

pound, where the Indian women were originally seen in the morning by the constabulary-officers. There Special Constables Caldwell, Savage and James Brown (police van driver) were severely beaten and wounded and the police driven back to Toorak road. The Magistrate was asked to attend by Inspector Swinbourne. The Chief Police Magistrate and a party of soldiers under Major Knox soon afterwards arrived on the scene."

The Inspector-General himself arrived upon the scene about the same time as the Military. The Indians who had been participating in the riot ran into some houses in the neighbourhood. Colonel Golding ordered these houses to be surrounded and caused all found inside to be disarmed and collected in one spot. A Party of 175 men and 14 women were marched down to the police station under escort. Meanwhile, Colonel Golding despatched some specials, under command of Inspector Swinbourne, to deal with a crowd of Indians armed with sticks who, had been reported as coming into Suva from another quarter. This crowd was intercepted and forced to retire to the outskirts of the town.

17. Late in the evening I visited the police station and congratulated the police and special constables on the way in which they had handled a very difficult and dangerous situation. I also visited the hospital, where I saw Mr. W. Savage and Mr. C. Caldwell, Special Constables. They were both very badly injured and almost unconscious, Mr. Savage's head and face being a mass of bruises, while Mr. Caldwell had an arm and several ribs broken. I also saw Mr. Pilkington, a gentleman, over 70 years of age, who had very pluckily gone to the assistance of the police and had had an arm broken.

18. At an early stage of the trouble it had become apparent to me that naval or military assistance, or both, from outside the Colony would be required. Even if a sufficient force could have been organised locally, it was clear that the Indians would never believe in its sufficiency; and the inevitable result of a collision between several thousands of Indians and a force which they believed they could overpower, although in the end the armed force would probably have prevailed, would have been a resort to rifle and machine-gun fire involving serious bloodshed and damage to property. In the circumstances I decided to ask the Government of Australia to send a warship, and at the same time, in case a vessel should not be available from Australia or should not arrive in time, to ask the New Zealand Government for assistance also. Both requests were generously and promptly complied with, and I desire to record the deep appreciation of the Government and people of this Colony of the action of the Commonwealth and the Dominion Authorities. The assistance from New Zealand, which arrived first,

consisted of a detachment of 60 officers and men of the New Zealand Defence Forces with Lewis gun sections. These arrived on the morning of 12th February on board the New Zealand Government vessel *Tutanekai*. Being uncertain at what point this force might be first required, I had requested the *Tutanekai* to proceed to Levuka and there to await developments. On the night, however, of 12th February, in view of the serious affray in Suva and possibility of further trouble here, I requested the *Tutanekai* by wireless to come direct to Suva. The arrival of the force was most opportune. A portion of the force was immediately called upon to support the police in preventing the incursion of crowds into Suva and generally in restoring order in the town and neighbourhood, while late in the same day a section was despatched by launch up the Rewa river in order to reinforce the Fijian police and Defence Force already stationed at Nausori, who had had to deal during the day with serious disturbances amounting to riot.

19. The following is a detailed account by Inspector A. Pietor, of the Fiji Constabulary, on the riot at Nausori on 12th February :—

"On account of trouble occurring at Suva on the 11th instant in the afternoon, the special constables who had already been sworn in were mobilised, rifles issued and Nausori picketed with posts of regular and special constabulary that night. No disturbance occurred, however, and nothing out of the ordinary until 11-20 p.m. it was found that the telephone wires to Suva had been cut. A special constable motor cyclist and linesman were sent out to locate the break, while despatch runners (Fijian) were sent to Suva at the same time. The cut was located and reported to Suva. On Thursday, the 12th instant, crowds were reported as coming in at an early hour from Baralevu, Vuci, Waimbokasi, &c., with sticks, knives, &c., and concentrating at Vunimoni. These people did not seem to know why they had been summoned, and a large number dispersed when called upon to do so. I ordered all sticks to be thrown away, and this was carried out. At 10-30 p.m., however, a crowd of about 300 men were reported as coming from Suva direction towards Davuilvu. The bridges from Nasinu to Nausori had previously been reported as broken, and this crowd were the perpetrators. I at once repaired to Davuilvu by launch with a detachment of Fijian constables, followed later by a launch load of specials (with rifles). A guard of six specials was already posted at Davuilvu Hotel, and on arrival I found the crowd had passed the hotel and had proceeded to the pontoon landing. I followed them up and asked their intentions. They stated that they were going to Nausori and that nothing would stop them. The pontoon having previously been withdrawn to the Nausori side, they were unable to proceed further, and the Fijian constables were in their rear. I called upon them to throw down their sticks and other arms therefore, which about 50 per cent. did; the remainder, however, escaped up the road towards Suva again. They were followed up and when opposite the hotel the 'specials' previously referred to reinforced the Fijians. The crowd somehow obtained other sticks and iron palings, however, and their numbers were momentarily

being swelled with reinforcements brought over in EVINAUDE boats from the Nausori side. As the tember of the crowd was ugly I formed square and telephoned Nausori to have a patrol sent on to the river to cut communication between the Nausori and Davuilevu side to prevent further reinforcements, and requested Captain Kane, the District Commissioner, to come over as I anticipated the necessity of reading the Riot Act. At the same time I sent for certain Indian leaders I could more or less trust and try to disperse the crowd by peaceable means. This latter move was successful, and the Nausori men who had crossed in small boats expressed their desire to return to their own side peaceably. This was consented to, and the pontoon sent for; nobody, however, was to be allowed to land at Nausori with a stick. I telephoned to Captain Paddy, Officer Commanding Defence Force, who had a guard on the Nausori side of the pontoon-way, to request him to have this order enforced, and to this he agreed. Left by the Nausori men, the Nasinu crowd rapidly dispersed, the majority throwing away their sticks. The Constabulary then returned to the Nausori side at 2 P. M. The Constabulary had scarcely landed at the Company's wharf, Nausori, when whistles were heard from the pontoon bridge. Collecting the Fijian constables who had fallen in at the first alarm, I proceeded to the spot, accompanied by Sub-Inspector Tucker. On arrival at the bridge the Defence Force guard was found to be in difficulties, as an angry crowd, armed with sticks, were on the bridge, and actually at grips with several members. It appears the trouble arose through the pontoon guard taking away sticks from the second pontoon load of people from the Davuilevu side as requested. It was obviously a case for swift measures, and so the Fijians were formed up in front of the Defence Force guard, across the bridge which was then held by a line of Fijian constables, with fixed bayonets. At sight of these the crowd fell back to the far end of the bridge, while the Fijians were subjected to a lively fusillade of stones. I am glad to be able to state that no trained troops could have stood this more steadily than the Fijians, whose behaviour throughout has been exemplary. The special constabulary now came up behind the Fijians, but seeing bodies of the crowd moving back at a run towards Vuci, I sent the specials back to take up a position blocking the Vuci road, while others were to hold the Naduruloulou road, to prevent people from the Nausori coolie lines taking us in reverse. Both these forces came face to face with armed crowds, but the sight of the rifles and the coolness of the N. C. O.'s was sufficient to meet the situation. Captain Kane now arrived at the bridge, and having spoken to the crowd without effect, read the Riot Act. The crowd, under the influence of certain of their leaders who were not inclined to violence, retired slightly and gradually dispersed without any firing taking place. There were no further incidents this day. On this date all European women and children were concentrated at Nausori, arrangements having previously been made."

20. The affair at Nausori on 12th February was the most serious of any that have occurred. Although, however, the most serious, it was not the last, for on the following day the police came into collision with a mob of several hundreds of Indians who had been wrecking bridges and telephone wires on the road between Suva and Rewa. I cannot describe this incident better than in

the words of the Inspector-General of Constabulary, whose report reads as follows :—

"On Friday the 13th instant at about 3 o' clock I received information that Major Knox with some mounted men and his Lewis gun section were holding up at the Samabula Bridge a crowd of between 200 and 300 Indians who were demanding to be allowed to come into Suva. Permission to do so had been refused, and Mr. Pennefather, Chief Police Magistrate, had proceeded to the scene and called upon the Indians to disperse. The Indians refused and remained in the vicinity of the bridge. I proceeded to the scene with inspector Swinbourne, Sub-Inspector Lucchinelli and party of 25 European special constables and Fijian Constabulary. I conferred with Mr. Pennefather, who told me of the situation, whereupon I told Major Knox, officer in charge of the Defence Force party, that I was going to advance on the mob and asked him to follow up my party with his mounted men in case I should require their assistance. I then crossed the bridge with the constabulary and hustled the mob of Indians, taking care not to inflict damage on those who did not resist. The main body of Indians ran up the road a distance of about 400 or 500 yards, and in the vicinity of an Indian dwelling house a number picked up poles and bludgeons and offered us serious resistance by flinging rocks, stones and sticks at us and striking at us with their weapons. One tall Indian I noticed in particular came for me with a pole, but was prevented reaching me by one of the Corporals of Constabulary, who was himself stunned by a staggering blow. At this moment I heard revolver and pistol shots being fired behind me, but I am unable to say who fired them. I saw Sub-Inspector Lucchinelli discharge his revolver twice at the Indian who attacked me, but the shots did not take effect, as I saw the Indian making off when I had ordered constables to take him in flank. Had not fire been opened on the crowd of Indians, who vastly outnumbered us, I do not hesitate to say that there would have been serious loss of life on our side. I remained on the spot half-an-hour after the action and collected the wounded Indians and constables and had them conveyed to Suva in the police van for treatment at the hospital. Three Indians were suffering from gunshot wounds (one of whom has since died) and several others from contusions on the head and body."

A magisterial enquiry was subsequently held on the death of the Indian who was killed, and the Magistrate's finding was that the case was one justifiable homicide. This was the only life lost, but the few shots that were fired and the death of the Indian may have been the means of saving greater loss of life. There is no doubt that the Indians had been led to believe by agitators that firearms would under no circumstances be resorted to by the Government forces—a belief which greatly increased the difficulties of the police in effecting peaceable dispersals. I cannot speak too highly of the restraint and forbearance shown both by the European and by the Fijian members of the constabulary and the Defence Force in the three affrays at Toorak, Nausori, and the Samabula Bridge.

21. The pacification of the district between Suva and Rewa presented no little difficulty. On each side of the road between the two centres there are scattered settlements of Indians of a miscellaneous class, of whom only a few were genuine strikers, and who, for the most part, were merely out for trouble and ready to join forces with any crowd that might collect either at Suva or at Rewa. After the Samabula affair it was necessary to patrol the Rewa road. At the same time it was desirable to give these people every chance of coming to an understanding with the Government. Accordingly, with my consent, Mr. T. E. Fell, C. M. G., the Colonial Secretary, went out by motor-car on 15th February in order to get into touch with the Indians in this neighbourhood and to hear what they had to say. The attitude of the Indians after the events of the 13th was very uncertain, and, although Mr. Fell was accompanied by two motor cyclists and arrangements had been made for relief in case of any mishap, the journey was by no means unattended by risk. After at first displaying considerable mistrust, about 50 Indians collected and were addressed by Mr. Fell, who explained the position to them from the point of view of the Government, assuring them that if they were law-abiding and peaceful the Government was ready to help them, but warning them that if they persisted in opposing the Government and damaging property it would be their own fault if they found themselves in trouble. Having eventually received assurances from the Indians that they would do no more damage to property or interfere with men guarding the roads and that they would obey the law and not assemble in crowds without permission Mr. Fell gave permits to a few Indian storekeepers to come into Suva to make necessary purchases, and told them that, if their conduct warranted it, a larger number would be allowed to come into the town later. The meeting was not regarded by Mr. Fell as entirely satisfactory, but it clearly pointed to the advisability of appointing a civilian official to act as intermediary between the Government and the Indians and to take note of any complaints against patrols operating in this area. I therefore appointed Mr. C. E. de F. Pennefather (Magistrate, Suva) as Political Officer for this purpose. During the ensuing 10 days Mr. Pennefather paid frequent visits to the district and received numerous minor complaints, which were all investigated and, as far as possible, adjusted. I believe that this appointment had a good effect.

22. The difficulty of restoring order in Suva was increased by the presence of bands of young Indian hooligans, who together with the women, were chiefly responsible for the intimidation of loyal Indians for preventing them returning to work. At a meeting of

'Loyal Indians, British subjects' a resolution was passed thanking the Government for having appointed the Commission, expressing a desire to return to work forthwith, and asking for protection against interference. The only effective way of ensuring protection for the loyal element and of preventing further riotous behaviour by these hooligans (or "larrikings," as Mr. Badri Maharaj described them in conversation with me) was to prescribe an area within which movements and gatherings of Indians should be restricted and to which only those should be admitted who were engaged in *bona fide* business or employment. On 12th February the Legislative Council passed an Ordinance enabling the Governor in Council to take certain measures for the public safety in the event of civil commotion, and under this Ordinance a simple but effective system of permits was instituted, and an area, including the greater part of the town of Suva, was prescribed with the above objects. The system has worked satisfactorily, and, while it has had a good disciplinary effect on the disorderly element, has involved the least possible irksomeness to the law-abiding Indian population. The policy will be to relax it gradually, and already certain of the restrictions at first imposed have been removed.

23. His Majesty's Australian Sloop *Marguerite* arrived at Suva on 14th February and after remaining for a day, paid a visit to the north-western coast of Vitilevu. I have reason to believe that the appearance of this vessel had an excellent effect, and I greatly regret that it has only been possible for her to remain in these waters for one month. The Government forces were further augmented by the arrival, on 16th February, of 200 natives from Lau, whom Mr. G. M. Hennings, a leading resident in the Lau Group, had volunteered to recruit and who formed a most useful auxiliary to the police in patrolling roads and protecting bridges. I may here say that the attitude, both of the local Fijians and of those who were recruited in Lau, Rewa, Navua and elsewhere to assist the police, has been most gratifying. They have shown a keen desire to help the Government, and there have been very few complaints of vexatious behaviour towards the Indians with whom they have been brought in contact.

24. On 15th February the Hon'ble Badri Maharaj, M. L. C., arrived at Suva and proceeded to Nausori, where he addressed a meeting of Indians, warned them against the danger into which they were being led by agitators, and strongly advised them to return to work. This advice, following upon the prompt measures taken by the Government to deal with the rioters, apparently had a good effect. On the following day, 16th February, the strike ended as suddenly as it had begun, and the Indians at Rewa, Suva and Navua were all reported to be returning to work.

25. I am glad to say that, although efforts were undoubtedly

made by the agitators to extend the strike to the principal sugar centres in the north-western districts, there has been no trouble among the large Indian population on that side of the main island. It was persistently rumoured that large bodies of Indians from the north coast were arranging to march across the country to join in a concentration at Suva, but nothing of the sort happened. The Indians residing in Suva, Nausori, Navua and on the south coast generally are of a different and, generally speaking, of an inferior class to those belonging to the north-western districts. There has always been a tendency for malcontents and bad characters to gravitate towards the south coast centres. Neither is there any identity of interests between Indians on the Suva side and those elsewhere. The latter include a considerable element of substantial cane-growers who are themselves employers of labour, and who have a stake in the country. If strike had extended to the north-western districts, it would probably have been from different causes (*e.g.*, dissatisfaction with the terms offered by the Colonial Sugar Refining Company as regards the price of cane and the rate of wages). While the Government has been by no means free from anxiety concerning possible developments in the north-western districts, this anxiety was in a large measure relieved by an announcement which the Colonial Sugar Refining Company made to the Indian cane growers at Loutoka and other centres on the 4th February. This was briefly to the effect that an additional bonus of 2s. 6d. per ton would be paid to growers for their cane, together with a special grant of 20s. per acre on all land under proper cultivation. Although this concession applies to the present year only and still leaves growers in uncertainty as regards the treatment for future years, and although I have not yet heard that the offer has been definitely accepted, there is reason to hope that any immediate likelihood of a general cessation of work has been averted. At the same time it is to be regretted that the concession was not made earlier. If it had been, it is possible that the strike at Nausori, which has been the chief cause of anxiety and expense to the Government, might have been avoided.

The following order of prohibition and removal of Mr. D. M. Manilal was handed over to him on the 27th March 1920.

Order under Peace and Good Order Ordinance 1875, Fiji.

"Whereas by the Peace and Good Order Ordinance, 1875, the Governor in Council is empowered by Order under his hand to prohibit any person whom he shall believe to be disaffected to the King or otherwise dangerous to the peace and good order of the Colony, from residing or being within any particular district or districts of the Colony during any space of time not exceeding two years, and by the same or any subsequent order under his hand to authorize and direct that if such prohibition be not obeyed forthwith or within a specified time, the person disobeying the same shall be arrested and imprisoned beyond the limits of the

prohibited district and in such removal force may be used if need be for the purposes thereof ;

"And whereas the Governor in Council believes that Doctor Maginmal Manilal is dangerous to the peace and good order of the Colony,

"Now, therefore, by and with the advice of my Executive Council, I do by this order under my hand prohibit the said Doctor Maginmal Manilal from residing or being within all or any of the undermentioned districts of the Colony during the space of two years, that is to say, the Island of Vitilevu, the Island of Ovalau, the province of Macuata.

"And I do further, by and with the advice of my Executive Council, by this order under my hand, authorize and direct that if the above prohibition be not obeyed within the following specified time, that is to say, by or before noon on the first day of April 1920, then and in such case the said Doctor Maginmal Manilal shall be arrested by the Inspector General Constabulary or by any Police Constable or by any other Peace Officer within the Colony and imprisoned, and shall be removed being so arrested and imprisoned beyond the limits of the prohibited districts, and in such removal force may be used if need be for the purposes thereof.

Dated at Government House, Suva, this twenty-seventh day of March, 1920.

The Fiji Government published the following Petition from 1500 Indian Residents to His Excellency the Governor of Fiji, dated April 1st 1920.

"We, the undersigned, Indian residents, beg most respectfully to submit the following representations to His Excellency the Governor for his kind consideration. We have learned with profound sorrow that an order has been served by His Excellency the Governor on Mr. Manilal, our foremost leader in Fiji, which amounts to his expulsion from this country. We deeply grieve for this and earnestly request His Excellency to cancel the order immediately. We beg to express our views regarding the matter that we do not want to live in this country if our leader or leaders are expelled from here. We would also mention here that in case our petition is not considered favourably, we all intend to return to our mother country together with Mr. Manilal. We would therefore request Your Excellency's Government to make immediate arrangements for repatriation of those amongst us who are entitled at this moment to a free return passage to India. We may suggest that if these arrangements cannot be made immediately the order for Mr. Manilal be withdrawn for the present and postponed, until the Government can make the above-mentioned arrangements asked for. Otherwise, we would refrain from doing any work in the Colony until we are repatriated, as a protest against such action of the Government. We do not mean to interfere with the work of Government of this Colony, but we fitly express our feelings. The simple thing is that, as we have already stated, we do not want to live in this country without a proper leader to guide us and one who safeguards our interests. If it is contended that he has committed any offence or has broken

any law of the country, we do not see any reason why the Government prefer expelling him from here rather than proceeding against him in a Court of Justice. In the absence of a prosecution against him we are inclined to think that it is because he might be an undesirable person, in the estimation of the European community and the Government of this country, in advocating our case. In that case we do not see how any self-respecting Indian can continue to live here any longer. In view of the above fact we submit the petition, hoping that it will receive due consideration at the hands of His Excellency's Government. In the absence of a prompt reply to this petition we will be compelled to stop all work for the future, and get ready to return home."

To this His Excellency the Governor sent the following reply dated April 14th 1920.

His Excellency the Governor has received the petition of Indian residents in the Ba district, with reference to the order recently served on D. M. Manilal.

The order in question prohibits Manilal and others from residing for two years in Vitilevu or the Macuata Province. Outside these districts the persons concerned may go where they please and there is no restriction on their movements. The order was issued by the Governor in Council after full deliberation because these persons are believed, while resident in any of the districts mentioned, to be dangerous to the peace and good order of the Colony. Under no circumstances will His Excellency reconsider the decision, and he dismisses forthwith the request in the petition that he should cancel the order.

Manilal has not deceived the Government, but he has grievously deceived the Indians at Suva and Rewa with the result that many of them are in prison or awaiting trial, while he has been careful to save his own skin. Loyal Indians here have protested to His Excellency against these agitators, who are responsible for the recent trouble, being allowed to remain at large while their dupes are punished.

Manilal has been the worst enemy of Indian progress in Fizi. If the petitioners knew all that the Government knows about him they would rejoice at his departure. It is entirely owing to him and to the trouble which he has caused that the Government has been unable to proceed with its intention, already publicly announced, to make provision for the election by the Indian community of two representatives in the Legislative Council. This would, in the Governor's opinion, have afforded a safeguard of Indian interests, such as the Petitioners desire, and a constitutional means of voicing Indian aspirations through their chosen and recognised leaders. The enforced postponement of this important concession has been a matter of regret to His Excellency.

The petitioners ask that if the order against Manilal is not withdrawn they may be repatriated, and they threaten to strike. As regards repatriation, arrangements have already been made for two ships to come to Fiji to fetch those who are entitled to repatriation and who wish to go. The first ship is due to arrive at the end of next month, and it is hoped that the second will follow not long after. Lists of those desiring to be repatriated are being prepared, and those who are entitled to free passages and wish to go should send in their names to the Agent General of Immigration. The Government has no desire to impede or delay the departure of those Indians who do not wish to remain in Fiji. Malcontents are not wanted here.

As to the threat of a strike, the petitioners are making a grave mistake if they think that the Government is to be intimidated by threats of this nature. The petitioners state that "they do not mean to interfere with the work of the Government." If, by this, they mean that they do not intend to commit any breach of the peace, His Excellency strongly advises them to abide by this intention. Any disorder or violation of the law will be promptly and sternly dealt with.

Mr. Manilal's Letter.

Mr. Manilal's version of the affair is given in the following letter which he addressed to the Press on February 19th 1920.

Since my arrival here in Fiji I have strenuously laboured to have an end put to the system of indentured labour which was slavery in disguise. Eventually the system received its *coup de grace* on the 2nd. of January last, when all remaining indentures was cancelled by the Fiji Government, presumably at the cost of the revenues of land.

The cancellation of indentures set all Indian labourers on an equal footing and they all began to realise painfully how their lives have economically, morally, socially, and politically been influenced by their arrival and stay in Fiji under that monstrous system. The incidents of coolie life formed a sort of shuttlecock to weave the web of colonial life round them; and their depressed and ruined condition became more patent under the strain of 200 and 300 p. c. rise in the prices of the necessities of life, without a rise in their wages. The want of a steady homelife, of a wife worth the name, promiscuous intercourse and natural children, dirt and squalor and immorality in general, can be geneologically traced to the indenture system.

People who had finished their indentures had been for years in receipt of two shillings a day wages for unskilled labour before

the War. And they have continued receiving that until a few months ago when a sixpence was added only for some labourers.

The labourers had approached the Indian Imperial Association of which I am President to represent their grievances to Government. And my Association wrote to the Government recommending legislation for 5 per cent. minimum wages for labourers, expressing our readiness to prove our case. *The Government paid no heed to our representations and the Immigration Department had hitherto followed a policy of bluff, browbeating and disguised threatening towards those who have been clamouring for better pay. The local news-paper, an only paper, pursued a campaign of malicious misrepresentation against me and my Association at the instigation of a number of colonial-born Indians who are converts to Christianity and whose conduct is influenced by their pastors or shepherds. The Indian people in Fiji had felt very much that the Government prosecuted me for building an office on a Fijian Chief's land with his permission, when any number of European and other Indians who have done similar things have not even been warned. But at the General Indian Conference held on Dec. 20th. last at the Town Hall, all sections of Indian settlers in and around Suva, Rewa and Navua, attended in great numbers and with the exception of half-a-dozen Indian Christians and a number of their European patrons, the meeting was a great initial step towards Indian organisation; and the labourers invited me to two of their meetings, where I was enthusiastically received. I then left for Lovuka and subsequently for Ba, where I heard that some Indian labourers in Suva were on strike. All sorts of rumours were rife and the campaign of misrepresentation by the Suva press had the desired result of making every white person highly indignant or ill-disposed towards me. Anyhow, the Indian element in Ba district was so important that the Ba Europeans did not care about to unpleasant lengths with me and the District Commissioner who is also the Magistrate, being a Theosophist and a good type of Oxford graduate, was sympathetic towards Indian aspirations. In face of some opposition, after some hesitation he attended and presided over a large representative gathering of Indians on the last Sunday in January where the Indian Association was formed with rudimentary Panchayets in important Indian settlements. Here I was, as expected, unanimously chosen as President of the Association, which was now formed, and Mr. H. G. Pilling, District Commissioner placed his name at our disposal as patron and promised to audit our accounts. This is the same gentleman who had given unique assistance to Mr. C. F. Andrews and to the schools be initiated—

the establishment of the Misses Priest and Dixon—who have been sent out from Australia at Mr. Andrews' instance to work educationally (and the latter lady professionally as nurse also), amongst Indian women and children in Fiji, derived great help and sympathy from the Englishman, the like of whom are not as frequently met with (in little Crown Colonies as this) as one may desire.

I was hardly on the way to settle in Ba district when a sudden call came from Suva informing me that the Indian strike in south had led to the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry into the cost of living wages, reasonable means of livelihood etc. before and after the war. A special launch came to Ba to fetch me to Suva. It was not to be expected that the Government would place me on the commission and the Agent-General of Immigration had succeeded in convincing Indians that I might be more useful as counsel to lead evidence on behalf of the Indians labourers, who then chose Mr. S. Chowla, an experienced and patriotic Indian Interpreter, to be on the Commission. I came to Suva and great crowds of Indians poured in to see me offering to help with the evidence. Some of the members of the Indian Imperial Association had been so threatened and treated by their European employers and others and for their consequent advice to strikers had become so unpopular amongst Indians, that they themselves kept out of the labour movement; and I did not press them further. I also pacified those who had cherished strong feeling against them and I held one meeting at Muaniwetu and another on the Cricket ground in Suva and the next day in Nausari. It was wonderful how the strikers were of one mind and what is more, absolutely peaceful so far so that the Inspector General of Constabulary, Col. Goling, telephoned to Inspector Picto of Rewa to motor down from his station to the Indian meeting and convey to me his message of thanks and appreciation of the quiet and orderly way in which the meetings had been conducted. It is worthy of note that this labour movement was contemporaneously signalled by the formation and support of the Indian Women's Association in Suva, who pressed my wife to be the president. The moral support rendered by this Association during my absence in Ba and ever since was a powerful factor in the insistent demand of men for 5 per cent wages as a minimum to enable a person to live in decency and comfort under the present high cost of living. When I came to Suva, I appreciated their work but warned people of both sexes in public as well as in private against the use of force to prevent weak minded persons from returning to work. But some of the women could not bear insults and injuries and assumed a militant attitude towards any Indian Christians or European Special Constables interfering with

their meetings or their movements. I must point out here that without the least necessity for doing so the Fiji Government became funkey and called in the aid of their military consisting of the Returned Soldiers and Sailors and the local Defence Force men. They disarmed the Indians by taking away their sticks and the Military Special Constables and rowdy Europeans established a reign of terror in Suva. The Fizi Government have never displayed any tact in such situations. They did not dismiss these Europeans from their duties of special Constables against whom the Inspector General of Constabulary heard authentic genuine complaints from peaceful Indians. The Police themselves began to act under the instruction of half of the dozen Indian Christians and the "Methods of Indian Police" (vide the pamphlet of Mr. Mackerness) began to be taught. These Europeans committed excesses. Prominent Indians were waited for and threatened, abused, ill-treated, assaulted and others prosecuted. The women could not remain quiet under these circumstances. They held meetings privately and the fatal one was the last, near the house of Ilahi Ramkan, on whose advice a European special constable walked roughly over the women sitting and used provoking language which led to a quarrel and then Indians who could not bear the sight of their women being treated in a cowardly manner rushed with the sticks of firewood from a kitchen in the vicinity. The Police whistled for help and the European force and the military arrived and Fijian policemen with rifles—a machine gun also was set against these women. Instead of pouring oil on troubled waters, some responsible persons are reported to have foolishly circulated a rumour that there were warrants out to arrest women, including my wife, and strong rumours spread through the length and breadth of Suva, Rewa and Navua that she had actually been arrested as leader of women. Those who started such tactics, whether they be in the Constabulary service or outside, whether white or brown, are themselves responsible before God for subsequent riots and bloodshed which took place in several localities. I am openly told by the Mayor of Suva, the Hon. H. M. Scott K. C. that I am at the bottom of the whole trouble. But I am not. I was away weeks before the strike started, the immediate cause of which was the order to do work for 9 hours instead of 8 as before, and the contagion spread to other centres. I was away at Tailevu when the riots were provoked. After I came back I went to the Chief Police Station in Fiji on appointment to interview women who were under arrest; but I was refused permission to see them on that occasion and whilst I waited I was kept out of Inspector Swinburn's office, where confidential matters were being reported or advised upon by the Indian Christians and their Pastor, who could have any man or woman locked up,

any man's house and premises forcibly entered and searched, any person on the street stopped, sleeping passengers or inmates in boarding houses examined. A special constable—white man with a blackened heart—used filthy language to me. I did not know whether I should wait for the arrival of the Inspector General. In the meanwhile, Inspector Swinburne appeared to be annoyed at my persistence and clearly told me that I was hindering his work. I therefore accompanied him to go out, when at the gate the special constable lifted the frame of my left ear, another white man caught hold of my right shoulder and in spite of Inspector Swinburne's warning, gave me a blow on the back of my head which did not hurt me, however. The Inspector General has now advised me to remain practically a prisoner in my own house as he will not have me interfered with by the ruffians. There are many others in my position in this respect. I must in fairness admire that he has given all the protection he could against a man called Pateson and he has promised me escort whenever I want to go out. But this same officer, either of his own accord or under pressure, applied for and obtained a special Legislation which puts in shade all Rowlatt Acts and other repressive Legislations in India put together. You cannot leave your locality without a permit to move about, not more than six persons can meet at your residence, not more than four go with you, you can take no sticks with you. The returned soldiers and sailors move about with rifles and bayonets and machine guns and any White man or Fijian or half-caste can do you anything. Moghul rule in India could not have been worse. Women are beaten and tortured to confess and testify against my wife or me, and men and women are exposed to season and melow their confession under the scorching rays of the sun, and are refused even water to drink and kept on little or no food.

Men are dead or dying—a great many whose trace is lost—a few are lying unattended in the bush. Bayonets have passed through the entrails of some, and bullets through the bodies of others. This German rule of the Whites masquerading under the British flag can not last much longer. Our cup is now full and we earnestly believe "the Gods confound the intelligence of those whom they destroy", which though a translation from some Greek source seems to be the same as "Tulsidas."

Indians want either to obtain a living wages or provisions cheap as before, or food and clothing etc. with nominal wages or piece of land to cultivate, or to be shipped back to India, or to be shot down or gaoled."

The Fiji Deputation

The Colonisation Committee mentioned on p. 328 met the Fiji Deputation consisting of the Rt. Rev. Turtshell, Bishop of Polynesia, and the hon. Mr. Rankine, C.M.G., on February 19th, afternoon in the Secretariat, and in two hours finished the inquiry into their scheme of free emigration to that Colony.

An Outline of the Fiji Scheme

Their suggested scheme was a system of free and voluntary State aided emigration, the object being the encouragement of the settlement of Indians. The emigrant would be free of any financial liability connected with the costs of his introduction in Fiji and would in no way be restricted to service under any particular employer. A Protector of emigrants would be appointed by local Governments in India to exercise supreme control of emigration in the Province. At the ports of departure, colonial camps would be started which could be visited by Indians of standing nominated by the Provincial Governments. The Colonial Government would bear half the cost in the case of those wishing to return to India if they had stayed in the Colony at least three years, three-fourth of the cost if it was five years, and the whole cost if seven years. Land, suitable for settlement, would be available for all who desire it. The scheme also stated as follows:—Indians in Fiji already enjoy the same facilities for primary education as are possessed by other inhabitants of the Colony. Under the Education Ordinance of 1916 provision is made for grants in aid to any private or vernacular school for Indians. Government schools are being established at necessary centres of the settlement where assisted schools do not exist. Since 1916, new schools have been opened every year and the Board of Education aims at providing facilities for every child in the Colony, no matter how remote the district may be. Provision is also made under the Education Ordinance for secondary schools as required. Indian colonists already acquired the same municipal rights as any other inhabitants and under the Constitution of the Colony two East Indian Members of the Legislative Council of Fiji are elected by East Indian constituencies.

Questioned by Mr. Banerjee, the Deputation replied that they were not at present prepared to give guarantee like the British Guiana Deputation, (see p. 337) because there were certain matters like repatriation, equality of status, etc., in regard to which they could not speak authoritatively. But they would communicate to

the Government of Fiji as to whether they could give a guarantee or not. At the same time, the Committee was assured that there was perfect equality of all mankind in the eye of law in Fiji, but admitted there was not the same franchise for all people. Fijians, for instance, had no franchise at all. Theirs was an old-fashioned Crown Colony and was exactly in the same position as, or perhaps a little more democratic than, Ceylon, or the Federated Malaya States. The Legislative Council had a majority of nominated European members who were always in favour of the Government. Fijians also had been nominated to the Council and in the coming general election they could be elected. No Indian stood for municipal election until now although he had the same privileges as a European.

No Racial Animosity.

Questioned by Sir Dinshaw Wacha, they said there was no differentiation of treatment between Indians and Europeans in trains, etc.

The Committee subjected the deputation to questions about cultivable lands, wages, housing, etc., and were told that it was very extraordinary that Indians were able to become capitalists in a few months. The Deputationists promised to consider the question for Indians until they were in a position to maintain themselves in the Colony. The minimum wages was two shillings a day, which came to about Rs. 2-8, one-third of which could be easily saved. Primary education was not compulsory at present. We must confess, said they, that we have been very remiss in giving education to all classes, but in 1916, a new Ordinance was passed which provides for the establishment of both primary and secondary schools. A sum of £8,100 had been set apart for the education of Indians. In the last two years, 28 schools had been established, twelve of which were under the direct control of the Indian community. They wanted Indians not only to cultivate lands, but also to work for wages. The new comer would be granted land, but not money. The climatic conditions were unsurpassable on the face of the earth. There was no small-pox, cholera or any such disease. In order to remove the sex inequality, their object was to import families, but at the same time there ought to be exceptional cases which should necessarily be very few.

Mr. Sastri: If there is perfect political equality, the Colony would get more and more into the hands of the Indians. Then, don't you think there would be a feeling among the European population to try to get rid of these people?

A: There is no sign of racial animosity at present, and I see no reason to anticipate it in the future.

Here ended the work of the Committee, and their final report is given on p. 337.

India in the International Labour Conference

Part 13 of the great Peace Treaty of 1919 deals with Labour and gave birth, along with the League of Nations, to the International Labour Bureau. The first International Labour Conference was held at Washington U. S. A., in November 1919, and India being an original member of the League of Nations also comes under the Labour Conference. For the Proceedings of the Washington Conference see P. 238, Part II of 1920 Register. The permanent office of the Bureau is established at Geneva, Switzerland. It has primarily a two-fold function :—

1. It has to insure the drawing up, passing and enforcement in all States of an international labour legislation, which, subject to differences of climate, habit and custom, should aim at being uniform throughout the world.

By this means unfair competition will be prevented and those States which are anxious for progress will not be hampered by States which exploit their workers.

2. The office is charged with the duty of making every endeavour to better the condition of the working classes in all countries by its studies, enquiries, and propaganda. It aims at men being more free, better able to think for themselves, at making men educated and happy. It has to contribute towards the creation of that higher form of civilisation which alone can insure peace.

The Washington Labour Conference adopted six draft conventions and six recommendations as follows :—

Draft Convention.

1. The application of the principle of an eight hour day and forty-eight hours week. (10 hours for India)
2. The question of preventing or providing against unemployment.
3. The employment of women before and after child-birth.
4. The employment of women during the night.
5. The minimum age of employment of children in industry.
6. The night work of young persons employed in industry.

Recommendations.

1. Concerning public employment exchanges.
2. Concerning reciprocity of treatment of foreign workers.
3. Concerning the prevention of anthrax.
4. Concerning the protection of women and children against lead poisoning.
5. Concerning the establishment of Government Health Service.
6. Concerning the application of the Berne Convention of 1906, on the prohibition of the use of white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches.

The Geneva Assembly

At one of the closing meetings of the Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva held in December 1920, consideration was given to India's claim to representation on the International Labour Board as a matter of right, as India is one of the eight States of chief industrial importance. Sir William Meyer and Sir Ali Imam were deputed by the Govt. of India to submit a case to the Assembly, and thus bring the issue to their attention.

Sir William Meyer's Account.

"I found at the Assembly a disposition to put India in the first place when it was a question of making her pay, but when it comes to the distribution of privileges, her very existence was ignored, and the smallest European countries were given the prizes. That may sound cynical, but it is the bare truth.

"A special organising committee was appointed, with reference to the first Labour Conference at Washington, to select the eight States of chief industrial importance which, as contemplated in article 393 of the Treaty of Versailles, were of right to serve upon the Governing body of the International Labour Bureau. This was because the Council of the League, with whom the decision ought to have rested, had not yet come into being. The members of that Committee consisted of representatives of the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, and Switzerland. Seven of the eight countries selected were those to which these representatives belonged. The eighth was Germany. The United States declined to serve and the place earmarked for her was assigned to Denmark.

"Sir (then Mr.) Louis Kershaw, Mr. A. C. Chatterjee and Mr. N. M. Joshi, who represented India at that Conference, were so indignant, that India with her many millions of industrial and agricultural labourers—for it must be remembered that agricultural labourers come within the scope of the International Labour Office—had been ignored in favour of such small European countries as Denmark, Belgium and Switzerland, that they refused to take part in the election of States to fill the four seats assigned to "Secondary States."

"The result of the nominations made and of the election held was that out of 24 seats on the Labour Council, including representatives of employers and employed, 20 are appropriated by Europe, while four are divided among the other five countries.

"The Labour Conference at Washington was struck with that anomaly, and a resolution was carried on the motion of a South African Delegate, condemning the constitution of the governing body which, however, philosophically continues to hold office.

"The Secretary of State for India tried to have the injustice done to India removed by making representations to the Council of the League of Nations, which did not exist at the time of the Washington Conference. But almost a year passed before the matter came before it.

"Although the Covenant of the League of Nations had expressly provided, in the penultimate paragraph of Article IV, that any member of the League not represented on the Council should be invited to send a representative to sit as a member at any meeting for the consideration of matters specially affecting the interests of that members, the Council did not accord that privilege to India. No one who could speak with authority for India was, therefore, present to plead her cause, and the Council dismissed the Indian appeal on the following grounds :—

"(1) The Governing Body was organised and in actual operation before the Council came into existence.

"(2) The composition of the Governing Body was formally endorsed by the delegates at Washington (this was not, in fact, correct).

"(3) Recognition of India's claim would involve the replacement of some country already on the Governing Body and, (it may be), a general reconstruction of the list.

"(4) The principle upon which the Organising Committee's list was finally approved have never been formulated, or communicated to the Council and the Council profess their ignorance of the precise meaning to be attached to the phrase, 'industrial importance.'

"The Council added that they were fully cognisant of the importance of India as an industrial Power and that the present governing body would only hold office till 1922, during which period the Council would have studied the subject fully and be ready to deal with the matter of nomination to a fresh Governing Body when the present one's term expired.

"The Secretary of State felt that the reply was unsatisfactory, that the claim of India had been largely 'burked' on technical considerations, and that it was not fair to ask her to wait, seeing that it was just in these early years that any new departures might be taken and precedents created. Accordingly, he put before the Assembly relevant papers and asked that the matter might be considered.

"The Assembly referred the case to one of its Grand Committees, on which I sat, and I put forward the case for India with all the emphasis I could command. I pointed out that it was not only her interests that were involved, but those of non-European countries generally. The difficulties that the Council had raised in respect of immediate action could be overcome, e.g., by the present Governing Body, discredited by the vote of Washington above referred to resigning. The following extract will show in what way I summarised India's industrial position :—

"Excluding peasant proprietors, there are nearly 28,000,000 agricultural workers in India who come within the scope of the International Labour Office. India has 141,000 maritime workers, lascars, etc., and in this respect come second only to the United Kingdom. She has over 20,000,000 workers in industries, including cottage industries (in which the 'industrials' of Japan are also largely employed), mining, and transport. Factories, mines and railways provide employment for nearly 2,000,000 persons. The mileage of her railways is in excess of every other country except the United States. Her export of manufactured goods in itself is very considerable, would be much greater were it not for the huge size of the country and resultant large home consumption. The export test, of course, favours countries whose whole area is relatively small."

"I laid stress on the fact that while India was denied the position of a first class Power on the Labour Body, she was given it without question when it came to the contribution of the assessment of expenses, whilst Belgium and Switzerland were given third place and Denmark fourth.

"I was sorry to find that my British colleague, the Rt. Hon. G. N. Barnes, M. P., who took a leading part in the drafting of the constitution of the labour organisation, tried to defend what had been done in Washington. The committee, however, declined to consider the case on its merits, arguing that under the constitution of the League the matter was one for the Council and not for the League. Technically this was correct, and I had to accept the decision; but I pointed out that India had expected an adequate measure of sympathy which, I regretted, had been denied to her. When the Committee reported to the Assembly, I repeated my previous arguments that India could not regard the Governing Body fairly representing Labour interests."

The £ 50,000 Contribution of India

As regards the way in which financial contributions are levied, Sir William said that "it was according to the grouping system laid down by the International Postal Union," "That system, which classifies States into seven groups each representing many units of expenditure, is good enough for the purpose for which it was devised ; because the share of the expenditure in connection with the International Postal Union, which falls upon the various countries, is quite small. But in a matter such as the contribution to the League, which is already costing India £ 50,000 a year, the scale of allotment needs to be worked out much more carefully, and with reference to such considerations as net revenue. At present the British Empire collectively pays over one-fourth of the total expenses of the League ; and India, Australia, and South Africa (as well as Canada) are placed in the first class of contributors along with Great Britain and France.

"Everybody admits that the present system is bad and that Article VI. of the Covenant, which tied the League to the Postal Union methods, was very unsatisfactory. The Budget Committee proposed to get the Postal Union to revise their system and to obtain, if possible, a method which should be fair alike for the Postal Union and the League.....but the Assembly rejected this in favour of the Committee's scheme"

The Indian Delegates at the Geneva Conference Dec. 1920

The following speech was delivered by Sir William Meyer, High Commissioner for India, before the meeting of the Council of the League :—

"I do not propose to move any amendment or resolution on this subject, but my Government wishes the Assembly to be in possession of the reasons for which India has felt and still feels aggrieved by her exclusion from the eight Powers of chief industrial importance contemplated in Article 392 of the Treaty of Versailles. A note stating the ground on which India claims this position has been circulated as Assembly Document No. 226 and I need only add a very few remarks to the points there set forth.

"The eight chief industrial powers were to be selected by the Council of the League, but as that Council was not in existence at the time that the Washington Conference met towards the close of last year, the selection of the eight States of chief industrial importance was left to a special organising Committee which contained representatives of the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, and Switzerland. It is a somewhat remarkable coincidence that the Committee proposed all the seven States to which they collectively belonged as great industrial Powers. The eighth selected was Germany. India has never been able to understand on what valid principles some of the selections were made. For instance, why was Switzerland, whose population is about one hundredth part of that of India, preferred to her ? When the United States of America decided not to be in the present on the Governing Body of the Labour Office, Denmark was put into her place, a selection which, with all respect to Denmark, was still less intelligible to India. It may be added that when it was a question of contribution to the funds of

the League, India's importance was at once recognised. She was put into the first class of assesses while Belgium and Switzerland were relegated to the third and Denmark to the fourth.

"Among the documents which have already been furnished to the Assembly are statistics which show India's pre-eminent claim, and I would merely mention here a few salient figures illustrating her industrial importance.

[Here Sir William gave the figures mentioned above on p. 397]

"The Council of the League, having now come into definite existence, India lodged a protest with it, the result of which is set forth in the Council's Report of August 5th 1920. The Council expressed itself fully conscious (to use its own words) of the magnitude of India's industrial output, the large number of her population engaged in industrial pursuits, the international importance of her overseas trade and other circumstances which might be urged in favour of her claim to be one of the eight States of chief industrial importance. The Council considered itself, however, precluded from taking any immediate action in support of India's claims, for reasons set forth in its Report of August 5th last above referred to. I will not discuss these in detail now, but will merely say that they seem to India to savour too much of technical pleading, as for instance, that the Council was not in existence when the Governing Body was organised; that the composition of the Governing Body was endorsed by the Conference at Washington—I have already indicated that the conference passed what may be called a vote of censure on the composition of the Governing Body—that recognition of India's claim would involve the elimination of some other State; that the Council did not know the principles on which the Organising Committee had acted, and found some difficulty as to the exact meaning of the words "industrial importance." Surely it is not more difficult to come to a conclusion as to what are the most important Industrial Powers of the world than to specify what are the Great Powers with reference to other matters.

"The Council, therefore, held that the existing Governing Body should sit on till 1922, and in the meantime proposed to investigate the methods of coming to a decision on the "Industrial importance" question and directed the Secretary General to take this matter up with the International Labour Office,

"It may be urged that, after all, consideration of India's claim was only delayed for two years more, but it is just those early years that are of importance, having regard to the fact that principles will be evolved and precedents created and that a great oriental country with its special labour conditions deserves special consideration.

"One more point I may mention, having regard to the penultimate paragraph of Article 4 of the Covenant, which states that any member of the League not represented on the Council should be invited to send a representative to sit as a member at any meeting for the consideration of matters specially affecting the interest of that member. It seems to me that India ought to have been asked to send a special representative to the Council meeting which resulted in the Report of August 5.

"I quite realise that although the decision arrived at has been a bitter disappointment to India and to her intellectual and industrial classes, who are apt to look suspiciously on procedure which in their view subordinates the interests of Asia to Europe, committee No. 2 were technically justified in holding that the Assembly was not in a position to override the Council's decision. We had not, in fact, asked for this. What we did hope was that a sympathetic reception of our representations might nevertheless lead to some solution which would have been welcomed by us. For instance, the resignation of the Governing Body, on the ground that it had been selected, if I may say so, in a somewhat irregular way, and its replacement at the Conference of 1921 by a body which

would be more regularly constituted under the Council's decision as to what the eight industrial Powers are, would have effected a satisfactory solution.

"It was for these reasons that my Government desired that the matter should be ventilated before the Assembly, and the fact that the claim was included in the Assembly's Agenda seemed to us to show that it was regarded as *"Prima facie"* suitable for discussion. But, as I have said, though disappointed with the decision of Committee No. 2, we must for the moment endure it. We can only wish that the Governing body were constituted in a manner which would render it more capable of giving full consideration not merely to India's interests but generally to those of countries outside Europe."

Sir Saiyad Ali Imam said :—"The hour is late, and I should be guilty of trespassing on the attention of the Assembly if I were to say one word more than is necessary. "The case has been so admirably put before the Assembly by my colleague Sir William Meyer that it is not necessary for me to point out the importance of India from the point of view of labour. With regard to a country where we have got over 10,000,000 people employed in labour, if a voice is raised for representation on the Governing Body of the International Labour Bureau, I suppose, that there is some justification for it. But there is one point in connection with this, that I would like to mention, and that is this. I heard it said, and I think that there is a certain amount of impression abroad, that because India is within the British Empire, therefore her membership of that Empire is sufficient for the protection of her interests. I would like to mention in this Assembly, that so far as fiscal, economic and labour conditions are concerned, there is not always necessarily identity between her interests and the interests of the rest of the British Empire. Therefore, there is an additional reason why India should be given a certain amount of recognition. I know that the Assembly cannot decide this question : perhaps the Assembly cannot deal with this question, but when a voice is raised here, that voice is heard in quarters where the appeal can be answered. Therefore, I entirely support the views which have been put forward by my colleagues Sir William Meyer."

The Net Result of the Conference.

The Indian delegates did not move any resolution on the subject of India having a seat on the International Labour Board. The Assembly of the League could not over-ride the decision of the Council. The Council in their decision, given on 5th August, 1920, at San Sebastian, practically admitted India's right to rank among the first eight nation of "industrial importance," though they were careful to add that they were aware of no authoritative interpretation of the meaning of the phrase. They declined to allow India's claim on the ground that they could not question the right and authority of the Organising Committee which, as the Council were not in existence at the time, selected the eight favoured countries, and also that the Washington Labour Conference 1919 had endorsed the list. The Council could easily have secured, under Article 4 of the Covenant, an Indian delegate to give expert evidence, but instead decided that India should wait for its chance till 1922, when the Governing Body will be reconstituted. The result is that India will be unrepresented on the Board during the year of its existence when, as said Sir William, the most important decisions of first principles will be taken !

The Brussels Conference

The following letter was addressed by the Finance Secy, Govt. of India to all chambers of Commerce for information.

1. I am directed to enclose, for the information of your Committee, copies of the Report of the Delegates for India to the recent International Financial Conference held at Brussels.

2. It is understood that the resolutions accepted by the Conference will shortly be considered by the League of Nations, and meanwhile the Government of India will be glad to receive any observations which your Committee may desire to offer with regard to them. It will be observed, however, that most of the resolutions merely register the unanimous adherence of the Conference to certain canons of sound public finance, and set forth certain generally-accepted principles, in the light of which India may justly claim that her public finance has been consistently administered.

3. Apart from the recommendations of general application, this country is specially interested in those relating to international credits, and I am particularly to invite the attention of your Committee to the scheme referred to in paragraph 8 of Appendix A, Enclosure IV and set forth as Annex A thereto. The Government of India are disposed cordially to welcome any endeavour to work out a scheme of international credits, the importance of which to India's export trade need not be emphasised. They think, however, that it is essential that for any such scheme to be of practical value, so far as India is concerned, the bonds in question must be fully negotiable, and for this reason your Committee will probably agree with them that the amplifications suggested by Sir Marshall Reid, as printed in Appendix II, are an improvement.

4. The present depression in the export trade is no doubt partly due, in the case of some exports, to the existence of large unused stock in foreign countries, but, in the case of other exports, it is probably due to the lack of credit facilities. It is as regards the latter class of exports that a scheme such as that put forward at the Brussels Conference may be of value. I am accordingly to invite the opinion of your Committee, firstly, as to how far any such scheme is likely to assist various export interests represented in your Chamber, and secondly, whether your Committee have

any criticisms or suggestions to make regarding the practical details of the scheme adumbrated by Sir Marshall Reid in Appendix H. In the event of a scheme on such lines proving practicable and finding general acceptance among the nations represented at the conference, the Government of India will then consider the question of participating thereon to the extent of accepting responsibility for some definite share of the international guarantee.

5. The Government of India have expressed to the Secretary of State their appreciation of the able way in which India was represented in Brussels by her delegates, Mr. H. F. Howard, Sir Marshall Reid and Sir Fazulbhoy Currimbhoy.

The Report of the Indian Delegates

The International Conference was convened by the League of Nations "with a view to studying the financial crisis and looking for the means of remedying it and of mitigating the dangerous consequences arising from it." The original intention was that the Conference should be held about the end of May 1920, but it was, for various reasons postponed, and it finally assembled at Brussels towards the end of September, under the presidency of Mr. Gustav Ador, ex-President of the Swiss Republic. In all no less than 39 States were represented, and the Conference held 17 sittings commencing on the 24th September and concluding on the 8th October. In the invitations issued to the members of the League of Nations the Council of the League requested that each Government should send not more than three delegates conversant with public finance and banking as well as with general economic questions. The delegates appointed to represent India were:—

Mr. H. F. Howard, late Secretary to the Government of India (Finance Department), and at present Controller of Finance, India Office.

Sir Marshall Frederick Reid, late Member of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, and previously Chairman of the Bombay Chamber of Commerce.

Sir Fazulbhoy Currimbhoy, a prominent Member of the Bombay, Business Community, late President of the Bank of Bombay, and for several years a Member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council.

2. The Conference was opened by an address by the President, Mr. Ador. Copies of this, as also of the general proceedings of the Conference, have been submitted as the Conference proce-

ded, and the conclusions arrived at by the Conference are embodied in its report (Appendix A). It will, therefore, be sufficient in the present report to give a brief outline of the proceedings, merely referring to matters of special interest from the point of view of India. The address by the President was followed by the presentation of written statements from each country setting out its general financial situation, including its budget situation, internal and external debt, currency, exchange, foreign trade, import and export restrictions, exchange control etc., and the present policy of each Government on these questions. These statements were introduced by each delegation in a brief speech. Many of these statements were of much interest, and the bulk of the delegations were at pains to show the efforts which their countries were making to arrange their finances, etc., on sound lines.

3. While fully realising the difficulty of many of the problems with which India has to deal at the present time as the aftermath of war, the Indian delegation could not fail to be impressed with her great inherent financial and economic strength, if her position be compared with that of the bulk of the participants in the Conference. To quote from the opening sentence of the Conference resolutions: "Thirty-nine nations have in turn placed before the international Financial Conference a statement of their financial position. The examination of those statements brings out the extreme gravity of the general situation of public finance throughout the world, and particularly in Europe. Their import may be summed up in the statement that three out of the countries represented at this Conference, and 11 out of 12 of the European countries, anticipate a budget deficit in the current year. Apart, too, from the fact that India has emerged from the war with her resources relatively unimpaired, she stands in a special position at the present time and possesses special opportunities, in as much as she has a surplus of important commodities to dispose of, whereas many countries are suffering from a deficiency of foodstuffs and raw materials and from a depreciation of their currencies which make it impossible to carry on the normal process of production or even to set its machinery once again in motion.

4. The written statement (Appendix B) of the delegates for India, while briefly reviewing her financial situation, brought out the fact that she is able to export considerable supplies of various commodities as regards which the Government of India had furnished information, and Mr. Howard in his speech (Appendix C) emphasised that she is anxious to so assist the world's reconstruction by doing so, provided that satisfactory financial arrangements can be made.

5. Apart from the above review of the financial and economic situation of the various countries, the main business of the Conference consisted in a discussion of financial policy. The field was subdivided into the four following subjects, a separate debate on each subject being opened by the Vice-President whose name is noted against it :—

- (1) Public Finance—Hon. R. Brand, England.
- (2) Currency and exchange—Dr. Vissering, Holland.
- (3) International Trade—M. de Woutersd' Oplinter, Belgium.
- (4) International Credits—M. Celier, France.

6. In opening the first debate Mr. Brand gave a striking address setting out the correct principles which should govern the conduct of public finance. Mr. Howard had submitted his name to speak on this debate, as the acceptance of the principle set out by Mr. Brand appeared to be of fundamental importance from the point of view of the re-establishment of international credit, in which India is vitally interested ; but as these principles were not questioned in any quarter, he considered it sufficient to confine himself to a few remarks (Appendix D) noting the universal acceptance with which these principles had met.

7. In the debate on currency and exchange the delegates were in full accord with the views stated by Lord Cullen, representative of Great Britain and considered it unnecessary to intervene. A paper read by Mr. Strakosch, delegate for South Africa, with regard to the future of gold, possesses special interest for India (Appendix E).

8. In the debate on international trade the question of tariffs was touched, and it seemed possible that this might be made an important issue. Sir Fazulbhoy Currimbhoy accordingly intervened in the debate to emphasise that while India was anxious to co-operate in the world's reconstruction, there was a strong body of public opinion in India which favoured a policy of protection for her industries, and he urged that the question of tariffs should be excluded from discussion as not relevant to the matters actually at issue. A copy of this remark is appended (Appendix F).

9. Special interest centered in the debate on international credits, since this afforded an opportunity for constructive measures. The Conference had before them numerous schemes varying widely in scope and apparent practicability. That of M. Delacroix, Prime Minister of Belgium, had perhaps attracted most attention, and formed a starting point for discussion. It was, however, generally felt that his proposals were on too ambitious a scale, and the Indian delegates think they are correct in stating that Sir Marshall Roid (*vide* copy of his speech at appendix G) focussed the general course of the Conference in urging that what was required for the

purposes of reconstruction was not the setting up of entirely new, expensive and untried machinery, but, an attempt to repair and lubricate the machinery which was already existing though it had in large measure fallen into disuse. This point of view was further developed by Mr. C. E. ter Meulen (Holland), and a scheme outlined by him formed the basis of discussion later.

10. After the formal debates in plenary session, the separate heads of discussion were referred to general Committees for the purpose of preparing draft resolutions for the adoption of the Conference. On these Committees each country was allowed one representative, India's representation being as follows :—

- (1) Public Finance ...Mr. Howard.
- (2) Currency and Exchange...Sir Marshall Reid.
- (3) International Trade ...Sir Fazulbhoj Currimbhoy.
- (4) International Credit ...Sir Marshall Reid

Each Committee in turn selected from its members a small "drafting" committee, which was entrusted with the active preparation of the drafts for consideration of the main committees. Sir Fazulbhoj Currimbhoy and Sir Marshall Reid were selected to serve on the drafting Committees in the case of International Trade and International Credit respectively. The draft resolutions so prepared were after approved by the main Committees, presented to the Conference and passed without a dissentient vote.

11. The resolutions of the Conference (of which copies will be found as Enclosures I, II, III, and IV of appendix A) have already been published. The delegation found themselves able to subscribe to these without reservation, and it is only to the resolutions with regard to International Credit that they desire to make any further reference. The operative part of this group of resolutions is contained in paragraphs 8 and 9 of Appendix A, Enclosure IV. The scheme referred to in paragraph 8 as Annex A had the support of a number of delegates of a great internal experience, who expressed confidence in its practicability. Paragraph 9 of the same group of resolutions refers to a scheme put forward by Sir Marshall Reid (a copy is attached as Appendix H). This proposal was made by Sir Marshall Reid in the light of commercial experience, and he explained that he could not in any way commit his Government. The Indian delegates wish to say, however, that Sir Marshall Reid's proposal was elaborated with full concurrence of his colleagues, who considered that its adoption would materially conduce to more normal conditions in the consuming markets, with corresponding advantages to the producers of raw materials. They suggest, therefore, that an early expression of the views of the Government of India in this matter should be obtained. For, while some delay is inevitable before a definite con-

elusion can be arrived at on the practical recommendations of the Conference, serious consideration of these recommendations will begin at an early date; and the various countries affected will then be expected to define their attitude at short notice.

12. Apart from the four Committees mentioned above, a further important Committee was appointed "to consider the principles on which the expenses of the League of Nations should be distributed among its members and to make recommendations for a new basis of apportionment." Mr. Howard was a member of this Committee and of its drafting Committee. The report of the Committee was not published, M. Ador the President, informing the Conference that this would be forwarded to the Council of the League of Nations.

13. In conclusion, the Indian delegation wish to say that it has been a great privilege to them to take part in this historic and instructive Conference. The general atmosphere of courtesy and goodwill, and the desire to find common ground where points of view were necessarily divergent, were very remarkable. The delegates also desire to acknowledge the great hospitality which was extended to the delegations by the Government and people of Belgium.

(Sd.) H. F. HOWARD,
 „ MARSHALL REID.
 „ FAZULBHOY CURRIMBOY.

The Indian Scheme.

The following is Sir Marshall Reid's Scheme referred to above :

In accordance with Annexe A there will be created :—

- (a) The undertaking of the buyer to fulfil his contract.
- (b) The assurance of the buying country that he is probably capable of doing so.
- (c) The confirmation of the assurance by the Central Commission.
- (d) The bond of the buying country to be handed over to the seller as collateral.

While supporting the scheme of M. ter Meulen (Annexe A), the Indian Delegation are of opinion that it will serve only a limited purpose, and that it will be of little practical value to countries which are remote from Europe, but which produce so much of the raw materials essential for reconstruction. They are of opinion that the bonds created under Annexe A will not be acceptable as collateral except at a considerable discount by the banks abroad to which they look to finance their shipments. The large proportion

of risk which will thus remain with the seller will seriously affect the usefulness of the scheme.

The aim of the present proposal is to create a bond which will be of value in international markets, and will be readily accepted by banks as collateral at approximately its face value, in fact will be practically equivalent to confirmed letter of credit.

The following are the outlines of the scheme:—

(1) The bond created under Annex A [paragraph (d) above] be delivered to the Central Commission instead of being handed over to the seller. The Central Commission would retain it as collateral and issue in its place a "Central Commission Bond," which would be secured under a limited joint guarantee of the countries or bodies participating in the scheme.

(2) The Guarantee Fund would consist of an unlimited number of shares of such value as may be considered convenient. Subscribers would be entitled to an allotment of Central "Commission Bonds" which would bear the same proportion to the total permissible issue of bonds as their share contribution would bear to the total amount subscribed. Thus if the ratio of 10 to 1, as suggested in paragraph 4, were adopted each subscriber of, say, 10,000l would be entitled to an allotment up to 1000,001, in bonds.

(3) Seeing that Central Commission Bonds would have the full benefit of the security of Annex A Bonds, it may be fairly assumed that the calls on the guarantee would at the worst amount to a very small proportion of the transactions carried through under the collateral of the bonds.

(4) It is therefore suggested that the volume of transactions current at one time under the system might quite safely amount to ten times the amount of the guarantee. Thus if shares were subscribed to the amount of say, 101, millions gold, transactions up to 1001, millions gold be guaranteed.

(5) Subscribers would not be required to pay for their shares in cash, but would furnish such securities as the Central Commission required; the risk of each subscriber would be definitely limited to the amount of shares subscribed.

(6) Central Commission Bonds would be available for use only in connection with transactions between countries or bodies who were subscribers.

(7) The Central Commission Bonds for transactions between two subscribers might be furnished either from the allotment of the buying or selling subscriber. This provide the buying parties with bonds in excess of their allotments, provided always that they were able to furnish Annex A Bonds for the full amount.

(8) On the completion of the transaction, the bonds would be

returned to the Central Commission who would cancel them and return the relative Annexe A Bonds to the buying country.

(9) The maturity of the bonds would be the same as in the case of the Annexe A Bonds.

(10) The Central Commission would publish periodical statements showing such important particulars as total bonds current and totals of each buying and selling country—also total of Annexe A Bonds of each country in its keeping.

(11) A commission would be charged on all "Central Commission Bonds" to cover expenses and to compensate guarantors.

(12) It might be that some countries might not find themselves in a position, for one reason or another, to participate as a nation in a scheme of this sort, but it would be quite open to a trade or section, e.g., the cotton growers of America, to join in the guarantee, and to get the full pro rata benefit of it.

(13) Bonds under Annexe A scheme would only be issued to buying countries for limited quantities of specific commodities and Central Commission Bonds would only be issued for the same commodities, but it would be open to selling subscriber independently to restrict the purposes for which their bonds should be utilised.

(14) If the Central Commission had at any time reason to fear that heavy calls were likely to be made in the near future, they might have to consider the expediency of restricting or discontinuing the issue of further bonds until the situation cleared and it became evident that the amount of the Guarantee Fund was ample to cover the risks in outstanding transactions.

NOTE—M. Celier, Vice-President, has kindly promised to submit these proposals to the League of Nations for the consideration of the Committee which will deal with the Conference resolutions on International Credits, particularly paragraphs 8 and 9.

The Meulen Scheme.

Regarding International Credits, the Brussel Conference make the following recommendations:—

8. An international organisation should be formed and placed at the disposal of States desiring to have resort to credit for the purpose of paying for their essential imports. These States would then notify the assets which they are prepared to pledge as security for the sake of obtaining credit, and would come to an understanding with the international organisation as to the conditions under which these assets would be administered.

The bonds issued against this guarantee would be used as collateral for credit intended to cover the cost of commodities.

A plan based upon these principles is developed in Annex, A.

It has been devised to enable States to facilitate the obtaining of commercial credits by their nationals. It is easy to see that the scheme is susceptible of development in various directions and that some of its provisions might be adapted so as to facilitate the extension of credit direct to public corporations.

A committee of financiers and business men should be nominated forthwith by the Council of the League of Nations for the purpose of defining the measures necessary to give practical effect to this proposal.

9. It has been represented to the Conference that more complete results might be achieved if the bonds used as collateral were to carry some international guarantee.

The Conference sees no objection to the further consideration of this proposal. The committee referred to in paragraph 8 above might usefully consider the conditions under which it could be applied.

The Meulen Scheme

Annexe A.—International Credit

1. In order that impoverished nations, which under present circumstances are unable to obtain accommodation on reasonable terms in the open market, may be able to command the confidence necessary to attract funds for the financing of their essential imports and International Commission shall be constituted under the auspices of the League of Nations.

2. The Commission shall consist of bankers and businessmen of International repute, appointed by the Council of the League of Nations.

3. The Commission shall have the power to appoint Sub-Commissions, and to devolve upon them the exercise of its authority in participating countries or in groups of participating countries.

4. The Governments of countries desiring to participate shall notify to the Commission what specific assets they are prepared to assign as security for commercial credit to be granted by the nationals of exporting countries.

5. The Commission, after examination of these assets, shall, of its own authority, determine the gold value of the credits which it would approve against the security of these assets.

6. The participating Government shall then be authorised to prepare bonds to the gold value approved by the Commission each in one specific currency to be determined on the issue of the bond.

7. The date of maturity and the rate of interest to be borne by these bonds shall be determined by the participating Government in agreement with Commission.

8. The service of these bonds shall be secured out of the revenue of the assigned assets.

9. The assigned assets shall in the first instance be administered by the participating Government, or by the International Commission as that Commission may in each case determine.

10. The Commission shall at any time have the right of making direct representations to the Council of the League of Nations as to the desirability of transferring the administration of the assigned assets either from the Commission to the participating Government or from the participating Government to the Commission.

11. The decision of the Council of the League of Nations on this question shall be binding.

12. After the preparation of these bonds the participating Government shall have the right to loan the bond to its own nationals, for use by them as collateral security for importations.

13. The bonds shall be made out in such currencies and in such denominations as are applicable to the particular transaction in respect of which they are issued.

14. The participating Government shall be free to take, or not to take, security for the loan of these bonds from the nationals to whom they are lent.

15. The maturity and the rate of interest of the loan of the bonds shall be fixed by agreement between the participating Government and the borrower of the bonds; they need not be the same as the maturity and the rate of interest of the bonds themselves.

16. When making application to his Government for a loan of these bonds, the importer must furnish proof that he has previously obtained from the International Commission express permission to enter into the transaction for which the bonds are to be given as collateral.

17. Each bond, before it is handed over by the participating Government to the importer, shall be countersigned by the Commission in proof of registration.

18. Having obtained the consent of the Commission, and received from them the countersigned bonds, the importer will pledge these bonds to the exporter in a foreign country for the period of the transaction.

19. The exporter will return to him on their due date the coupons of the pledged bonds, and the bonds themselves on the completion of the transaction.

20. On receipt of the coupons and the bonds respectively, the importer will return them to his Government.

21. Bonds returned to the participating Government shall be cancelled, and may subsequently be replaced by other bonds.

either in the same or in a different currency, up to an equivalent amount.

22. The exporter, or if he has pledged the bonds, the institution with which he has repledged them, acting on his behalf, would be free, in the event of the importer not fulfilling the terms of his contract, to hold until maturity the bonds given as collateral by the importer, or to sell them in accordance with the custom in his country in the case of default.

23. In the second alternative an option of repurchasing the bonds direct must first be given for a short period to the Government which issued them.

24. If a sale is resorted to and results in a surplus beyond what is necessary to cover the claims of the exporter upon the importer, the exporter shall be held accountable for that surplus to the Government which issues the bonds.

25. The revenues from the assigned assets shall be applied as follows to the service of the bonds.

26. Out of these revenues the Commission or the participating Government, as the case may be, shall purchase foreign currencies sufficient to meet at their due date the coupons on all bonds at any time outstanding in the different foreign currencies.

27. In addition, they shall establish abroad in the appropriate currencies a sinking fund calculated to redeem at maturity 10 percent of the bonds outstanding in each of the different countries.

28. Further, in addition to the amounts provided for payment of coupons and for the endowment of the sinking fund, they shall establish out of the assigned revenues a special reserve in one or more foreign currencies for the redemption of bonds sold in accordance with paragraph 22.

29. The amount to be set aside for the special reserve shall in each case be determined by the Commission.

30. Any surplus remaining at the end of each year after the provision of these services shall be at the free disposal of the participating Government.

31. A participating Government shall have the right to offer its own bonds as collateral for credits obtained for the purpose of importations on Government account. The previous assent of the Commission will in these cases also be required for the particular importations desired by the participating Government.

32. If a participating Government, which has been in control of its assigned revenues should fail to fulfil its obligations, the exporter concerned will notify the Commission and the Commission will apply to the Council of the League of Nations for the transfer of the management of the assigned revenues to the Commission.

33. The consent of the Commission is necessary whenever bonds secured on the assigned assets are given as collateral, and shall, as a rule, be accorded only for the import of raw materials and primary necessities.

34. The Commission may, however, at its discretion, sanction in advance the importation of specified quantities of such goods.

35. Even in the case of imports under such a general sanction, a notification of the particular transaction must be registered with the Commission.

36. The assent of the Commission must also be obtained in every case to the term of the credit which it is proposed to open.

The Murray Report

The following is the report of Mr. A. R. Murray, C. B. E. representative of the employers of factory labour in India at the Washington International Labour Conference, 1920 :—

At a meeting of the Indian Jute Mills Association held in Calcutta on 5th September, I had an opportunity of ascertaining generally the views of the members of that Association regarding the hours of work and conditions of factory labour in the Bengal jute mills. On the morning of 15th September, too, I attended an informal meeting of the Committee of the Mill Owners' Association at Bombay and had a short discussion regarding the hours and condition of factory labour in the Bombay cotton mills. Apart from these two meetings I had no opportunity of formally ascertaining the views of employers of labour in India. It was not until I was sailing from Bombay on the 15th September that I received copies of the Organizing Committee's letter and questionnaire and relative papers. On my arrival in London on 6th October, I received at the India Office copies of the three reports prepared by the Organising Committee for the International Labour Conference, which had been published in August. These reports analysed and summarised the materials contained in the replies to the questionnaire received from different Governments, and in them the Committee presented, as a result of their examination of the materials, certain conclusions and recommendations in the shape of draft conventions as a basis for the discussion by the Conference of the several subjects on the Agenda. The first three reports deal respectively with—(1) The eight hours day or 48 hours week, (2) Unemployment, (3) The employment of women and children, and the Berne Conventions of 1906 : but they contain nothing about India or Japan except provisional suggestion of the Organizing Committee that these and similar countries might be able to accept certain alternatives to the conventions drafted for the other countries of the world. These notifications will be dealt with later and I merely refer to them at this stage to show that the Organizing Committee felt themselves justified in making suggestions to meet India's special circumstances without having before them materials on which to form opinions of any value.

Before I left India, the Government of India had drawn the attention of the local Governments to certain paragraphs in the Indian Industrial Commission's Report and had invited the opinion

of the local Governments whether, taking into account the present position of Indian mills and mill operatives, they think that the hours of labour should be shortened, and if so, to what extent, for what classes of labour and by what stages, if any, and also whether there are other points in the existing factory law requiring amendment. On receipt of replies the Government of India were to consider what further actions should be taken; whether, for instance, it would be necessary to appoint a Committee of Enquiry, or whether the opinions received would warrant the framing of legislation, either with or without further discussion with local Governments. When I sailed, the Government of India could not have received replies, from all local Governments, to their request for expressions of opinion as to shortening the hours of labour; far in less have had time to consider carefully such an important question in all its bearings as affecting Indian labour and Indian industries. I was, therefore, surprised to learn, in the course of informal discussions with the Indian Government delegates when crossing the Atlantic, that they were prepared to agree, on behalf of the Government of India, to the principle of a sixty hours week. On the face of the Government of India's replies to the questionnaire and relative explanatory Memorandum on Indian labour conditions, there is nothing to indicate why the Government of India should commit themselves to a precise reduction of working hours. In discussions with the Indian Government and Workers' Delegates, I urged that the enquiries instituted by the Government of India should be completed, and all the facts taken into consideration before agreeing to any particular amendment of the existing Factory Act. This seemed to me the correct attitude for the Indian Delegation to take up at the Conference, but unfortunately I was unable to carry my fellow delegates with me on this point, and we, therefore, arrived at Washington on 27th October 1919, holding divided opinions on what the Organizing Committee described as the most important subject on the agenda for the consideration of the Conference.

The recommendations of the Committee as regards India are incorporated in Article 10 of the Draft Convention adopted by the Conference which reads as follows :—

In British India the principle of a sixty hours week shall be adopted for all workers in the industries at present covered by the factory acts administered by the Government of India, in mines and in such branches of railway work as shall be specified for this purpose by the competent authority. Any modification of this limitation made by the competent authority shall be subject to the provisions of Articles 6 and 7 of this Convention. In other respects the provisions of this Convention shall not apply to India, but

THE MURRAY REPORT

275

further provisions limiting the hours of work in India shall be considered at a future meeting of the General Conference.

Under the existing Indian factory laws, adult males may work twelve hours per day in Indian textile industries, women 11 hours, and children (between the ages of 9 and 14) 6 hours. If the draft Convention is ratified by the Indian Legislature, the effect of the foregoing article will be to limit the hours of work in Indian industries to 60 per week for both men and women. It will be observed that Article 10 applies to mines as well as other industries. The limitation of hours of work of adults in mines will, if adopted, form a new departure in Indian mining legislation and this question will require careful consideration by those interested. Indeed, the Committee recommended that the Government of India should be asked to consider the possibility of limiting the hours of underground work in mines to 54 in the week. They also recommended that the Government of India should be asked to consider the possibility of adopting modified definition of "Factory," which would reduce the number of workers required to bring a factory under the scope of the Act. Under the existing Indian factory laws, this number is fixed at 50 although in certain cases, it may be, and has been, reduced to 20.

Mr. Joshi, the Worker's Delegate from India, gave notice of a motion to add to the proposed Convention concerning India.—

1. The word "factory" in the Convention to be applied to India should mean, "any industry worked with steam, water or any other mechanical power or electrical power and employing not less than ten persons."

(2) The hours of work for women employed in factories shall not exceed 54 a week.

(3) Children under 14 shall not be employed for more than 30 hours a week.

These particular proposals had all been fully discussed in the Committee and were brought up in the Central Conference by Mr. Joshi in the hope that he might be successful in getting them adopted there. On the second last day of the Conference, however, Mr. Joshi withdrew his proposed Amendment in order to save time, and contented himself by putting in a written statement which appears in the Provisional Record of the 20th day of the Conference. He closes that statement by saying that he postpones consideration of the question mentioned in his amendment to the next year's meeting of the Conference in the strong hope that they will then receive very sympathetic consideration. The Committee's Report regarding India and the other countries, except Japan, was adopted by the Conference by a vote of 67 to 1, the dissenting vote being

that of the Worker's Delegate from Belgium, Mr. Martens, who is one of the Vice-Presidents of the International Federation of Trade Unions.

In addition to the Draft Convention limiting the hours of work in industrial undertakings to eight in the day and forty-eight in the week, two resolutions were passed by the Main Committee on the Hours of Work. One had reference to work of re-construction in devastated areas which, it was agreed, justified special consideration. The other was in the following terms :

The provisions of this Convention shall not interfere with any better conditions already in operation, or agreed upon, for all or part of the workers of any country ; neither shall they interfere with any negotiations now proceeding in which the workers are asking for better conditions than the convention provides.

Both resolutions were adopted unanimously at the plenary sitting of the Conference on 25th November. Another resolution of importance was proposed by the Worker's Delegates from France and Italy and was ultimately carried unanimously on the second last day of the Conference in the following form :—

The Conference hopes that in no case should the wages of workmen be reduced simply by reason of the introduction of the 8-hours day, and the 48-hours week, in order that the conditions which exist in certain industries and which the present Convention allows to continue may not be aggravated by the imposition of lower wages on the workers.

If ratified by the Indian Government, the effect of article 3 will be to raise the age limit of children from 9 to 12 years, to widen the existing definition of a factory and to bring mining and the transport and handling of goods within the scope of factory legislation in India.

India in Parliament, 1920

The House of Commons first met in 1920 on Feb. 10th. In the following pages are given some of the more important interpellations of the year on Indian affairs, excepting military, pension and cognate matters of a technical nature. The outstanding features of the debates relate to the 1919 affairs of the Punjab under that arch-enemy of India, Michael O'Dwyer, and the Rules framed under the new Reform Act—the former by far the most stormy that has ever taken place since a very long time in Parliament.

The first report of the Punjab Government on the riots (rebellion, according to it) was submitted to the Government of India on October 11th, 1919,—six months after the tragic massacres! This report was kept a secret till it was issued as a White Paper on January 30th, 1920. On December 16th 1919, Mr. Montagu stated in reply to a question in the House that he was not then fully in possession of the facts relating to the Punjab Massacre (see Register 1920, Part II. p. 381) and implored the House to suspend judgment till the Report of the Hunter Committee then sitting in India was out.

But meanwhile the Punjab Government's admittedly one-sided report was issued on the eve of the meeting of Parliament, and the reason is obvious; for the intention was to influence public mind in favour of the Punjab officials. In answering a question on this subject on February 10th. Mr. Bonar Law described the report as merely "a narrative of events" when it was in fact a strong case deliberately prepared in its own favour by O'Dwyer's Government. In reply to another question, however, he said, "until the Committee now sitting in India under Lord Hunter to enquire into the disturbances had reported to the Government of India, and the Government of India have expressed their views to the Secretary of State, it would obviously be improper to take any action", though it was thought quite proper to publish and make known the facts abroithly marshalled by the Punjab Government.

All this in the House of Commons. In the Lords, the Sydenham gang was not inactive.

On Feb. 25th. 1920 Lord Sydenham asked the following question:—

Lord Sydenham:—My Lords, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India (Lord Sinha) whether the Secretary of State has been informed that—

1. Among the inflammatory notices posted at Layallpur on April 13th last was one suggesting to the mob that there were European women at the rallying post who should be outraged.

2. The necessity for proclaiming martial law at Lyallpur has been denied.

3. During the week ending January 17th last, all Europeans were directed not to enter Delhi, the capital city of India, for four days, in consequence of celebrations attending the release from internment of Mahomed Ali and Shaukat Ali.

4. Indian witnesses before the Hunter Commission, who gave evidence not in accordance with the views of the National Congress, have been cruelly persecuted and boycotted.

5. Public buildings, such as schools, have been permitted to be used for political meetings organised by the party which has demanded the recall of the Viceroy.

Viscount Sandhurst :—My Lords, I hope that my noble Friend will allow me to answer the questions in the absence of the Under Secretary of State, who is in India. The Secretary of State for India is aware that a notice suggesting the dishonouring of English women was found posted up at Lyallpur. He is also aware that the necessity for proclaiming martial law in any Punjab district has been widely questioned in India. This indeed is one of the main subjects of inquiry by the Hunter Committee. On the third, fourth, and fifth points the Secretary of State is informed as follows : Europeans generally avoided Delhi city at the period in question, but no prohibitory orders were issued to civilians and, in fact, the Chief Commissioner reports that certain Europeans were assisted through the crowd by volunteers on the day of the Ali brother's reception. Orders were, however, issued to the troops, British and Indian, by the General Officer Commanding Delhi Brigade, placing Delhi city out of bounds from January 14 to 18 inclusive. The object was to avoid possible collisions between the troops and the mob. This course has frequently been adopted on occasion of festivals. The Government have had reports that Sir Umar Hayat Khan and other pro-Government witnesses before the Hunter Committee have been accorded hostile receptions. Reports have also been received that Indians considered to be pro-Government are subject to social persecution and boycott. No reports have been received that meetings of the nature referred to have been held in schools. The foundation of the rumour is probably due the fact that school boys often take a prominent part in meetings of the extremist party and are employed as volunteers in public demonstrations. It may be added that agitation for the recall of the Viceroy is very little in evidence at present.

Lord Hunter's Report was submitted to the Govt. of India on March 8th. 1920; it was forwarded by that Govt. to the Secretary of State on May 3rd and was issued to the public in June, together with the famous despatch of the Secretary of State. Then came that nauseating fusillade of questions in the Commons inspired by a sympathy of Dyerism given on page 460, *et seq.*, and then that historic debate in Parliament on July 8th 1920.

Regarding the Debate on Amritsar and General Dyer, the following critical account given by a 'Student of Politics' and published in the *London Times* is worth reproducing.—

"When the Secretary for India rose to-day to speak on General Dyer's conduct at Amritsar, the benches were more crowded than they have been for a year, except in some of the Russian debates. Before a word was said, one could feel the air beating with excitement.

"Mr. Montagu is a sincere man and a genuine Liberal, but he does not know the House of Commons. His opening speech was bad advocacy, and one could see his critics growing more and more irritated with each sentence. He acknowledged the services of General Dyer, but said his principles were wrong when he declared that his intention was to read Indians at large a "moral lesson"—that was terrorism. His compulsory salaaming and his "all fours" order were racial humiliation. His setting up of the whipping triangles was the policy of frightfulness. These things were inconsistent with our policy in India. If you justified General Dyer, I meant that we ruled India by the sword; and the end of that policy would be that our rule in India would stink in the nostrils, alike of our own democracy and of the Indian people, and that the two would combine to close it. You must choose between the policy of force and the policy of partnership. You could not mix the two, voting for partnership one year and for force the next. As Mr. Montagu developed this argument the House became more and more restive. When he went on to say that there was a theory abroad that an Indian was tolerable only so long as he obeyed orders, interruptions swelled into a prolonged roar of anger. He persisted courageously and lowered the horns of his dilemma more menacingly. "Choose, choose," he said, "between race ascendancy and partnership, and on your choice will depend the continuance of the British Empire."

"The House was now thoroughly angry. It had not expected this sort of speech. It was bad advocacy in two ways. It was too passionate, and the malcontents were irritated by its sharp logical dilemmas. Secondly, the English mind does not work in that way. We are the most daring political generaliser in the world, but it

is our way in politics, as in science, to proceed inductively from the particular to the general, and not from the general to the particular.

"The House would have welcomed the principles of Mr. Montagu, which were not merely sound, but noble, if he had led up to them by an accumulation of instances. But between our inductive English method of political argument and this deductive argument from sharply opposed logical propositions, there is an interval of 2,000 years, and 30 deg. of longitude. East and West, be they produced ever so far, will never meet, and Mr. Montagu, patriotic and sincere English Liberal as he is, is also a Jew, and in excitement has the mental idiom of the East. That was the fault of a speech which in logical idea was a singularly pure and brilliant expression of Liberal doctrine.

"A more violent contrast than that between the speech of Mr. Montagu and that of Sir Edward Carson who followed, it would be impossible to conceive. There was not a general idea in Sir Edward Carson's speech, unless we regard his passion for justice to the individual as a general idea. "We cannot try him, but we have a right to insist that he should have a fair trial." For the rest, his speech was an appeal to prejudice. To break a man without fair trial, was un-English; you must trust the man on the spot. Even if there had been an error of judgment, ought he alone to bear the consequences? His strongest point was that the punishment was not immediate, but was delayed. How unfair for armchair politicians in Downing street to pass these judgments on men who had these frightfully difficult practical problems, not of their own making, to solve. You must encourage your agents by your support if they do the onset. Perhaps General Dyer had saved India. The substance of the speech was extraordinarily poor; the manner was impressive, and the advocacy perfect.

"Mr. Churchill, who followed, was amazingly skilful, and turned the House (or so it seemed) completely round. He began so haltingly as to get the patient ear of the House. He avoided at first expressing an opinion on the merits and entered on an elaborate, not to say, dry discourse on the law of master and servant in the Army. He defined the three degrees of dissatisfaction with the conduct of an officer in the Army. General Dyer's retirement on half-pay was the mildest of the three punishments, and you could not say he had been treated unfairly unless you were also prepared to insist on a special trial for the hundreds of officers who had been treated so during and since the war. He met the argument that General Dyer's conduct had been condoned by his superiors by making it clear that but for that he would have been subjected to severe punishment.

"Having thus met the suspicion that there was something especially vindictive in the treatment of General Dyer, Mr. Churchill

began to deal with the merits of the case. He admitted the difficulties that confronted an officer in dealing with civil disturbances. Still there were certain elementary tests. Was the crowd with which he had to deal attacking or threatening to attack? Was it armed? At Amritsar the answer to both the questions was in the negative. He then went on to describe the slaughter. We had a picture of the crowd massed in a narrow space, rushing wildly from centre to the corners and back again, as the guns were turned to this direction or that. The feeling of pity grew dominant as the picture became more vivid.

"Mr. Asquith followed with a criticism of Sir Edward Carson's speech. He complained that he had not addressed himself to the merits of the case. To ask the House of Commons to reverse the decision that had been taken was to condone one of the worst outrages in our history.

"After that the debate flagged. Mr. Spoor for the Labour Party developed that General Dyer was typical of an Anglo Indian spirit which was not only illiberal and tyrannical, but was undermining the foundations of our rule.

"Feeling was again very high when Mr. Bonar Law rose to wind up the debate. He laboured to show that he understood all the difficulties of General Dyer's position, but hardly succeeded in soothing the anger of the malcontents. He seemed less successful usually in gauging the moods of the House, and in managing them.

"The Labour amendment to reduce the India Office Vote by £100 was lost by 247 votes to 37; and Sir Edward Carson's amendment, also for a reduction of the vote, by 230 votes to 129."

"General Dyer listened to the debate from a seat under the gallery. The following Indian Princes were in the Distinguished Strangers' Gallery; The Maharaja of Jhallawar, the Maharaja of Kapurthalla, the Tikka Sahab of Kapurthala, the Maharaja of Cooch Behar, the Yuvaraja of Mysore, the Maharaja of Alwar, and the Jam Sahab of Nawanganar."

The Lord's Debate

The Debate in the Lords on Lord Finlay's Motion "to deplore the conduct of the case of General Dyer as unjust and as establishing a precedent dangerous to the preservation of order in the face of rebellion" lasted for two days and was lively in the extreme. It had all the accompaniments of a great occasion. For once the Peers of the realm found means to leave their shady career and congregate

to assert a principle on which lay the foundation of their decrepit existence. More than 200 of their Lordships, most of them as innocent of that pampered chamber as of India, attended and a very "distinguished" gathering of Peeresses and 'fashionable' society-women, reeking capitalists and other friends and admirers of the "Hero of the Punjab", lent an imposing air to the assembly. The Gaekwar of Baroda, the Maharani, and other Indian Princes and noblemen also attended.

Lord Finlay had been well briefed for his job. He stuck to the case of General Dyer throughout, without any concern for the graver issues involved for the people of India or a word of sympathy for the innocent victims of the massacre. He condemned the partisanship which the Indian members of the Hunter Committee had displayed and depicted the disadvantages under which the accused officer laboured.

Lord Sinha, apologetic in his tone and manner, was more placid and restrained. Perhaps the atmosphere of the House was too strong for him and he thought it wiser to leave the more unqualified denunciations to those who could speak with cabinet authority. He went out of his way to condemn the activities of Mr. Gandhi, which was altogether uncalled for, especially in relation to the new movement of Non-Co-operation. It was a calm well reasoned speech.

The Lord Chancellor mercilessly denounced the cruel acts of General Dyer. He did this certainly in unqualified language such as one does not often hear from such lofty quarters; but he also showed that he was not unaware of the deeper issues that were at stake and of the fundamental principles that there were involved. In words that were worthy of the high office which he holds, Lord Birkenhead asserted the right of Indians to equal treatment with other citizens of the empire, and he warned their Lordships of the harm they would be doing in India if they passed the resolution.

The case for the Government of India was stated by Lord Meston. His business was to justify the policy of finding a scape-goat for others (himself included). He was the only speaker who thought it necessary to defend the action of the Viceroy.

Lord Curzon declared his distrust of the theory that General Dyer saved the Punjab by his exertions, and he altogether denied that he saved India by example. Were the principles upon which General Dyer acted approved, said his Lordship, we should lower our reputation in India, lower our own standards of justice and humanity, and debase the currency of our national honour. The House heard him throughout with breathless interest, but with scarcely a sign of approval. The motion was adopted by 129 votes to 86—a direct defeat of the Government!

HOUSE OF COMMONS—Feb. 18th, 1920

Mr. Ormsby Gore asked the Secretary for India what instruction, of any, have been sent by him to the Government of India or to the Governor of Madras with regard to the framing of the franchise rules governing the representation of non-Brahmins in the province of Madras; and whether an agreement has been reached by the Government of India with regard to the method and amount of representation to be given to the non-Brahmins in Madras?

The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. Herbert Fisher*): My right hon. friend has sent no instructions either to the Government of India or the Governor of Madras, beyond requesting them to carry out as speedily as possible (along with other recommendations) the recommendation of the Joint Select Committee contained in paragraph (c) of their Report under the heading "Clause 7", and explaining to the Governor of Madras that in recommending provision for non-Brahmins of "separate representation by means of reservation of seats" the Committee did not intend to recommend the setting up of separate electorates consisting only of non-Brahmins. The Viceroy reported on January 26th that Lord Willingdon was hopeful of a speedy settlement of the matter. I am not aware whether a settlement has actually been reached.

Mr. Ormsby-Gore: Is the right hon. gentleman not aware that the Joint Committee expressly suggested that the matter should not be left to the Governor of Madras but dealt with by the Government of India on its own initiative and that a great deal of unrest has been caused in Madras by the intervention of the Governor of Madras in the very delicate negotiations?

Sir J. D. Rees: Who would properly intervene, or more properly intervene, than the Governor of Madras?

Mr. Fisher: I think it is quite obvious that the Governor of Madras is the proper person.

Sir J. D. Rees asked what progress had been made by the Committee on financial relations which is considering the question of provincial contributions to the Government of India in view of the eventual equalisation in incidence of such contributions?

Mr. Fisher: The work of the Committee is barely begun, and no report of its progress has yet been received. (See P. III, p. 49).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—Feb. 25th 1920

Strikes at Bombay.

Colonel Wedgwood asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Bombay mill strikers were fired on in January of this year; and how many casualties resulted among the Indian population?

The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. Herbert Fisher*):

I am informed that before a settlement of the strike was reached, the mob attacked a picket of military police accompanied by a magistrate, the magistrate and others of the party being struck by stones. On the crowd being ordered to disperse they displayed a defiant attitude; threats of firing had no effect on the mob, and the magistrate gave orders to disperse it by force. The serjeant and one private fired one round each, killing one rioter and seriously injuring another. Subsequently, when as the result of the Governor's mediation, concessions were made to the strikers and preparations made to start work at four or five mills, determined efforts to prevent this were made. At one mill large crowds stoned the military posts, forcibly entered the mill compound and stoned the cashier and two sepoy. A few rounds were fired, one mill hand being wounded in the thigh. The Governor of Bombay has brought to my notice the admirable conduct during these disturbances of the military and police, who were on duty continuously for nearly a month and were constantly engaged in minor conflicts with the mob. I feel sure that the House will agree that Sir George Lloyd was justified in this opinion.

Legal Proceedings Against Ministers.

Colonel Yate asked whether the exclusion of Ministers from being sued in the High Courts in India, as provided for in the Government of India Act, will have the effect of differentiating the constitution of India from that of all the Dominions and of this country, and of denying to the peoples of India any means of redress in the case of illegal proceedings by Ministers.

Mr. Fisher: I understand that my hon. and gallant friend is referring to the Amendment made by means of part II of the Second Schedule to the Government of India Act, 1919, whereby ministers appointed under that Act are brought within the scope of Section 110 of the Government of India Act, 1915-16. The Amendment referred to has no effect at all in five of the major provinces in India. In three provinces it has the effect of placing Ministers in the same legal position as that occupied by Governors and Lieut.-Governors of provinces and members of their Executive Councils. To a limited extent no doubt the position of Ministers in India will in this respect be different from that of Ministers in the Dominions, but it must be remembered that Ministers in India are not in all respects on the same footing as Ministers in the Dominions. It is not the case that the Amendment will have the effect of denying to the people of India all means of redress in the case of illegal proceedings by Ministers. Proceedings may be taken against Ministers under other provisions of the Act. The provisions of the section in question may be repealed or amended at any time by the Indian Legislature.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—10th March 1920

Mesopotamia (Army of Occupation)

Colonel Wedgwood asked how much of the cost, if any, of the Army of Occupation and the civil administration in Mesopotamia falls directly or indirectly upon the Exchequer of India?

Mr. Fisher: No part of the cost of the civil administration of Mesopotamia falls upon the India Exchequer. The same is now the case as regards the Army of Occupation. During the War the ordinary (but not the extraordinary) charges of the troops despatched from India for service in Mesopotamia and other theatres of War were borne by Indian revenues under the Parliamentary Resolutions of 16th September and 26th November 1914. No contribution is now being made by India towards the cost of the troops overseas.

Military Affairs (Commission of Inquiry)

Mr. Spoor asked the Secretary for India if he will state how far the Committee or Commission enquiring into Indian military affairs has been able to proceed with that enquiry and how soon the Report will be forthcoming; whether he will state if the deliberations of that body are being carried on under the presidency or acting chairmanship of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, the ex-Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, whose administration of that Province during the spring of last year came under examination by the Hunter Committee and has been the subject of controversy both here and in India; and, if he is so acting, whether he will consider the advisability of relieving him of that position until his administration of the Punjab, which supplies a considerable percentage of the recruits for the Indian army has been cleared?

Mr. Fisher: The Committee will shortly complete their inquiries in India, but no estimate can be given of the date when their Report will be issued. Sir Michael O'Dwyer is acting chairman of the committee. The Secretary of State sees no reason for relieving him of the position. His administration of the Punjab has no bearing on the matters under discussion by the Committee.

Industrial Workers (Wages)

Mr. Jhon Davison asked the present rates of wages paid to Indian workers in the principal industries; and whether it is the intention of the Government to take steps to ensure an early approximation of Indian industrial conditions to British standards?

Mr. Fisher: As in several cases, increases have recently been granted I have no exact information as to the present rates of wages in the various industries in India, but I will enquire. The settled policy of the Government of India, which has the full

approval of my right hon. Friend, is to improve as rapidly the condition of Indian workers, but in a country like India British standards cannot in all cases be adopted. This, as the hon. Member is aware, is recognised in Article 405 of the Treaty of Peace, which lays down that in framing Draft Conventions and Recommendations for general adoption, the International Labour Conference shall suggest modifications to meet the case of those countries in which, to quote the words of the Treaty, "climatic conditions, imperfect development of industrial organisation or other special circumstances, make the industrial conditions substantially different."

Lieut. Commander Kenworthy: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether it is the intention of the Government of India to retain power over Labour legislation and to introduce any system of legal minimum wage in India as has been suggested?

Sir. J. D. Rees: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether the approximation to the British standard will include the compulsory adoption of English clothing, food and housing, and if so, who will pay for the mutiny which must result?

Mr. Fisher: It is obvious that there must be great differences between economic legislation in India and in England. The differences must be adjusted to the economic circumstances in the two countries. The whole matter of the economic legislation suitable to Indian conditions is under the consideration of the Government of India.

Colonel Wedgwood: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that at present there are 60,000 mill workers out in Bombay, striking for higher wages, and may we understand that the cause of these striking mill-workers is being supported by Sir George Lloyd and the Government against the employers, with a view to securing a wage more compatible with that paid in other countries?

Mr. Hailwood: Under the Government of India Act, are they not capable of dealing with these cases in India?

Mr. Fisher: Sir George Lloyd has already intervened in an important labour dispute in Bombay and his intervention has been effective in securing a settlement, and I have no reason to suppose that his intervention in any later dispute will be less successful than in the past.

Colonel Wedgwood: Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that there is a dispute on now and that 60,000 men are out in Bombay?

Burma Rice Trade

Mr. Talbot asked the Secretary for India whether he is now in the position to make a statement respecting the excessive price

fixed by the Government of India for rice exported to Ceylon and certain other British Dominions?

Mr. Fisher : As the reply is somewhat long I propose, by the permission of my Hon. Friend to circulate it in the Official Report

THE FOLLOWING IS THE REPLY REFERRED TO :—

The object which the Government of India had in view in assuming control over the Burma rice trade was to enable consumers in India and Burma to obtain a stable food at a reasonable price and to supplement the seriously depleted stocks in India. As this necessarily involves a limitation of the profits of producers, the Government of India are under an obligation to obtain a fair market price for the exportable surplus and to restore the profits to the producers. But although the world shortage of rice, caused by the failure of the Siam crop and a short Burma crop, would have enabled exceedingly high prices to have been obtained, the moderate minimum export price of about Rs. 15 per cwt. f. o. b. Rangoon has been fixed against a cost price of Rs. 9 at which India is supplied. This export price is very considerably less than the world price, which but for the control, British Possessions would have been compelled to pay. Further—and perhaps more important—practically the whole of the exportable surplus has been reserved for British Possessions. This surplus, unfortunately, is insufficient to meet all demands, but is being distributed as fairly as possible. Had this control not been established it is reasonably certain that the Colonies would not only have been forced to pay a much higher price, but would have been unable to obtain the quantities allotted to them under the scheme.

Last week the Viceroy received a deputation from Ceylon which represented the serious condition of affairs in the island caused by the high price of rice. Lord Chelmsford, while sympathising with the deputation, emphatically repudiated the suggestion that the Government of India were in any way responsible for the rise in the price of rice in the world's markets, and pointed out, as explained above, that the control which had been established enable Ceylon to obtain her requirements at much below world prices. In the matter of allotments also, Ceylon had been treated very favourably, as 360,000 tons had been reserved for the colony. To the complaints of the deputation, that no previous warning had been given, the Viceroy replied that, so long ago as November last, the Ceylon Food Controller knew that the control over exports might be removed, and the Government of Ceylon therefore should have been prepared for a rise in the price of Burma rice to the level of world prices. As regards the claim of the deputation, that Ceylon should be treated as part of India, Lord Chelmsford, while recognising the close histori-

cal and geographical connection between the two countries, pointed out that Ceylon was politically and financially independent of India, and could not expect to obtain what would in effect amount to a large subsidy from India by receiving its supplies of rice at less than the price which had been accepted by other Colonies without question. But moved by the appeal on behalf of the general population, and especially the Indian population, and having regard to the fact that Ceylon affords employment for the surplus population of Southern India, which might be forced to return to India in the event of a food shortage in Ceylon, he agreed to supply 180,000 tons of rice at the flat rate of Rs. 12 cwt. I feel sure that my Hon. Friend will agree that the concession which the Viceroy has found it possible to make—involving as it does a surrender of over £1,252,000—is a substantial one and I trust that it will serve to relieve the situation in Ceylon.

Mr. Gideon Murray: Is the reply satisfactory?

Mr. Fisher: It depends upon the point of view from which the reply is regarded.

Mr. Murray: Will a reduction be made in the price that is being charged for the rice?

Mr. Fisher: Yes.

Indentured Labour (Fiji)

Mr. Fredric Roberts asked the Secretary of State for India whether a deputation of Fiji planters is at present in India: whether this deputation is demanding the continuance of indentured labour in Fiji: and whether His Majesty's Government and the Government of India will make a public denial that there is any intention of supplying indentured labour to Fiji, in view of the recent unrest there?

Mr. Fisher: The unofficial Fiji Mission now in India is certainly not asking for a renewal of indentured labour, which is quite well understood to have been finally stopped. The recent unrest in Fiji occurred after the cancellation of all remaining indentures.

Mr. William Carter asked the Secretary of State for India if he will state how many Indians have left India during the last 10 years under indenture and how many are at present under indenture, and in what localities.

Mr. Fisher: In the last 10 years, 6,401 Indians have left India under indenture but none have gone since 1917. I gave the hon. and gallant Member for Gateshead, on the 24th February, the latest figures as to the number still under indenture in the several Colonies.

Strikes and the Military

Mr. Lunn asked how many strikes have occurred in India since the beginning of this year ; in how many cases were troops called out ; on how many occasions have there been conflicts between the strikers and the military in which the military fired on the crowd ; and what has been the total number of casualties resulting among the Indian population ?

Mr. Fisher : Information available at the India Office shows that since the beginning of the year, in addition to the widespread strikes in the Bombay Presidency, which affected the cotton mills and other industries, strikes occurred in the Jamalpur railway workshops, at four Calcutta jute mills, and at Cawnpore. No official information has yet been received regarding the more recent strike at Jamshedpur. As regards the latter part of the question I would refer the hon. Member to the replies given on the 25th February and the 3rd March to questions asked by the hon. and gallant Member for Newcastle under-Lyme and the hon. Member for Barnard Castle,

Mr. W. Throne : Does the right hon. Gentleman not think that the economic conditions of the Indians would be very much better if they were not compelled to carry on their backs some of the tribe of Civil Servants ?

Mr. Lunn asked how many iron and still workers are at present on strike in Jamshedpur District : and whether an attempt is being made to give the strikers' claims a fair hearing and to arbitrate the strike on British lines, in view of the regrettable occurrences at Sholapur and elsewhere ?

Mr. Fisher : I have received no report from the Government of India regarding the strike.

Colonel Wedgwood : Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to obtain a report on this strike from the Government of India ?

Khilafat Delegation.

Lieut. Colonel James asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Indian Khilafat or Islamic delegation at present visiting this country is led by certain Muhammad Ali : whether this Muhammad Ali is the same individual who, on account of his revolutionary tendencies and his intimate association with the Committee of Union and Progress, was interned on his own responsibility by His Highness the Nawab of Rampur and who was subsequently interned by the Indian Government, together with his brother Shaukat Ali, who had earned a similar reputation at the University of Aligarh ; whether the inclusion of a man of such revolutionary tendencies on this Islamic delegation is approved by the Government of India and whether he will consider the possible prejudice to the cause of the

millions of loyal Islamic subjects of the Crown of the inclusion of an avowed revolutionary on a mission of this kind?

Mr. Fisher : The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, the leader of the delegation is the same individual who was interned by the Government of India. With regard to the third and fourth parts of the question, the Government of India had no hand in selecting the personnel of the delegation. I can accept no responsibility on this point.

Lieut. Colonel James : Is it a fact that members of the delegation have been officially received by representatives of the Indian Government in this country; does not such reception constitute an act of approval of the constitution of the delegation; and is it a fact that the Government of India, quite properly, had no hand in selecting the personnel of the delegation?

Mr. Speaker : The hon and gallant Member should hand in his question at the Table.

Colonel Wedgwood : Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a visit of a Committee of this kind is of the utmost advantage to the relations between ourselves and the Muhammadans in India; and is he also aware that it can only be of advantage to this Empire for men like Muhammad Ali to come here?

Mr. Speaker : The hon. and gallant Gentleman must follow the example of the hon. and gallant Member and hand in his question.

The following Questions appeared on the Order Paper for non-oral answers :

Colonel Wedgwood asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (1) whether Indian soldiers who served in the campaign against the Germans in East Africa are receiving grants of land from the East African local Governments in the same way as the British soldiers of European descent; if not, whether His Majesty's Government will instruct the East African authorities to do so, in view of the resentment which is caused among the Indians by the differential treatment of British white troops and Indian soldiers who fought side by side in the same campaign; (2) whether he is aware that resentment is caused among the Indians in East Africa by the omission on the part of the Government of East Africa to appoint any Indian member on the British East Africa Economic Commission and by those parts of the Commission's Report which affect the Indian community; and whether His Majesty's Government will consider the advisability of appointing another Commission with at least one Indian member to safeguard the interests of the Indians in East Africa?

Lieut. Colonel Anery : I will answer these four questions together. The matters dealt with in the hon. and gallant Member's

four questions, including that addressed to the Secretary of State for India, are included in the Resolutions adopted by the East Africa Indian National Congress in the November last. (*See Register 1920.*) These Resolutions, and the position of Indians generally, in East Africa, will be discussed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, on arrival in England, with the Governor of the East Africa Protectorate, who is remaining in England for the purpose. In the circumstances, I am not in a position to make any statement on the points raised in the questions.

Colonel Wedgwood: Will this discussion include a representative of the India Office, preferably the Secretary of State?

Lieut.-Colonel Amery: I have no doubt the Secretary of State for the Colonies will consult him.

Lieut.-Commander Kenworthy: Will the hon and gallant Gentleman convey to the Colony in question the views of the Colonial Office on the question of flogging?

Lieut.-Colonel Amery: I am not prepared to do that.

Mr. Spoor asked the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (1) whether a Government Commission on Native Labour sat in British East Africa in 1912-13; whether the Hon. A. C. Hollis, C. M. G., Secretary for Native Affairs, gave evidence showing that labour recruited through the Native Chiefs was in practice compulsory labour, whether it is the policy of His Majesty's Government now to introduce compulsory labour in British East Africa; if not, whether the Governor's instructions to Provincial and District Commissioners, that the onus of finding labour was to be put on Native Chiefs and elders, will now be withdrawn; (2) whether the Governor of British East Africa has issued instructions to Provincial and District Commissioners to inform Native Chiefs and elders that it is part of their duty to advise and encourage young men in their areas to go out and work on plantations; whether any such duty has been imposed by law on Native chiefs and elders; if not, on what authority the Governor's statement was made; on what authority reports are called for on any headman who is impervious to His Excellency's wishes; and what is the nature of the action which the Governor proposes to take against any such headman?

Lieut.-Colonel Amery: As I informed the Hon. Member on the 23rd February, the whole question of native labour in East Africa, including the issue raised by the administrative circular to which the Hon. Member refers, will be discussed with Sir E. Northey by the Secretary of State on his return.

Colonel Wedgwood: That circular has not yet been received?

Lieut.-Colonel Amery: No.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—24th March, 1920.

Committees of Inquiry [Composition]

Lieut.-Commander Kenworthy asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the complaints in India that representatives of the Indian National Congress have been persistently excluded from the Committees appointed for purposes of investigation of public questions by the Government of India, for instance, the Hunter Committee and recent Advisory Committee regarding Rules and Regulations to be framed under the Government of India Act, 1919; and whether he will take steps to ensure that this body is represented on such public Committees in future?

Mr. Fisher: The Secretary of State has seen these complaints in Indian newspapers. As regards the Hunter Committee it was obviously necessary to select members who had not, as prominent adherents of the Congress, had already committed themselves to strong views on the points which required investigation.

As regards the Reforms Committees appointed in the Provinces, the Secretary of State has not full information on their composition. But the hon. Member is probably aware that the prevailing party in the National Congress, being dissatisfied with the Reforms, and having declared itself sceptical as to their sincerity and value, great number of Indian Liberal politicians, who are desirous of obtaining the best results from the new system have left its ranks and formed a separate Congress of their own. It is probable, and the hon. Member will perhaps recognise that it would be reasonable, in appointing Committees to work out the details of changes consequent on the recent Act, to enlist the services of men who, while criticising certain features, have promised sincere co-operation in working the new system rather than those who have denounced the Act as unacceptable or unworkable.

Lieut. Commander Kenworthy: Would it not be desirable that men of pronounced views, even if hostile to certain aspects of the present Government of India, should be on this Committee?

Mr. Fisher: My right hon. Friend is of opinion that the Hunter Committee in its composition should be a judicial body, and that it is undesirable to appoint on that Committee men who have taken a very strong line in public controversies.

Lieut. Commander Kenworthy: If this Hunter Committee is a judicial body it must be impartial, and why should not distinguished legal luminaries, even if they have pronounced views, be upon it

Lord Hunter's Committee.

Colonel Wedgwood asked the Secretary of State for India if Lord Hunter has left or is on the point of leaving India; if the Report by his Committee has been submitted or is ready for submission; if he could state when that Report is to be published; and when time can be allotted for discussing in the house the issues that the Report is sure to raise?

Mr. Fisher: I understand that Lord Hunter is on his way home, and that the Report of his Committee reached the Government of India a few days ago. It will be published as soon as possible, but cannot be published before the house rises, so that the question of allotting time is not immediate.

Mr. Neil Maclean asked the Secretary of State for India whether Lord Hunter, before leaving India on or about the 13th instant, handed in the Report of his Committee to the Government of India; whether it is the intention of the Government to publish that Report in this country and in India; and whether the evidence tendered by the ex-Governor of the Punjab, the Chief Secretary to the Punjab Government, and on behalf of the military authorities will be included or published separately?

Mr. Fisher: The answer to the first two parts of the question is in the affirmative. I cannot yet make any definite statement as to the publication of evidence.

Deportation of B. G. Horniman.

Colonel Wedgwood asked the Secretary of State for India whether Mr. B. G. Horniman, who was deported from India by the Government of Bombay to this country in April last without charge or trial, has been refused permission to return to Bombay, where he had been domiciled for several years, and resume his professional occupation and whether he will state why Mr. Horniman has been excluded from the amnesty recently extended under the terms of the King's Proclamation to persons against whom Orders under the Defence of India Act affecting their entry into British India were in force?

Mr. Fisher: The Secretary of State refused to recommend Mr. Horniman for a passport to India so long as the Government of Bombay considers it necessary to enforce the Order made against him. I do not understand the last part of the question, and doubt if there were any persons excluded from British India in the same manner as Mr. Horniman, who have been allowed to return to it.

Lajpat Rai

Colonel Yate asked whether Lajpat Rai, who was deported from the Punjab in 1907 was concerned in any way during his resi-

dence in America with the plots that were hatched there for revolution in India; and how many other deportees similarly situated have also been permitted to return to India?

Mr. Fisher: I must refer my hon. and gallant Friend to the statement made in this House on the 28th November, 1917, by the Home Secretary (Viscount Cave). I am not aware that any Indian has been deported to a foreign country. Lajpat Rai was released from internment nearly 12 years ago, and went voluntarily to the United States in 1914.

Colonel Yate: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer my question whether Lajpat Rai was concerned in any of the plots that were hatched in America for revolution in India?

Mr. Fisher: I am not aware that he was.

Muhammad Ali

Colonel Yate asked whether Muhammad Ali, who has arrived in England as a member of the Indian Khilafat deputation, is the same Muhammad Ali mentioned in paragraph 164 of the Report of the Committee appointed to investigate revolutionary conspiracies in India as concerned in the project hatched in India with the object of destroying British rule by means of an attack on the North-West frontier supplemented by a Muhammadan rising in India itself; whether it was for this reason that he was interned; and, if not, for participation in what conspiracy was he interned?

Mr. Fisher: The individual mentioned in paragraph 164 of the Report cited in the question is not the Muhammad Ali who is now in England as a member of the Khilafat Deputation. The latter was interned during the War for conduct tending to promote the interests of His Majesty's enemies.

Khilafat Delegation

Mr. Ormsby Gore asked what steps have been taken to secure early and wide publicity in India of the Prime Minister's recent reply to the Indian Khilafat delegation regarding British policy in the Near and Middle East?

Mr. Foreman asked the Secretary of State for India whether steps have been taken to telegraph to India the reply of the Prime Minister to the Indian Muslim delegation on the future of Turkey, and to publish it throughout the whole of India in all the vernacular papers; and, if not, will he at once consider the desirability of taking these steps?

Mr. Fisher: A very full summary of the Prime Minister's reply to the delegation was telegraphed to the Viceroy on the 21st March for purpose of publication in India.

Constitutional Reform (Lord Hardinge)

Mr. Waterson asked the Secretary of State for India whether Lord Hardinge, at the request of the India Office or otherwise, sent, prior to his retirement from the Viceroyalty and Governor-Generalship of India, a despatch making important recommendations for constitutional reforms; if so, would he have any objections to the publication of that despatch to complete the series of records issued on that subject; and would he state the main recommendations contained in the despatch and the principle upon which Lord Hardinge's recommendations were based, and particularly would he indicate whether Lord Hardinge contemplated the introduction of the principle of duality or diarchy, or did Lord Hardinge elaborate the suggestion of provincial autonomy made in the despatch sent by him about the time of the last Delhi Durbar?

Mr. Fisher : Though the question of constitutional reforms was, of course, under consideration before Lord Hardinge left India, his Government had not addressed any despatch on the subject to the Secretary of State.

British East Africa (Indian Medical Practitioners)

Mr. Waterson asked the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Indian medical practitioners in British East Africa are forbidden to carry on independent medical practice; and, if so, on what grounds?

Lieut.-Colonel Amery : The question of medical practice in the East Africa Protectorate is governed by the Medical Practitioners and Dentists Ordinance, 1910. Under that ordinance the holder of any British Indian degree, diploma, or licence entitling him to registration in the United Kingdom is entitled to be registered as a medical practitioner in the East Africa Protectorate. Under the same ordinance the practice of systems of therapeutics according to native, Indian or other Asiatic method is permitted for persons recognised by the community to which they belong to be duly trained in such practice, subject to provisos that such systems may only be practised amongst the community to which the practitioner belongs and that no act under any such system on the part of such persons as is dangerous to life shall be permitted.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—31st March 1920

Disturbances at Jamshedpur.

Lieutenant Commander Kenworthy asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has any information with regard to the recent disturbances at Jamalpur, in the North West Provinces; what was the cause of the disturbance; whether strikers were fired

on by the troops; if so, whether there were any casualties among the troops or among the strikers; and whether any form of inquiry will be held into the occurrence?

The President of the Board of education (Mr Herbert Fisher): The honourable and gallant Member no doubt refers to the recent disturbances at the Tata ironworks at Jamshedpur, in the Province of Bihar and Orissa, erroneously reported in the newspapers as having taken place at Jamalpur. The strike, which was declared towards the end of February, involved some 30,000 workers. Disturbances began on the 13th March, when determined and well-organised attempts were made by armed bodies of strikers to prevent those who wished to attend work. The factory was besieged and troops escorting a motor lorry bringing food to workers were attacked. The Deputy Commissioner of the district was able to avert a collision, but picketing continued and no workmen were allowed to enter the works. On the morning of the 15th it was discovered that the railway lines had been tampered with; and the Deputy Inspector-General of Police ordered two parties of mounted police to arrest the offenders, with instructions not to fire unless in self-defence. About forty arrests were made, but the prisoners were rescued and a large mob of strikers then attacked the police, who were compelled to fire in self-defence. Mr. Ashby and several police were seriously injured, five of the crowd being killed and 21 wounded. The police fell back on the works and fired only when closely pressed. The injured were taken to hospital for treatment. The situation then improved rapidly, and on the 17th 2,000 men had resumed work. An announcement by the directors seems to have had a favourable effect, and my latest information is that on the 18th 15,000 men had returned to work, the rest being expected to return on the 20th.

Lieutenant Commander Kenworthy Will there be any form of inquiry held into the occurrence as asked for in the last part of my question?

Mr. Fisher: The facts will certainly be investigated.

Muhammad Ali [Speech at Woking.]

Sir Charles Oman asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to a speech delivered at Woking on 21st March, by Mr. Muhammad Ali, leader of the Indian Khilafat delegation, in which the speaker declared that if England fought the Turks on the question of the temporal powers of the Khalifa then the Indian Muslims must fight on the side of the Turks, and that they did not want it, but they must fight for

their religion; and whether he intends to take any action with regard to such speeches?

Mr. Fisher: I do not propose to take any action.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—14th April, 1920.

Punjab Legislative Council

Colonel Wedgwood asked the Secretary of State for India if he has received any intimation that a representative Provincial Conference held early this month at Jullundur, in the Punjab, protested against what it considered to be an attempt to deprive the Punjabis of the opportunity of getting the utmost out of the Government of India Act by so framing rules under that Act as to keep the Punjab Legislative Council small, pack it with landed aristocracy and other conservative elements, and otherwise keep as far as possible educated Punjabis out of that council; and whether he would give an assurance that consideration of the Punjab rules will be postponed until detailed representation of the Conference's wishes is received in England.

Mr. Montagu: I have seen a telegram, the general purport of which, though less specific, is of the kind indicated in the question. If the complaints are well-founded I have no doubt that the Government of India and their non-official Advisory Committee (on which the Punjab is represented) will pay due attention to them in considering the draft rules, which will eventually come before Parliament.

Deobund Arabic School

Lieut. Colonel James asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Sheikhul Islam, of the Deobund Arabic School, in the Shaharunpur district, has recently been arrested and deported from India on account of the subversive and anti-Government propaganda in which he has been engaged; whether, for many years past, the Deobund Arabic school, originally inaugurated with the intention of grounding trans-frontier Pathans in the principles of Islam, has, in fact, been a centre of seditious propaganda; and whether, in view of this, the school will now be closed?

Mr. Montagu: I presume the Hon. Member refers to one of the doctors of the school in question, who had mixed himself up in seditious intrigues before leaving for Mecca in September, 1915. His conduct in Arabia led to his arrest by the Hedjaz authorities. He was removed to Egypt and eventually interned at Malta. Neither before these intrigues nor since the departure of the particular doctor has there been, to my knowledge, complaint of seditious propaganda at Deobund, and there appears to be no reasons for the suggestion that the school should be closed.

Border Districts

Mr. Waterson asked the Secretary of State for India if he is aware that a representative Provincial Conference that met on 2nd April at Jullundur in the Punjab expressed great concern at conditions of insecurity of life and property in border districts and in the North-West Frontier Province and if he will enlighten the house as to the steps that he is taking to protect life and property in those districts?

Mr. Montagu : I have received no report of the proceedings at the Conference referred to. The hon. Member is aware that military operations are in progress for the purpose of restoring order, and he may rest assured that conditions on the border are engaging the active attention of the Government of India.

Colonel Wedgwood : Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this question refers also to Baluchistan, where, apparently, Indian life and property are not safe at the present time?

Mr. Montagu : I was not aware of the geographical area to which it refers.

Colonel Wedgwood : I have sent the right hon. Gentleman a letter about it to day.

East Africa Protectorate

Indian Medical and Legal Degrees

Mr. Waterson asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware that persons holding Indian university medical and law degrees, such as L. M. S. and B. A. B. L., who are eligible to practise medicine and law, respectively, in India, are not allowed to so practise in British East Africa; and, if so will he state why in British East Africa, where the Protectorate was first established with the object of safeguarding the interest of His Majesty's Indian subjects in that country, where Indian law is to-day administered, and where Indians preponderate both in point of numbers and vested interests, the said Indian university medical and law degrees are not recognised?

The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (*Lieut. Colonel Amery*): I explained to the hon. Member in my answer to his question on the 24th of March that Indian medical degrees or diplomas are recognised in the East Africa Protectorate, provided that they entitle the holder to registration in the United Kingdom. Advocates who have been admitted and are entitled to practise before one of the High Courts in British India are entitled to practise in the East African Courts.

The general question of the position of Indians in East Africa is under consideration between the Secretary of State and the Governor of the Protectorate.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—15th April 1920.

Major Entwistle asked the Secretary of State for India if Lord Meston's award, granting only 28 seats out of 65 in the future Legislative Council of the Madras Presidency to the non Brahmins, is final in view of the opposition of the non-Brahmins to the proposal?

Mr. Montagu : The allocation of seats on the Madras Legislative Council will not be final until the rules in which it is embodied are approved by the Parliament. But I hope that the general principle that the award of an independent arbitrator is the final (and only possible) settlement of a question on which the parties cannot agree will be accepted in this case by both parties.

Prince of Wales's Tour (Advisory Committee)

Captain Terrell asked the Secretary of State for India if he will inform the House what Indian representatives have been appointed to the Advisory Committee to discuss the arrangement for the Prince of Wales's tour to India ; and if he will state whether they are Brahmins, Moslems, or non Brahmins !

Mr. Montagu : The Indian representatives are as follows;—

H. H. the Maharaja of Gwalior (Hindu);

H. H. the Maharaja of Bikaner (Hindu);

H. H. the Maharaja of Patiala (Sikh); and

Mr. Banerji (Brahmins).

Sir Umar Hyat (Moslem);

Sir Dinsha Wacha (Parsee)

Fiji Islands (Disturbances)

Mr. Bennet asked the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has received information of a disturbance reported to have occurred at Levuka, Fiji Islands, on Saturday last in favour of Indians awaiting deportation : who these Indians are and for what reason and under whose authority they are to be deported ; whether they have been tried by any of the ordinary courts of the Colony ; whether there has been a renewal of trouble since the announcement in this House that the situation had been restored ; and for what reason New Zealand troops are being kept in the Fiji Island ?

Lieut.-Colonel Amery : No information has been received from the Governor as to a disturbance having taken place on the day mentioned, or as to there having been a renewal of the recent trouble since my statement in the House on the 3rd March. A telegram has been received from the Governor stating that by an order made under the Peace and Good Order Ordinance, 1875, the following four persons : D. M. Manilal, Mrs. Manilal, Haropal Maharaj, and Fazil Khan, have been prohibited from residing for two years within certain parts of the Colony. The Governor states

that he is reporting by mail the grounds for the action taken. As I stated in the House on the 10th March, an armed guard of about 50 men was sent from New Zealand. This small detachment afforded valuable help during the actual rioting, and if they are still being kept in Fiji it is no doubt because their presence is considered desirable by the Governor.

Mr. B. G. Horniman.

Mr. Lunn. asked the Secretary of State for India whether in view of his assertion at the time of Mr. B. G. Horniman's deportation from India a year ago that this measure was necessitated by the emergency of the moment which required swift and prompt action to be taken, he will state the reasons why the Government of India, after this lapse of time, consider that Mr. Horniman's return to India is still incompatible with the public safety?

Mr. Montagu. The Government of India have stated that they do not consider that Mr. Horniman's return to India is compatible with the public safety. As I stated in the House on 21st April, I do not propose to interfere with their discretion. I presume they have taken into account Mr. Horniman's journalistic work, and I am content to leave to the Government of India and the Government of Bombay the decision as to the date on which Mr. Horniman can be allowed to return.

Lieut. Commander Kenworthy. Will Mr. Horniman be allowed to return after peace is finally ratified?

Mr. Montagu. The decision as to when he will be allowed to return will be left to the Government of Bombay. If they decide that he shall return when peace is signed I shall accept their decision. If they do not so decide I shall again accept their decision.

Sir W. Joynson Hicks. May I ask whether peace after the Great War has anything whatever to do with Mr. Horniman and his conduct?

Sir J. D. Rees. Would not Mr. Horniman's return distinctly tend to destroy peace in India?

Mr. Montagu. The point on which I prefer to rely is that by statute discretion is left with the Governor of Bombay. In the exercise of my responsibility to this House I propose to leave the matter to his discretion. If hon. Members do not like that, the best thing to do is to put down a Motion.

Sir Thomas Bramsdon asked the Secretary of State for India, in view of the fact that Mr. B. G. Horniman was deported from India 12 months ago without trial, that he has been refused inquiry into the charges made against him, and that he denies the truth of these charges or any other justification for such deportation,

if he will say what is the earliest occasion upon which the matter can be debated in the House?

Mr. Montagu : My Hon. Friend must address the Leader of the House as to opportunities for debate.

Indian Reforms [Lord Meston's Award.]

Mr. Forrest asked the Secretary of State for India whether he contemplates the re-appointment of the Joint Committee on Indian Reforms to reconsider the rules and regulations governing the working of the Indian Reforms; whether in that case the protest of the Non-Brahmanas of Madras against the award of Lord Meston will also be considered; and how he proposes to ensure that Parliament is properly advised on the matter?

Mr. Montagu : The answer to the first two parts of the question is in the affirmative; to the last part, I will do all in my power to see that the Joint Committee receives all the information it requires.

Mr. Forrest asked the Secretary of State for India whether he sent any instructions to Lord Meston or to the Government of India regarding the interpretation of the Joint Committee's recommendation for the separate representation of non-Brahmanas.

Mr. Montagu : The answer is in the negative.

Civil Service.

Sir W. Joynson-Hicks asked the Secretary of State for India whether he received a series of petitions, sent through the Madras Government in May, 1919, from a large percentage of the Indian Civil Service in that province; and when he proposes to make an answer to such petitions?

Mr. Montagu : The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative, although a day or two ago my hon. Friend was good enough to forward me copies. The second part therefore does not arise.

Sir W. Joynson-Hicks : Will my right hon. Friend inquire of the Government of Madras as to what has become of this very large block of petitions? I personally know that they were addressed to him.

Mr. Montagu : I will inquire, if my hon. Friend wishes. Of course, a memorial from the Civil Service must be transmitted through the local Government, which has a discretion as to what it will forward.

Sir W. Joynson-Hicks asked the Secretary of State for India whether he can see his way to giving an option to the members of the Indian Civil Service to retire during the next five years if

they feel unable to serve under the new altered conditions on the basis of a pension proportionate to service and loss of prospects?

Mr. Montagu : I would ask, leave to refer my hon. Friend to my explanation in this House on 4th December last on Clause 36 of the Government of India Bill, of which I will send him a copy.

Government of India Act. [Draft Rules]

Motion made, and Question proposed :

"That it is expedient that a Select Committee of Seven Members be appointed to join with a Committee to be appointed by the Lords to revise the Draft Rules made under the Government of India Act."—[*Mr. Montagu.*]

Lieut.-Colonel Maloué . The Committee which is going to re-draft these rules is considering one of the most important measures concerning the Government of India. Those draft rules are, in my opinion, as important, if not more so, as the Government of India Bill, which we are to discuss next week and I consider that seven members on this Committee is totally inadequate. We presume that one of the seven will be a Liberal and one a Labour member, and in case these two members are absent there will only be five members left representing the supporters of the Government to consider these very important questions. If the number of members of the Committee cannot be increased, what opportunity, if any, will be given to this House to consider the draft regulations when they have finally been re-drafted? Will they be placed upon the Table of the House, and will an opportunity be given to Hon. Members to discuss these Orders, and will they be given full opportunities to examine all the evidence and all the particulars which have been put before this Committee when it discussed these Orders? I shall be much obliged to the Right Hon. Gentleman if he will give us some information on those points before we pass this Motion.

The Secretary of State for India (*Mr. Montagu*) : I quite agree that the duty of this Committee is very important. This is being done in conformity with the Act passed last year, and it seems to be advisable that the same men should deal with the rules. Most of the rules will have to be laid on the Table of the House, and some of them will have to receive the consent of both Houses of Parliament. I can promise my hon. and gallant Friend that there will be ample opportunity for consideration by this House, and all the evidence taken by the Joint Committee will be laid before them in the Report of that Committee.

Colonel Yate : Do I understand that the intention of the Government is to appoint the same Committee as was appointed

last year? If so, the Right Hon. Gentleman seems to me to be departing from the Regulations which have been laid down in Clause 295 of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. In that report it is distinctly stated that a Select Committee on Indian Affairs shall be appointed at the beginning of each Session. Last year the Right Hon. Gentleman appointed a Committee and put himself on it with six other members who had all signified on the Second Reading their approval of his scheme. I do not want, however, to enter into that question now. I spoke on it last year. The Bill then under discussion has now become an Act of Parliament and I shall, as I am sure all men serving in India will, loyally do my best to make it a great success. But the Right Hon. Gentleman has not followed the proposal laid down in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, which distinctly says that a new Committee shall be appointed at the commencement of each Session. I know the Committee suggests that they should be continued in office, but I do not think a Select Committee should have power to make any such suggestion, and at any rate, it should not be carried into effect. It is further laid down that the Secretary of State shall appear before the Committee to answer questions about Acts of Administration over which he and, therefore, Parliament, exercises control. There is nothing said in the Report about the Secretary of State being himself a member of the Committee, and I think it is entirely wrong he should be so. I, therefore, ask him to consider the propriety of his present action, and whether it is not right that a fresh Committee should be appointed to deal with this question in accordance with the Montagu-Chelmsford report.

Mr. Montagu: The Committee to which my hon. and gallant Friend referred will only come into existence when the Act is working. This is not that Committee at all. When the Act comes into operation another Committee will be appointed by the Houses. The Committee, the appointment of which I am now moving, will complete the work of bringing the Act into force, and it was for that purpose that it was considered by the Joint Committee desirable to make the recommendation referred to. The names of this Committee will be submitted to the House for approval in a subsequent Motion, and my hon. and gallant Friend can then use his discretion as to whether he will ask the House to take other names than those recommended by the Government. The Committee was appointed last year by the vote of the House, and I was not upon it.

Motion agreed & Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith

General Dyer

Mr. Spoor (by Private Notice) asked the Secretary of State for India whether his attention had been called to an interview alleged to have been given by General Dyer to a Press representative, in which the statement is made that General Dyer has been requested to resign his appointment; whether this statement is correct and if so whether this action on the part of the Government is consequent upon their consideration of the Hunter Committee's Report?

The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Montagu): I am informed that the Commander-in-Chief directed General Dyer to resign his appointment as Brigade-Commander in India. The whole matter is now engaging the consideration of His Majesty's Government. I hope that full documents will be available to Parliament within the next fortnight and I hope hon. members will be content to delay discussion until they have full information.

Colonel Wedgwood: If General Dyer is allowed to resign his commission, does that mean he will not be court-martialled for these massacres?

Mr. Montagu: This is a very serious question and very difficult to discuss by way of question and answer when, unfortunately no papers are before the House. I am prepared to answer all these questions when the time comes for the debate and I hope that the House, which has been so patient so long, will wait the few remaining days in order to get full information.

Colonel Wedgwood: Can we be assured that the question will not be prejudged by General Dyer being allowed to resign?

Mr. Lambert: Will the papers circulated include Lord Hunter's Report on the subject?

Mr. Montagu: Yes, certainly: the papers I propose to lay are Lord Hunter's Report, the evidence taken before the Hunter Committee, and the resolution of the Government of India on the subject.

Colonel Wedgwood: Will they include all the evidence that was given, or will Sir M. O'Dwyer's evidence be omitted?

Mr. Montagu: My hon. and gallant Friend knows that certain evidence was taken in camera for public reasons, and it is not proposed to publish any evidence which the Committee thought ought to be heard in private.

The Bombay Chronicle (Distribution Among British Troops)

Lieut. Commander Kenworthy asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Chairman of the Indian Newspaper Company, Limited,

in his cable informed the right hon. Gentleman that the directors of the company had made careful inquiry into the allegation that the paper which Mr. Horniman edited had been distributed free to British troops in the hope of exciting insubordination and found it to be absolutely without foundation, and the board of directors had ascertained that no copy of the "Bombay Chronicle" was distributed free to the British troops in Bombay; whether to say merely that the Chairman of the board of directors of the Indian Newspaper Company denied all knowledge of the free distribution to British troops is a proper description of this categorical and authoritative refutation of the charge; and whether, in such circumstances, he will make public the evidence on which his assertion that there was such free distribution is based?

Mr. Montagu : The terms of the cable message were as quoted by the hon. and gallant Member. I accepted the assurance as far as I could, but the directors were not in a position to say that distribution had not taken place. All that they could say was that they were in no way connected with what I believe to have occurred. The evidence I have is, to my mind, indisputable that some reader of the paper did distribute it to British troops in the Bombay Presidency.

East Africa [Indian Subjects.]

Mr. Bennet asked the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received from or on behalf of His Majesty's Indian subjects in East Africa any request for the franchise upon the basis of the franchise created by the Government of India Act, 1913, or an indiscriminate and uniform franchise?

Lieutenant Colonel Amery : The Secretary of State has received representations in favour of the grant of elective representation to the Indian community in East Africa, it is understood that the franchise desired is the same as that already granted to Europeans, including woman suffrage.

Colonel Wedgwood asked the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Secretary of State for the Colonies received, on or about 19th April, a deputation on the subject of the grievances of Indians in His Majesty's Protectorates and Territories in East Africa; whether the Colonial Office proposes to make inquiry into those grievances; and, in case no inquiry is to be undertaken, if he will indicate the nature of action that his office proposes to take to insure equality of treatment to His Majesty's Indian subjects in these Protectorates and Territories?

Lieut. Colonel Amery : The Secretary of State for the Colonies received a deputation on the 19th of April. He has since had an

opportunity for full discussion of matters affecting the Indian community in East Africa with the Governors of the East Africa and Uganda Protectorates; and he does not consider that further inquiry will be necessary. The decisions on the matters discussed will be announced in due course.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—12th May 1920.

British Officer's Wife [Peshawar]

Sir W. Joynson Hicks asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has yet received details regarding the case of the British Officer's wife who was carried away from Peshawar by Afridi tribesmen and what steps the Government of India proposes to take to bring them to justice?

Mr. Montagu: If the House will allow me, I will read out a statement which the Government of India have published concerning this case.

"As there have been exaggerated rumours regarding the abduction of an English lady from Peshawar Cantonment, we are authorised to state that the following are the actual facts. A gang of Afridi ruffians entered outskirts of Peshawar Cantonment of Sadar Bazar late on the night of 23rd, 24th March, probably with the object of theft. It happened that, contrary to usual practice, an English lady and her family were occupying the house in this exposed quarter. The gang broke into this house and carried off the lady, dragging her in a most brutal manner with them across the border. The alarm was raised as soon as it was found what had happened and troops, militia, constabulary police and villagers started in pursuit in all directions with the result that the gang was all but intercepted and one of them was actually arrested. Meanwhile, Khyber authorities got into touch with the Afridis along the border, and an Afridi rescue party of over 1,000 men started within a few hours. Members of this party pushed forward and blocked passes, and came into conflict with the gang more than once, and eventually rescued the lady after some sharp fighting. The lady was at once brought into Jamrud within 36 hours of abduction—a very prompt performance, considering the nature of the country. The next day a large Afridi jirga of all sections waited spontaneously on the Political Agent at Khyber to express their abhorrence of this outrage, their sincere regrets that members of their tribe should have been guilty of such conduct, and their assurance that such acts would not be permitted in future. Measures are in progress to ascertain the identity of the offenders and to take further action. No ransom was paid and no reward given to the rescue party who were told that they had merely done their duty."

The Government of India assure me that every effort is being made to secure the arrest of the offenders, and to exact reparation from the section to which they belong.

Sir J. D. Rees : Was this English woman fairly treated during the time she was in the hands of the tribesmen?

Mr. Montagu : I must refer my Hon. Friend to the passage in the answer, which says : "Carried off the lady, dragging her in a most brutal manner with them across the border." I do not think it would be in the interests of the lady to give a detailed description of her treatment.

Indian Medical Service

Sir W. Joynson-Hicks asked the Secretary of State for India if he can state the number of officers of the Indian Medical Service, native and European, in 1914 and 1919; how many of each race were gazetted in 1919; and what steps he is taking to make the Service attractive to English doctors?

Mr. Montagu : In 1914 the number of officers in the Indian Medical Service was 706 Europeans and 63 Indians. In December 1919, excluding officers holding temporary commissions, there were 650 Europeans and 80 Indians. During 1919, 25 Europeans and 21 Indians were appointed to permanent commissions.

In amplification of improvements already sanctioned, I hope to announce at an early date increased rates of pay and pension for the Indian Medical Service. I also recognise that it is essential to improve the facilities for leave and study, but no decision on these points can be effective until recruitment has brought the Service nearer to its normal strength.

Sir W. Joynson-Hicks : If I put a question in a month's time will the right hon. Gentleman say if he hopes to be able to give the increases and the other arrangements for improving the Service?

Mr. Montagu : Yes, I hope so, and if my hon. Friend will permit me, as soon as a decision has been reached, which, I hope, will be only a matter of a few weeks, then I will let him know.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—12th May 1920.

Crown Colonies and Protectorates [Indian Communities]

Mr. Bennett asked the Secretary of State for India if his attention has been called to the declaration made by the Viceroy on the 30th of January last that the position of the Government of India is, and always has been, that there is no justification in a Crown Colony or Protectorate assigning to British Indians a status in any way inferior to that of any other class of His Majesty's subjects; and whether he can assure the House that the principle thus asserted will be adhered to by the Imperial Government in the arrangements

for the political and administrative settlement of East Africa that are now under consideration?

Mr. Montagu : The Viceroy declared that the position of the Government of India is, and always will be, as stated by my hon. Friend. I am assured by the Colonial Office that full consideration is being given to the claims of the Indian communities in the East African Protectorates as well as to those of the other section of the population.

Mr. Bennett asked the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether and upon what conditions His Majesty's Indian Subjects exercise the franchise in any province of the Union of South Africa, in Rhodesia, in British Guiana, in Fiji, in Trinidad, and in Ceylon : whether it is proposed in any of these territories or in any other of His Majesty's territories to extend the franchise to His Majesty's Indian subjects, and, if so, upon what conditions; whether, in any of the British Colonies an Indian sits in the local Legislature by election as distinguished from nomination; and whether the statement that, for the present, it was not proposed to extend the franchise to His Majesty's Indian subjects in the East African Protectorate is to be taken as the considered reply of the Secretary of State for the Colonies on this point to the representations made to him thereon by the deputation under the auspices of the Indian Overseas Association that waited upon him on 19th April last?

Lieut.-Colonel Amery : As regards the first part of the question the electoral law of the Cape Province of the South African Union and of Southern Rhodesia draws no distinction as to race or colour in respect of voters qualified for registration. In British Guiana there is an elected Legislature, and there is no racial distinction as regards the franchise. In Fiji, Indians do not exercise the franchise at present. In Trinidad, the Legislative Council is nominated. In Ceylon, a person of Indian origin, born in Ceylon and otherwise qualified, is able to vote for the Ceylonese member of the Council.

As regards the second part of the question, in Fiji it is proposed that Indians should be added to the Legislative Council as the elected representatives of the Indian inhabitants of the Colony, but the condition upon which they shall be elected have not yet been settled. In Ceylon, proposals are under consideration which would qualify as a voter any male British subject who possesses the requisite qualifications. No proposals with regard to the extension of the franchise are under consideration in any other Colonies or Protectorates.

As regards the third part of the question, in British Guiana there is an elected member of the Legislature who is of East Indian race, and in Ceylon a person of Indian origin but born in Ceylon

sits on the local Legislature by election as the Ceylonese members of the Legislatures of other Colonies or Protectorates.

As regards the fourth part of the question, the Secretary of State has given careful consideration to the representations made to him by the deputation to which my hon. Friend refers, but I am not yet in a position to announce his final decision on this point.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—13th May 1920.

Defence of India Act [Punjab]

Mr. Cape asked the Secretary of State for India if he will give a list of the persons against whom the Defence of India Act was used during Sir Michael O'Dwyer's administration of the Punjab; how many persons were prohibited from entering the Punjab; and how many local men were interned during his administration?

Mr. Montagu: There were 145 persons whose movements were restricted under the Defence of India Act in the Punjab at various times, of whom only 24 remained under such restriction on the 1st April, 1919. Four persons were prohibited from entering the Punjab. Besides the number restricted under the Defence of India Act, about 400 were interned at different times in gaol, and 1,025 restricted to their own villages, under the Ingress into India Ordinance. In April, 1919, seven of these still remained in gaol, and 124 under restriction in their villages. These were men who had returned to India from America and the Far East at the beginning of the War, with the object of causing revolutionary outbreaks.

Punjab Newspapers

Mr. Cape asked the Secretary of State for India what newspapers edited outside the Punjab were prevented from being circulated in the Punjab during Sir Michael O'Dwyer's administration; from how many newspapers security was demanded; and in how many cases security already deposited was forfeited during that period?

Mr. Montagu: From 1914 to 1918 eight newspapers including "Sadaqat," "Jamhur" and "Naqqash" of Calcutta, and "New India" of Madras, were kept outside the Punjab. In 1919 twelve such Orders were passed, namely, against the "Congress," "Vijaya," "Inqilab" of Moradabad, the "Al Khalil" and "Yathrib" of Bijnor, the "Independent" of Allahabad, the "Hamdam" and "Akhawat" of Lucknow, the "Swadesi" of Gorakhpur, and the "Amrita Bazar Patrika" of Calcutta. To the best of my information, security was demanded during Sir Michael O'Dwyer's administration from four newspapers and twenty-four presses. Forfeiture was ordered in the case of one newspaper and four presses. But I am not quite sure that these figures are complete.

Martial Law

Mr. Lunn asked the Secretary of State for India (1) whether the Hunter Committee, or any of its members personally, visited any of the places affected by Martial Law; if so, which; and whether the Punjab Sub-Committee of the Indian National Congress or some of its members, personally visited, during their enquiry, almost all the principal places affected by Martial Law and

(2) the names of witnesses examined by the Punjab Sub-Committee of the Indian National Congress regarding ill-treatment of women during the administration of Martial Law, with a brief statement of the allegations made by it?

Mr. Montagu: The answer of the first part is in the affirmative; to the second, Amritsar, Gujranwala, Kasur, Lahore, and Ahmedabad. As regards the last part of this question I would refer the hon. Member to the Report of the Congress Sub-Committee.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—14th May 1920**Amritsar Hunter Report**

Captain W. Benn asked the Prime Minister when the Hunter Report will be published!

Mr. Clynes asked the Lord Privy Seal whether he will give an early day after the recess to discuss the Report of the Hunter Commission regarding the Amritsar incident; and whether if a definite Motion is placed on the Paper, he will allow the discussion to take place on that Motion and not on a Motion for the Adjournment?

Mr. Bonar Law: I am informed that these papers will be published before Parliament re-assembles. The subject can be raised on a Supply day on the salary of the Secretary of State.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—19th May 1920.**Legislative Council Committees;**

Mr. Swan asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that during the last sessions of the Imperial Legislative Council, the Honourable Mr. Patel and the Honourable Mr. Chanda were not included on any Select Committee on Government Bills or any other Committee appointed by Government during the Sessions; that during the whole session the Honourable Pt. Madan Mohan Malaviya and the Honourable Mr. Khaparde were taken only on one Committee; and whether the Government of India have of late adopted a policy of excluding as far as possible prominent Congress men from all Committees?

Mr. Montagu: I do not know whether the statements are

correct; I would deprecate discussion in this House as to the personnel of the Committees of the Legislative Council in India.

Amnesty of Political Prisoners.

Mr. Swan asked the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India have given, or propose to give, to Savarkar brothers of the Bombay Presidency the benefit of the Royal amnesty; whether one of the brothers had submitted two petitions, one in 1914 and another in 1917, offering his services to the Government during the War, and praying that a general amnesty be granted to all political prisoners.

Mr. Montagu: The answer to the first part is in the negative; to the second, in the affirmative.

General Dyer.

Mr. Swan asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will state the different posts and places to which General Dyer was appointed after the Jallianwalla Bagh firing; what was his remuneration before the firing; and what was his remuneration at the date of his resignation?

Mr. Montagu: Brigadier-General Dyer was in command of 45th (Jullundur) Brigade prior to the disturbances at Amritsar, and this was his substantive appointment up to the time when he returned to this country. He served with this brigade during the Afghan operations, and on its return from field service he was posted to officiate in command of the 5th Infantry Brigade in the Khyber Pass, and this was his actual command when he left India. His pay throughout has been that of a brigade commander.

Gold Importation (Restrictions.)

Mr. Lunn asked the Secretary of State for India whether the restrictions on the import of gold into India by the public still continue and what are the reasons for the continuance of the same; whether Indian industrial and commercial opinion has protested against the continuance of such restrictions; whether, as a creditor country with a favourable balance of trade in her favour, India is entitled to receive in gold the balance due to her by other countries; and what is the total amount of profit made by the Government of India on the gold transactions?

Mr. Montagu: There is undoubtedly a considerable feeling in India in favour of a removal of the restrictions which it has been thought necessary to continue in respect of the import of gold, for the reasons given in the announcement of which I am sending a copy to my hon. Friend. The announcement recognizes the removal of present control as an objective of currency policy in India. The

operation of profit on the gold transactions of the Government of India is complicated by exchange considerations; taking these transactions as a whole, the Government of India estimated that for the year 1920-21 a net loss would accrue. I am also sending to my hon. Friend a copy of the reference to the subject in the Government of India's budget.

Fiscal Policy [Commission.]

Mr. R. Richardson asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will lay upon the Table the correspondence which may have taken place between the Government of India and himself on the question of Imperial Preference?

Mr. Montagu: The communications which have passed between the Government of India and myself on this subject were of a confidential character and I do not think that any useful purpose will be served by their publication, especially as I understand that the Government of India are now considering the advisability of appointing a Commission to consider the whole question of the future fiscal policy of India.

Currency.

Mr. Lunn asked the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware of the great dissatisfaction prevailing in India on the action taken by the Government of India on the recommendations of the Majority Report of the Indian Currency Committee; whether the recommendations were published in the Government of India Gazette, or in any other way, in order to enable the Indian public to consider the effect of such recommendations, and whether the policy was undertaken with the entire concurrence of the Government of India?

Mr. Montagu: I am aware that the action taken on the Report has been criticised in certain quarters in India. The nature of the subject was such as to require action immediately on publication of the Report, and as was done in the case of the closing of the mints in 1893, the decisions arrived at were put into effect without previous notice. The Government of India concurred in the main recommendations in the Majority Report which forms the basis of the present policy.

Franchise Rules [Wage-Earning Classes.]

Mr. R. Richardson asked the Secretary of State for India whether, in the opinion of the Government of India, the practical application of the recommendation of Lord Selborne's Committee to secure better representation of the wage-earning classes in India is attended with difficulties; whether they propose to restrict

such representation to two cities only in the whole of India and on the Provincial Councils; whether he is aware that the problem is no less urgent in many cities such as Madras and Ahmedabad, than in the cities of Calcutta and Bombay, and that the Government of India has even refused to call for the Report of the Bombay Government on the question of providing representation of the wage-earning class of the city of Ahmedabad; whether the Bombay Government, in their original franchise proposals submitted to the Franchise Committee, included all persons earning Rs. 250 annually; and if so what difficulties do the Government of India anticipate if those proposals were accepted?

Mr. Montagu: With regard to parts 1, 2, and 3 of the question, I have not yet received the Government of India's final proposals for franchise rules under the Act of 1919, which will embody their views on this question, but from informal communications I understand that they do anticipate difficulties. I hope to receive these draft rules very shortly and submit them in due course to the Joint Select Committee and to Parliament.

With regard to parts 4 and 5 of the question, I understand that this is not a correct statement of the case, and that what happened was that in endeavouring to work out a basis for decision as to the number of members to represent each district on the Bombay Provincial Council, the Bombay Government adopted as one of their experimental tests an income of Rs. 250 in order to gain some rough idea of the number of voters each district might be expected to contain. I do not understand that this test was even put forward as a definite proposal for a voting qualification.

Rate of Exchange _Sterling Transfers_

*Mr. Charles Edwards asked the Secretary of State for India what is the total amount of Reverse Council Bills sold by the Government of India since the new policy of fixing the rate of exchange on the basis of the London New York rate was introduced, such amount to include remittances made to this country through the Post Office; out of what funds is payment being made here against such bills; what was the rupee equivalent at which these funds were accumulated and stood in the books; what is the rupee amount now realised by such sales; what is the total loss incurred so far by the Government of India by these sales; and against what is it to be debited?

Mr. Montagu: The total amount of "Reverse Council Bills" or sterling transfers, sold since 5th February, 1920, is about £30,000,000. Remittance through the Post Office during February,

March and April, amounted to about £2,000,000. Payment against these transfers is being made from the Paper Currency Reserve and from Treasury. The funds held in the Paper Currency Reserve stand in the books at a rupee equivalent of Rs. 15 equal to £1. These funds, as also the Treasury holdings, were laid down in London at rates of exchange varying from 1s. 4d. to 2s. four and half pence. The rupee amount realised by the sales of reverse mentioned above is approximately Rs. 23 crores. The precise loss cannot be calculated, as the funds held in England cannot be earmarked against particular remittances from India, these having been effected, as just mentioned at varying rates. Moreover, it will in any case be necessary, as recognised by the Currency Committee, to revalue the sterling holdings of the Government on the basis of a 2s. rupee. On this basis the net loss on the sales as measured in sterling is approximately £7,000,000, representing the difference between remittances at 2s and the rates actually realised by the sales. The net loss incurred by reason of the high rate at which these remittances were effected will ultimately be debited to revenue which will per contra profit by the fact that under the new policy the Government of India will be able to make the remittances necessary for the purpose of meeting their sterling expenditure in this country at a far more favourable rate than was formerly the case. In this connection it may be mentioned that the rise in exchange above the rate of 1s. 4d. on which the Government accounts have hitherto been based, led, in the years 1917-19, to an exchange gain on the Government's total remittances of about £ 8,000,000.

Amnesty

Mr. R. Richardson asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will lay upon the Table, a statement giving the number of all the political offenders, including the detainees, internees, State prisoners, and persons convicted under the Indian Penal Code or otherwise confined in gaols or kept under restrictions in each province in India and in the Andamans on the 23rd December, 1919, their original sentences or periods of restriction ordered by the executive; the period undergone by each; the number of those who were released under the Amnesty Clause of the Royal Proclamation; and the number and names of those to whom benefit of the royal amnesty has been refused, with the reasons for such refusal in each case?

Mr. Montagu: The following figures are taken from the statement made by the Secretary to the Government of India in the Imperial Legislative Council on the 24th February

Total number released under the amnesty	...	1,255
Of these there were :		
(a) State prisoners under Regulation III 3 1818	...	24
(b) Restricted under the Defence of India Rules	...	369
(c) Restriction under the ingress into India Ordinance.		—
(d) Persons who had been convicted of offences against the State.	52
(e) Persons convicted in the disturbances of March and April 1919.	727

By comparison of these figures with an earlier return, I gather that the numbers in each of the above classes not released was on that date as follows : (a) 40 ; (b) 9 ; (c) — ; (d) 55 ; (e) 115. I have not inquired the names of these persons. His Majesty's Proclamation directed the Viceroy to exercise clemency in the fullest measure which in his judgment was compatible with the public safety.

Army and Public Services (Increased Pay)

Mr. Lunn asked the Secretary of State for India whether he will state the financial effects of the recent increases in the remuneration for the Indian Medical Service, the Indian Police Service, the Indian Educational Service, the Indian Civil Service, and the Indian Army, and lay upon the Table the correspondence on the subject between him and the Government of India on the subject?

Mr. Montagu: The approximate cost per annum of the increases of pay which have been sanctioned is estimated to be—

	£
Indian Civil Service	360,000
Indian Police Service	130,000
Indian Educational Service	100,000
British officers of Indian Army and of British troops in India	1700,000
Indian Medical Service	250,000

The correspondence is very voluminous, and I do not propose to lay it before the House. The usual course is for the Government of India to announce the decisions arrived at in the form of Resolutions promulgated in India. This is, I think, the most convenient procedure.

Mr. B. G. Horniman.

Mr. J. Adamson asked the Secretary of State for India whether he has received from *Mr. B. G. Horniman* a letter controverting the charges made against him by the right hon. Gentleman in this House on 23rd May, 1919; whether he promised to send *Mr. Horniman* a considered reply to this letter, but afterwards wrote to him saying that he preferred to deal with the matter in Parliament; whether, in

these circumstances, he will agree to Mr. Horniman's request for an investigation of these charges by a Parliamentary Committee; and if so, whether he will make a Motion before the House rises for the appointment of a Committee for that purpose?

Mr. Montagu: I received a letter from Mr. B. G. Horniman, and my considered reply was that any controversy which might arise about the statements I have made in this House should be conducted in the House itself. I am prepared to explain or justify here these statements if they are called in question. But there is, in my opinion, no need of inquiry.

Government of India Act [Draft Rules] Ordered:

"That a Select Committee of Seven Members be appointed, to join with a Committee to be appointed by the Lords, to revise the Draft rules made under the the Government of India Act, 1919."—*[Colonel Gibbs.]*

Motion made and question proposed, that Mr. Ackland, Mr. Bennett, Sir Henry Craik, Mr. Montagu, Mr. Ormsby Gore, Sir J. D. Rees, and Mr. Spoor be Members of the Committee.—*[Colonel Gibbs.]*

Colonel Yate: I object to this for the reasons which I gave the other day. In my opinion the Secretary of State should give evidence before this Committee and not be a Member of the Committee. He should not be both counsel, judge and jury. I lodge my protest against the appointment of this Committee and the appointment of the Secretary of State and the Under Secretary of State as Members of it, and I beg to move: "That the Secretary of State be not appointed."

The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Montagu): I would remind the hon. and gallant Gentleman that his protest was more appropriate when it was first made, when the original Committee was appointed to consider the Bill. He then made his protest and House decided against him. The rules which are to be revised by this Committee are part of the Bill. They arise out of the Bill, and it would be most unfortunate, having regard to the great importance of time, to delay matters by a change in the personnel of the Committee of Gentlemen who have devoted their attention to the rules, who are familiar with all the process which relate to the rules being framed and incorporated in the Bill itself. I am afraid that I can never convince my hon. and gallant Friend, and therefore I will not go on trying.

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, "That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records."

Ordered that "Five be the quorum,"—*[Colonel Gibbs.]*

Hunter Report [Evidence].

Mr. Inskip asked the Prime Minister whether the Hunter Report will be issued with the evidence; and whether, in view of the desirability of giving ample time for the perusal and study of the evidence, there is any objection to the immediate issue of the Report with the evidence, in order that it may be available before the Whitsuntide Recess?

Mr. Bonar Law: The evidence will be made available to Members who wish to study it as soon as the Report is presented. No effort is being spared to minimise delay, but I fear it will not be possible to present the Report before the early part of next week.

University Franchise—Women.

Mr. Lunn asked the Secretary of State for India whether it is proposed to include women graduates of seven years' standing in the electoral rolls for university seats in the local Legislative Councils; and whether Lord Selborne's Committee has recommended the giving of the vote in the University constituencies to all graduates of seven years standing irrespective of sex.

Mr. Montagu: I give the hon. Member the reply which was given on behalf of the Government of India to this same question when it was put in the Indian Legislative Council during the last session:

"(a) No. As recommended by the Joint Committee, provision will be made in the rules under Section 7 (4) (b) of the Government of India Act, 1919, for their inclusion in any province in which the Legislative Council may by Resolution so recommend.

"(c) The Joint Committee recommended that the franchise for the University seats should be extended to all graduates of over seven years' standing, but the Government of India understand that this recommendation, which does not include the last three words in the hon. Member's question, is subject to the general proposal of the Committee in regard to the admission of women to the franchise."

HOUSE OF COMMONS—8th June 1920.

General Dyer.

Mr. Gwynne asked the Secretary of War whether the question of Dyer's conduct whilst in command in India has been referred to the Army Council; if so, when and with what result.

Mr. Churchill: Yes Sir; as is stated in the published despatch of the Secretary of State for India to the Viceroy on this subject, the circumstances of the case of General Dyer have been brought to the notice of the Army Council by the Secretary of State for

India. Secondly, the Commander-in-Chief in India has recommended that General Dyer should be retired from the Army. Thirdly, General Dyer himself has written to the War Office requesting to be allowed to make a further statement. A preliminary discussion has taken place in the Army Council, and it has been decided to allow General Dyer to submit in writing the further statement which he wishes to make.

Colonel Burn: Is the opinion of the Army Council in unison with the opinion expressed in Lord Hunter's Report?

Mr. Churchill: It would be improper for the hon. and gallant Gentleman to ask questions in regard to confidential business of a Council of this character, and it would certainly be very improper for me to offer him any enlightenment.

The Punjab—Arms Act

Mr. Swan asked the Secretary of State for India whether, after the Royal Proclamation, the District Magistrate, Jullunder, in the Punjab, has refused to renew licenses under the Arms Act to several applicants on the ground that they had attended the Indian National Congress, which he said had passed seditious resolutions; whether he refused to forward to the Government of the Punjab a representation on the subject made by the Jullunder District Congress Committee, on the ground that that body was irresponsible and Self-constituted; whether a series of questions on this subject, of which notices were given by several members of the Indian Legislative Council, were disallowed by His Excellency the President during the last session; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter?

Mr. Montagu: I have no information beyond some complaints made in the Press. I will make inquiries.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, 9th June 1920.

General Dyer

Mr. Gwynne asked the Secretary of State for India whether General Dyer resigned his command in India voluntarily; if not, who asked him to resign; and was any reason given?

The Secretary of State for India (*Mr. Montagu*): The Commander-in-chief informed General Dyer that he accepted the conclusions of the Hunter Commission in regard to the occurrences at Amritsar, and directed him to resign his appointment as Brigade Commander.

Commander Bellairs: Was General Dyer supplied with legal assistance at this inquiry?

Mr. Montagu: I do not think so.