising the allowance to the minimum does not necessarily mean an increase in earnings. There are loopholes in the scheme to which attention has been drawn above, under which the probabilities are for the earnings to go down in spite of an increase in the allowance to the minimum. If the probable minimum earnings under the scheme are compared with the earnings in December, 1933, the number of mills going up to the minimum for different occupations is as follows:—

<i>Piece Workers.</i>		<i>Time Workers.</i>	
	No. of mills.		No. of mills
Drawing Tenters	1	Ring Siders	23
Slubbing "	4	Tarwallas	22
Inter "	6	Doffer Boys	25
Roving	4		
Weavers	12		
Winders-Grey	9		
Winders-Colour	21		
Reelers	11		

The comparison of winders' and reelers' wages is vitiated by the fact that they generally do not get full time employment. The comparison of probable minimum earnings under the scheme with December, 1933 wages for other piece workers in relation to the number of mills going up to the minimum, shows

that, in fixing the minimum allowance, the standard of a bad, and not an average, mill is adopted. It is true that the number of mills going up to the minimum in the case of time workers is comparatively high. But this only shows to what scandalously low level the wages had been reduced by the end of December. Further, it needs to be emphasised here that what little rise in earnings the millowners claim, is confined to only such mills as may have to come to the minimum level and is in relation only with December 1933 wages, which contain an average reduction of 16.94p.c. over the 1926 wages. The Millowners' Association seems to have accepted as an accomplished fact the wage cuts that have so far taken place and their claim of a rise in wages is confined only to a few minor adjustments at the bottom.

PRINCIPLES OF MINIMUM WAGE.

This leads one to the consideration of the adequacy or otherwise of the minimum wage prescribed for the time workers and the probable minimum wage that the piece workers are expected to get under the scheme. The Millowners' Association has introduced, for the first time, the principle of minimum wage for a section of the industry. No possible objection can be taken to this step provided the minimum fixed is a living wage. In fact the adoption of the minimum wage principle is considered necessary particularly in times of depression. There are many countries in the world which have prescribed a minimum wage for their industrial workers, and a few countries, even for their agricultural workers. But it is through the intervention of the State that the principle is given effect to. It is also the State which devises suitable machinery to prescribe and regulate the minimum wage. It may further be pointed out that where such machinery takes the form of compulsory arbitration, the minimum wage once fixed is not allowed to be altered without the consent of the arbitrators. In the scheme of the Millowners' Association, all these important features of the minimum wage principle are conspicuous by their absence. Apart from the question whether the rates of wages prescribed as minimum wage, are adequate or not, the methods by which the principle has been sought to be introduced are highly objectionable and must be altered by the intervention of the State if justice is to be done to the working classes.

TESTS TO DETERMINE MINIMUM WAGE.

Among the tests that are applied to determine the adequacy or otherwise of the minimum wage prescribed, there are three tests which are most important and generally applied. They are: whether the minimum wage is (1) a living wage; or (2) a fair wage; or (3) a wage based on the principle of "the ability of the industry to pay." It is necessary to examine briefly the scheme of the Millowners' Association by applying to it those three tests to find out whether it satisfies any or all of them.

A LIVING WAGE

Different statutes in different countries have defined a living wage in different ways. But the idea that is generally conveyed by these definitions and by the interpretations put upon them by competent authorities dealing with the fixation of minimum wage, is that a living wage is a wage which is adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of life. How far remote the standard of life of the textile workers is from a reasonable standard of life has been shown in the past by Government Committees and other authorities including the Whitley Commission. Their severe indictment of the miserable housing and sanitary conditions, poor dietary and physique, lack of family life, child mortality, sickness, etc., is an eloquent commentary on the low level to which the standard

of life has been reduced. It is also an admitted fact that the average working class family is in debt to the extent of Rs. 130, the usual rate of interest being 75 p. c. Such was the position when a two-loom weaver and one side spinner, to take only two most important classes of workers, were getting an average daily wage of Re. 1-13-4 and Re. 1-0-3 respectively. The position will get worse when the same two classes of workers begin to get a minimum daily wage of Re. 1-6-0 and Re. 0-13-0 respectively—a heavy reduction of 25 p. c. and 20 p. c. According to the Labour Office report, average monthly expenditure of a working class family in Bombay in 1932-33 was Rs. 45-15-6. It has already been pointed out that this budget is not complete and cannot be considered as wholly accurate. Taking 1.5 earners for each family, the minimum income of the piece worker's family and that of the time worker's family will, under the millowners' scheme, come to Rs. 34-2-0 and Rs. 29-13-9 respectively. The monthly deficit will thus be enormous and to that extent the debts will be piled up. It is, therefore, clear that the minimum rates of wages fixed by the Millowners' Association fall far too short of the Living Wage.

A FAIR WAGE.

A Fair Wage is described as a wage generally paid in the district to the workers of the same profession, of average skill, working in factories and performing the customary work of the trade. According to this description, the wages of the textile workers in Bombay and Ahmedabad where, it should be remembered, the cost of living is less than in Bombay, can be compared to ascertain whether the minimum wage rates prescribed under the Millowners' scheme are fair. To take again the weaver and the spinner, it will be seen that the Ahmedabad weaver's and spinner's daily average wages are Re. 1-14-11 and Re. 1-0-10 as against the minima of Re. 1-6-0 and Re. 0-13-0 of the Bombay weaver and spinner respectively—a difference of 28.8 p. c. and 22.7 p. c. in favour of Ahmedabad. Having regard to the fact that the Ahmedabad wage, higher though it is than that of Bombay, is not considered an adequate living wage as it falls short of the average monthly expenditure of an average working class family which has been fixed by the Umpire at Rs. 49-13-6, Bombay's position gets still worse under this test of "Fair" wages.

ABILITY OF THE INDUSTRY TO PAY.

Considerable stress is often laid by the Millowners on the third test, viz., the ability of the industry to pay and it is complained that the workers and their representatives do not give adequate consideration to it. The complaint is unfounded and cannot be substantiated by facts. In its memorandum submitted to the Whitley Commission, the Bombay Textile Labour Union stated that it "is ready to reconsider its demand for fixation of a minimum wage at the rate indicated below (Rs. 30), if the Union is satisfied that the millowners have explored all the available sources of effecting economies in the cost of production and that the only item then left is wages". On the other hand, it is not uncommon that under the guise of applying the test of the ability to pay, the employer, when anxious to meet the stress of competition, shows a temptation to seize upon wages as being the element of cost which can most easily and substantially be reduced. In applying this test of the ability of the industry to pay, almost all countries have found serious difficulties in defining the industry and ascertaining the correct measure of the ability to pay. Moreover, the ability to pay is bound to vary according to the degree of the efficiency of the firms which compose the industry. The ability to pay does not also mean

the ability of the weakest mill in the industry. It is the ability of the average mill that is generally considered. In examining the claims of the industry for protection, the Tariff Board has taken into account the mill of an average, and not the lowest, efficiency. The economists have, therefore, reached the conclusion that the principle of fixing wages which the trade can bear provides no precise criterion. On the other hand, it has been stated by E. M. Burns in her book on "Wages and the State" that there has been a tendency to apply the principle rather as a reason for making downward adjustments than as justifying an increase. That is to say, it has been accompanied by an underlying theory of minimum profits, below which none of the chosen employers should be allowed to go".

AHMEDABAD & BOMBAY.

Although it may be difficult to measure the degree of the efficiency of the industry, it is not so difficult to compare the relative efficiency of the two centres, Ahmedabad and Bombay. It is an admitted fact that in 1926 Bombay wages were slightly higher than those in Ahmedabad and that since then the earnings at the former centre have been reduced by 16.94% till December, 1933, and after that, under the Millowners' scheme, they will be further reduced by 20 p. c. in the case of piece workers and 7.7 p. c. in the case of time workers in the case of mills that will be put on the minimum basis, while those in Ahmedabad have been increased by 5 to 6 p. c. The Tariff Board has also stated that the proportion of labour costs to the total cost of production is higher by 44.0 p. c. in Ahmedabad than in Bombay. The comparison, however, of some other items in the cost of production shows that Bombay is extravagant and, therefore, inefficient. According to the Tariff Board, the proportion of selling expenses in Bombay form 7 p. c. of the cost of production as against 1.10 p. c. in Ahmedabad. Packing expenses in Bombay and Ahmedabad are 2.50 p. c. and 1.60 p. c. respectively and the fuel and the power expenses are 10.80 p. c. and 8.70 p. c. for the two centres. No reason has been assigned for the disproportionately high expenditure on selling and packing and it is within the power of the mill-owners to reduce these expenses to the Ahmedabad level. It is also not impossible to secure a reduction in the fuel and power charges by joint action. Bombay's turnover of yarn and cloth was 22 crores. Of the total cost of production, 40 p. c. is the cost of raw cotton and 60 p. c. is the manufacturing cost. Of the latter, if the expenses on selling, packing and fuel and power, to take only those items, are reduced,—and it is within the powers of the millowners to do so—to the Ahmedabad level, it is calculated that about 80 lakhs will be saved on a turnover of 22 crores. If the managing agents shift their offices from the Fort to the mills, it will not only ensure better supervision but will not fail to result in some savings. The heavy interest charges are also an item for considerable reduction. Similarly if cotton is brought by organising better methods of purchase, such as those followed in Ahmedabad, a substantial saving can be effected. It is, therefore, calculated by competent authorities that these improvements, apart from ensuring better efficiency, will yield a saving to the Bombay industry to the extent of between one crore and one crore and a quarter. This saving will be, it is calculated, as much as, if not more than, that what the wage reductions are expected to make. The test of the ability of the industry to pay, even though applied broadly, does not, therefore, prove the necessity for the low level to which the minimum wages have been taken, and for any wage reductions.

CONCLUSIONS.

The criticism so far offered brings out the following conclusions:—

1 The scheme of the Millowners' Association is a hybrid scheme without any rational basis.

2 The effect of the scheme on the total earnings cannot be ascertained until it is seen how the mills paying higher rates of wages and allowances than the minimum react to the scheme.

3 It can, however, be stated that in the case of those workers who will be put on the minimum wage basis, the earnings of the time workers and piece workers as compared with the December 1933 average earnings, will be reduced by 7.7% and 20% respectively in addition to the 16.94% cut that has already taken place by the beginning of 1934.

4 There are loopholes in the scheme under which the rates of wages and allowances above the prescribed minimum can be reduced.

5 Fixing the minimum allowance at 35% will not ensure a minimum wage for the piece workers.

6 The minimum wage and consolidation parts of the scheme are confined only to the time workers.

7 The minimum wages prescribed for the time workers are utterly inadequate and do not satisfy any tests by which they are generally determined.

Correspondence.

KICKING THE LADDER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—Having spent something like a quarter of a century in Zanzibar, I think I have got some right to have a say in the present controversy about some recent Zanzibar decrees that is raging at present in the press and on the platform in India at present.

It was Zanzibar's boast up to now that it was singularly free from communal squabbles, as well as from the disgraceful incidents of the nature of colour bar that have up to now marred the fair name of many a British Colony to which the Indians have migrated in large numbers, either of their own accord or on the express desire and invitation of the authorities of those colonies. But a bomb-shell was thrown into the placid waters of Zanzibar's political and economic life of well-nigh a century. I mean to indicate below the utter ingratitude that has marked the enactment of these recent decrees passed in Zanzibar. In the absence of the requisite reference books, I shall have to make some general statements without being able to give exact dates and so on. But that is unavoidable.

Political tactics are often divorced from justice and equity and coupled with expediency. There was a time when Indians were used as a handle to press the demand of the British Government to allow a British Consulate to be established in Zanzibar for the protection (?) of the rights of the Indians, i. e. the British Indian subjects settled in Zanzibar, which was then (i. e. about the middle of the last century) the capital of the independent Arab State of Zanzibar. It should also be mentioned that some of these independent Arab Sultans of Zanzibar were extremely anxious that Indian merchants should settle in Zanzibar and develop her trade. And these Sultans did all they could to induce the Indians to make Zanzibar their home and settle there. The Indians did

this and contributed very largely to develop this Arab State, which then gradually rose to be the centre of the trade and commerce of the whole of East Africa. Even noted English politicians and writers have borne willing testimony to this very important contribution made by Indians to the development of East Africa.

Times however went on changing. The Indians who were thus found to be *indispensable* at one time became gradually more and more of an eye-sore to several parties who came on the scene later on. And this process has now culminated in this same Indian community being looked upon as a regular nuisance to be done away with in any way that may be practicable.

The Indian Government have declared their intention to stand by the Zanzibar Indians in their present grim struggle. Let us hope they will do so. One cannot, however, refrain from expressing a doubt as to how far their action will prove really useful, when we take into consideration the very pertinent fact that South Africa and Kenya have so far never been effectively checked in their anti-Indian tactics in spite of all the efforts, not only of the poor so-called Indian Government, but of even the Imperial Government.

It should also be noted that while passing these decrees in the Legislative Council, the Zanzibar Government were supported by the Arab members of that Council. And it should also be noted that Indian members were whole-heartedly supported in their fight in the Council against these Bills by an English member, the Hon. Mr. B. H. Wiggins, who has been a Zanzibar citizen for the past twenty-eight years. Needless to say that all honour and gratitude is due to the Hon. Mr. Wiggins for the bold and just stand he has taken in this connection.

Let us still hope that this process of kicking the ladder, when there is no further use for it, will be checked by the action the Indian Government will take.—Yours, etc.

P. B. KHARE.

Nasik City, July 21st.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGION IN VEDIC LITERATURE. By P. S. DESHMUKH. (Oxford University Press.) 1933. 22cm. 378p. Rs. 15.
- THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION IN 1930-31. (International Institute of Agriculture, Rome.) 1932. 24cm. 426p. 25 liras.
- PREVENTION OF FRAGMENTATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF HOLDINGS IN THE BARODA STATE. By GOVINDBHAI H. DESAI. (Pustakalaya Sahayak Sahakari Mandal, Baroda.) 1934. 23cm. 149p. Rs. 2.
- REPORT ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNITED PROVINCES OF AGRA AND OUDH, 1932-33. (Government Press, Lucknow.) 1934. 23cm. 95p. Rs. 3.
- THE AMERICAN EXPERIMENT. A Study of Bourgeois Civilization. By M. J. BONN. (Allen & Unwin.) 1933. 21cm. 308p. 10/6.
- ONE MAN'S VIEW. By LEONARD MARRICK. (Hodder & Stoughton.) 20cm. 212p. 7/6.
- THE SCHOOL AND A CHANGING CIVILIZATION. By W. B. CURRY. (The Twentieth Century Library.) (John Lane.) 1934. 20cm. 129p. 2/6.
- PRISONS AND A CHANGING CIVILISATION. By M. HAMBLIN SMITH. (The Twentieth Century Library.) (John Lane.) 1934. 20cm. 150p. 2/6.

SOCIALISM'S NEW START. A Secret German Manifesto.
By MILES. (Allen & Unwin.) 1934. 20cm. 144p. 3/6.
SELECT CONSTITUTIONS OF THE WORLD. Ed. By B. SHIVA RAO. (Author, 1 Armenian St., Madras.) 1934. 25cm. 684p. Rs. 10.
THE WORLD AGRICULTURE. An International Survey -Report. (Chairman: The Viscount Astor.) (Oxford University Press.) 1932. 24cm. 314p. 12/6.

BY ORDER OF F. L. SMITH, ESQ., I.C.S., JUDGE,
SMALL CAUSE COURT, DEHRA DUN.

SUMMONS FOR DISPOSAL OF SUIT.

(ORDER 5, RULES 1 AND 5.)

IN THE COURT OF
THE S. C. JUDGE AT DEHRA DUN.
SUIT No. 308 OF 1934.

Messrs. Jhandumal & Sons, Dehra Dun, Cloth Merchant, Paltan Bazar ... PLAINTIFF.

Versus

Sundram Iyer, etc., Bombay ... DEFENDANT.

To,

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| 1. Sundram Iyer | } Ss/o late Mr. P. S. Pushpaw-
nam Iyer under the guardian-
ship of their natural guardi-
an mother Sh. Parbati Devi,
Bombay. |
| 2. Munin Iyer | |
| 3. Vinktesh Iyer | |
- Minors.

4. Sh. Parbati Devi W/o Late Mr. P. S. Pushpaw-
nam Iyer, C/o Mr. P. K. Natson, Account Sec-
tion, G. P. O., Bombay.

WHEREAS the Plaintiff has instituted a suit against you for Rs. 380/-, you are hereby summoned to appear in this Court in person or by a pleader duly instructed, and able to answer all material questions relating to the suit or who shall be accompanied by some person able to answer all such questions, on the 10th day of August 1934, at 10-30 o'clock in the forenoon, to answer the claim; and as the day fixed for your appearance is appointed for the final disposal of the suit, you must be prepared to produce on that day all the witnesses upon whose evidence, and all the documents upon which, you intend to rely in support of your defence.

Take notice that, in default of your appearance on the day before mentioned, the suit will be heard and determined in your absence.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court, this 7th day of July 1934.

Small Cause
Court,
Dehra Dun.

RAJ DHARILAL,
Munsarim.

NOTICE.

- Should you apprehend your witnesses will not attend of their own accord you can have a summons from this Court to compel the attendance of any witness, and the production of any document that you have a right to call upon the witness to produce, on applying to the Court and on depositing the necessary expenses.
- If you admit the claim, you should pay the money into Court together with costs of the suit to avoid execution of the decree, which may be against your person or property or both.

BY ORDER OF F. L. SMITH, ESQR., I. C. S., JUDGE,
SMALL CAUSE COURT, DEHRA DUN.

NOTICE TO MINOR DEFENDANT AND GUAR-
DIAN (O. 32, R. 3).

IN THE COURT OF THE JUDGE, SMALL CAUSE COURT,
DEHRA DUN.

SUIT No. 308 OF 1934.

Messrs. Jhandoo Mal & Sons, Cloth Merchant, Paltan
Bazar, Dehra Dun. ... PLAINTIFF.

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| 1. Sundram Iyer. | } Minor Defendants Ss/o Late Mr.
P. S. Pushpavanam under
the guardianship of their
natural guardian mother Sh.
Parbati Devi Bombay C/o.
Mr. P. K. Natson, Acct.
Section, G. P. O., Bombay. |
| 2. Munin Iyer | |
| 3. Vinktesh Iyer | |

WHEREAS an application has been presented on the part of the plaintiffs in the above suit for the appointment of a guardian for the suit to the minor defendants, you, the said minors, and you the guardian Mrs. Parvati Devi are hereby required to take notice that unless before 10th August 1934 an application is made to this Court for the appointment of you the minors or of some friend of you, the minors, to act as guardian for the suit, the Court will proceed to appoint some other person to act as a guardian to the minors for the purposes of the said suit.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Court, this 7th day of July 1934.

Small Cause
Court,
Dehra Dun.

RAJ DHARILAL,
Munsarim.

**IS DIABETES
CURABLE**

WITHOUT DIETING, FASTING AND
INJECTIONS

?

YES!

FREE TREATISE TELLS
HOW

(STARTLING NEW THEORY)

Write for a copy now.

VENUS RESEARCH LABORATORY,
P. O. Box 587, CALCUTTA.