

intendent has not, as he should have done, either granted sanction for the prosecution of the Inspector for the said offence or punished the constable for bringing such a false charge; that the Inspector-General is taking no notice of this and other irregularities, and that, as the majority of the Police Department are uneducated men, they should be punished then and there for their offences.

KERALA PATRIKA,
May 12th, 1888.

Theft of a bunch of plantains by the police station officers in Payyoli.

8. A paragraph in the *Kerala Patrika*, of the 12th May, reports a case of theft of a bunch of plantains by the officers in charge of the Payyoli police station from a neighbouring compound.

(b) Courts.

SWADESHAMITRAN,
May 2nd, 1888.

9. In the *Swadeshamitran*, of the 2nd May, a correspondent complains of the incapableness of the subordinate magistracy, and recommends the separation of revenue from magisterial functions. He states that he hears that Government are contemplating to withdraw magisterial powers from taluk sheristadars and vest them in sub-registrars, and questions whether sub-registrars, notwithstanding their undoubted capabilities, are proper men to exercise magisterial powers:

(d) Education.

SWADESHAMITRAN,
May 12th, 1888.

10. The *Swadeshamitran*, of the 12th May, considers that Mr Grigg was too hasty in having passed the resolution that the students of the Madras Christian College who were involved in the recent disturbances there and were thence expelled, should not be admitted either into Government or aided colleges. The revolt of the students having had its origin in a matter affecting religion, Mr. Grigg should not have acted independently in the matter as he would in a case of a purely educational character, but should have communicated to Government all the circumstances of the case, and moved them to appoint a commission to inquire into the revolt, and then he might, on the strength of the report of the commission, have passed his judgment in the case. But as matters now stand, Mr. Grigg has heard the representations of only one party in the case, viz., the college Professors, and without taking into account what the college students had to say in justification of themselves, has pronounced judgment on them, excluding them from admission into other colleges. This, to say the least of it, is a blunder.

KERALA PATRIKA,
May 12th, 1888.

11. Referring to the late disturbances in the Madras Christian College, an article in the *Kerala Patrika*, of the 12th May, advises the Hindu community not to send their children to mission schools, as education in those schools will bring about many evils.

(e) Local and Municipal.

SWADESHAMITRAN,
May 2nd, 1888.

12. The *Swadeshamitran*, of the 2nd May, referring to the forthcoming municipal elections in Madras, advises the voters to exercise proper judgment in electing municipal commissioners. The commissioners elected should be persons of a sound understanding and good conduct, as only then the business of the municipality will be conducted properly and well. The efficient working of a municipality will be the means of inducing Government to remodel the Legislative Councils. To qualify for election as commissioner in the Madras Municipality, one must pay municipal taxes to the aggregate amount of not less than Rs. 100. A majority of those who are thus qualified are Englishmen. They are to be compared to mere birds of

Public DEPARTMENT.

G.O., DATED 4. Augst. 86

No. 771.

When given for copying

[Despatch Abstract.]

Emigration to French Colonies

BACK PAPER, No.

OF 188 .

FURTHER PAPER, No.

OF 188 .

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, dated
188 , No. , MISCELLANEOUS.

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

A A

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

N.B.—

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.

Recd
+ I 8/8

Submitted to the Hon. Secy. State
for perusal of the Hon. Secy. State

Recd. 25/6/83

Order 4 Augt/83 No. 771.

Recorded 25/6/83

The telegram from the Govt. of
India read above will be
transmitted confidentially to the
Hon. Secy. State for perusal of the
Hon. Secy. State at
the Office of the Secy. State,
Trichy & Madras

Recd
31/8

CURRENT No.

2643

[2]

Public DEPARTMENT.

From the Govt. Secy.

No. 117-118.

Dated 24 July 1880

Received 31

Enclosures 1.

SUBJECT.

Emigration to French
Colonies.

[Faint, illegible handwriting on the left page]

3
[Faint, illegible handwriting on the right page, including a circular stamp]

No. 117. E.
4-18

From W. R. Lawrence, Esquire, Es.,
Under Secretary to the Govt. of India.

To The Secretary to the Govt. of Madras.

Revenue and
Agricultural Deptt.
(Emigration.)

CHIEF SECRETARY
31 JUL 88
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Simla, the 24th July 1888.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
31 JUL 88
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Sir,

I am directed to forward confidentially, for the information of His Excellency the Governor in Council, a copy of a despatch * No. 7 (Emigration) dated the 9th June 1888, addressed to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India - expressing the views of the Government of India on the subject of Emigration from India to the French colonies.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant

W. R. Lawrence

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India

FILE NO. 4.
SERIAL NO. 12.

No.

1888.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

REVENUE AND AGRICULTURAL
DEPARTMENT.

EMIGRATION.

No. 7, DATED SIMLA, THE 9TH JUNE 1888.

(Copy.)

Letter to Her Majesty's Secretary of State
for India.

SUBJECT.

Communicates the views of the Government of India on the subject of emigration from India to the French colonies of Martinique, Guadeloupe and Réunion.

From

W. R. Lawrence, Esquire, Esq.,
Under Secretary to the Govt of India.

To

The Secretary to the Govt of Madras.

Revenue and
Agricultural Deptt.
(Emigration.)

CHIEF SECRETARY
31 JUL 88
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Simla, the 14th July 1888.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
31 JUL 88
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

Sir,

I am directed to forward confidentially, for the information of His Excellency the Governor in Council, a copy of a despatch No. 7 (Emigration) dated the 9th June 1888, addressed to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India - expressing the views of the Government of India on the subject of Emigration from India to the French colonies.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant

W. R. Lawrence

Under Secretary to the Govt of India

FILE NO. 4.
SERIAL NO. 12.

No.

1888.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

REVENUE AND AGRICULTURAL
DEPARTMENT.

EMIGRATION.

No. 7, DATED SIMLA, THE 9TH JUNE 1888.

(Copy.)

Letter to Her Majesty's Secretary of State
for India.

SUBJECT.

Communicates the views of the Government of India on the subject of emigration from India to the French colonies of Martinique, Guadeloupe and Réunion.

N^o. 17. E.
4-18

From
W. R. Lawrence, Esquire, C.S.,
Under Secretary to the Govt. of India.

To
The Secretary to the Govt. of Madras.

Revenue and
Agricultural Deptt.
(Emigration.)

CHIEF SECRETARY
31 JUL 88
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Simla, the 31st July 1888.



Sir,

I am directed to forward confidentially, for the information of His Excellency the Governor in Council, a copy of a despatch

N^o. 7 (Emigration) dated the 9th June 1888. } addressed to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India — expressing the views of the Government of India on the subject of Emigration from India to the French colonies.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant

W. R. Lawrence

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India

No. 7 OF 1888.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

REVENUE AND AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.

EMIGRATION.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

VISCOUNT CROSS, G.C.B.,

Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India.

Simla, the 9th June 1888.

MY LORD,

WE have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Lordship's Despatch No. 2 (Public—Emigration) of the 5th January 1888, relating to matters connected with emigration to the French colonies. We propose to reply separately to the points mentioned in paras. 3, 4 and 5 of the despatch; and in this communication to furnish Your Lordship, as requested, with our views and decision on the whole subject of Indian immigration in Réunion, as well as with our conclusions in respect of the colonies of Martinique and Guadeloupe.

2. We are not unwilling to accept the opportunity thus afforded by Your Lordship for a complete review and discussion of Indian emigration to the French possessions; conceiving that the question can be better understood, and negotiations more easily carried out, if the circumstances connected with each of the French colonies, in which Indian immigrants now reside, are brought together and considered as a whole.

3. We would preface our observations with the remark that, whereas emigration from India to the British colonies and to the Dutch colony of Surinam proceeds smoothly to the mutual advantage of India and those countries, emigration to the French colonies has always been attended with anxiety to us and not unfrequently with hardship to our Indian subjects. The voluminous correspondence on emigration to Réunion abounds in stories of oppression and abuses; and though Consul St. John's Report for 1884 suggests that matters were beginning to improve in that colony, we are compelled to the conclusion that the general tendency is to subordinate the rights of Indian immigrants to the interests of Creoles, with the result that the Indian is no security of obtaining equal justice at the hands of the Colonial Administration. It is hardly necessary to repeat the fact so often insisted on that the abuses which led to our closing emigration to Réunion arise from the intimate connection which is understood to exist between the Syndics or the members of the Syndicat Protecteur and the planting interests in the island. This unfortunate connection goes far to account for the circumstance that protests and representations have failed to have any material effect, and to explain why even with the co-operation of the French Government it is almost impossible to ensure reforms being introduced in the administration of immigration to Réunion.

We would also draw attention to another consideration. The coolies who return from British colonies come back with savings and in good physical condition. Their wealth and their accounts of the favourable circumstances of immigrant life in the colonies induce other natives to leave the crowded tracts of Madras, Bengal, and the North-Western Provinces; and in this way a beneficial movement of population, which will become more and more important as time goes on, sets in. This healthy condition of things is apt to be reversed in the case of Réunion and the other French colonies, from which the return of worn-out pauper immigrants whose passage up-country from the ports has to be defrayed by the State is of frequent occurrence. The following passages from the report of an official deputed by the Bengal Government to enquire into the conditions of emigration in connection with the recent revision of the law, and whose attention had in no way been directed to the question of emigration to any particular colony, indicate that,—irrespective of the loss which is caused to this country by the return of paupers who are a burden on the community, the treatment afforded to our Indian subjects in the French colonies is a subject of adverse comment among the people themselves. Mr. Grierson writes—

"Colonial emigration is by no means unpopular except to the French colonies. Every one has the same story that when a man goes to the French colonies he is entirely lost sight of.

"French colonies are not like Demerara or Trinidad, as coolies have no facilities for sending letters or money which they have in the latter places.

"About the French colonies, as Major Pitcher" (the officer deputed to make a similar enquiry in the North-Western Provinces), "says, heads are shaken. Of them I heard the same story everywhere, that few returned from them."

These opinions of the people of India regarding the disadvantages attending emigration to the French colonies are borne out by the fact that out of an average Indian population of nearly 45,000 coolies in Réunion from 1871 to 1876, the annual proportion who returned to India was a little over 0.9 per cent.

And we would conclude our prefatory observations by saying that the outlet afforded to our surplus population by emigration to the French colonies is not of sufficient extent to make it important that we should maintain it. Other more promising fields of labour exist, in which we have a better assurance that our subjects will receive fair and equal treatment, and in which our representations and advice command attention.

4. *Réunion*.—Adverting now more particularly to the special subjects of Your Lordship's despatch under acknowledgment, we have perused the papers referred to in paragraph 6, relating to the cases of two Indians in the colony of Réunion, one of whom is stated to have died under suspicious circumstances, and the other to have been severely maltreated by his master. From one of Consul St. John's other letters to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, we observe that the sum voted for the Immigration Service still continues to be reduced; that for the year 1888 the grant is 63,200 francs only, while the Consul believes that nothing under a sum of 90,000 francs can suffice for maintaining an efficient service. It is also believed, we see, that a further reduction will be made for the ensuing year, and so on until the protectorate is abolished altogether. The Consul also brings to notice a strong anti-English feeling which manifested itself in the colony in August 1887, which he was of opinion would act very prejudicially to the interests of the Indian immigrants, but which feeling he subsequently reported was subsiding. The

imposition of a tax levied on all strangers of Asiatic or African origin is another matter referred to by the Consul as bearing unfairly on Indian immigrants.

We agree with Your Lordship that the various matters brought to light by Consul St. John—whose efforts on behalf of Her Majesty's Indian subjects we again take the opportunity of acknowledging—demand that a strong protest should be conveyed to the French Government. Within the last three years the question of the renewal of emigration from India to Réunion has more than once been considered by us; and, in the several despatches we have addressed to Your Lordship, we have throughout maintained our opinion that unless the French Government accepted, unreservedly, the three conditions laid down in our Despatch No. 17 of the 25th April 1882, we could not allow emigration to be resumed. The facts contained in the papers now forwarded by Your Lordship confirm our conviction that these conditions are imperative. In our Despatch No. 2 of the 10th January last we stated that we did not consider any detailed examination of the new Decree, relating to the emigration of coolies from India to Réunion, to be called for from our Government; and we are, in view of the circumstances above stated, less disposed than ever to accord the new regulations any further consideration. We are constrained to record our opinion that the cases brought to light by Consul St. John point to a continuance of the abuses which before existed in the colony; and we view with some alarm the statement made by the Consul that it is the intention of the Conseil Général to abolish the protectorate altogether: a course which cannot but injuriously affect the interests of our Indian subjects.

5. These papers further confirm us in the opinion, which we have for some time held, but to which we have not hitherto deemed it necessary to give distinct expression that, even if the three conditions laid down are eventually acceded to by the French Government, there would be little or no benefit to our Indian subjects in allowing emigration to be resumed, and that it would be our duty to stipulate for further reforms which are essential to the well-being of Indians in that colony. We consider, in the first place, that, in addition to the three conditions upon which we have throughout insisted, an independent and honest head for the protective service must be secured. The Protector should be a French official unconnected with the Créole interest, who would work in harmony with the British Consul. Secondly, that a form of contract should be adopted which would be complete in itself, and such as could be understood by the Indian recruit before he accepts it. The old contract bound the emigrant *pour tout faire*. So general an expression would technically justify the Réunion authorities in sending coolies into the sea to pick up stones with water up to their shoulders, an occurrence which on one occasion actually took place. The kind of work should be stated, the wages, the number of holidays and working days, and the hours of work. And as regards wages, it should be specially stipulated, in view of the correspondence which has taken place regarding the *côte personnelle*, that those specified in the contract are not liable to any local taxation. We cannot admit that the Indians in Réunion are in any sense citizens. They are treated as a distinct people, and are subject to somewhat harassing Police regulations; and so long as they are thus treated, they should be exempt from taxation. If, however, the Réunion Government will not grant any such exemption, it would, in the case of emigration being reopened, be our duty to give wide publicity to the fact that the wage mentioned in the contract was liable to

drawbacks. Further, the right to a return passage should find a place in the contract; and it should be distinctly laid down that the conditions of the contract apply equally to second and other engagements as to first engagements. Thirdly, the provisions of Article XV of the present Convention, which prescribes the amount of space to be allowed for the conveyance of emigrants from India to the French colonies should be made applicable to the return journey. As things now are, vessels carrying time-expired emigrants may carry one emigrant for every ton of burden.

6. Even if the above conditions are exacted from the Government of Réunion, we doubt whether the Indian immigrant will ever enjoy the advantages which he possesses in the British colonies and in the Colony of Surinam. Previous to the closure of emigration in 1882, there was an elaborate machinery for the protection of immigrants which seemed in every way perfect. But, like the rules for the regulation of immigration, in practice it proved a failure; probably because, as was represented to us, there was not from the *Commissaire d'Immigration* down to the Syndics Cantoneaux an independent man. To quote Consul Perry's words:—

"The Syndics and clerks are all needy Creoles of little or no education and belonging for the most part to the lower classes . . . dependent on the large proprietors who make their power felt and do not scruple to threaten a Syndicate with the wrath of the Conseil Général and the rigours of the Administration if he performs his duties to their prejudice."

Our experience does not, as we have already indicated, lead us to hope that fair and impartial treatment is likely to be secured to our Indian subjects in Réunion by mere regulations or rules however carefully framed. The fault appears to lie in the jealous and partial character of the Administration of the Colony; and until this changes, we feel that it is our duty not to recommend but on the contrary to discourage the reopening of emigration. If, however, there are reasons which lead Your Lordship to consider it desirable that it should be reopened, we urge most strongly that the additional conditions we have suggested above should be insisted on.

7. The views we hold regarding the unsatisfactory conditions of immigrant life in Réunion are supported not only by Consul St. John, but also by the Consular Agent at Pondicherry and Karikal, who has excellent opportunities for forming an opinion on the subject. We enclose, for Your Lordship's perusal, two reports recently received, which reveal facts most unsatisfactory, yet most characteristic, of Réunion emigration. Of the 269 immigrants who returned from Réunion in the French barque *Condor*, the most part were "worn-out, decrepit, aged, or prematurely aged persons; two were utter idiots; 14 were completely broken down and worn-out, fit for no useful purpose in the world; while 42 of them were entirely destitute."

In the French barque *Félicité*, 361 immigrants returned; "their general condition was sufficiently pitiable," and "99 of them were either on the verge of mendicancy or absolute mendicants." We would especially invite attention to para. 19 of Colonel Fischer's report of the 16th December 1887, which shows that his unfavourable opinion regarding Réunion emigration is shared in by the inhabitants of Pondicherry and by the French officials. In the case of both vessels, the arrangements made for the accommodation of the immigrants were extremely bad, and will convince Your Lordship that the third of the additional conditions we have suggested is fully warranted.

8. *Martinique and Guadeloupe*.—After repeated requests on the part of our Government, we have received a report direct from the British Consul, a copy of which has also reached us with Your Lordship's Despatch No. 150 (Public—Emigration), of the 15th December 1887, on the condition of Indian immigrants in Martinique and Guadeloupe. We have given Consul Lawless' careful report our consideration, and now beg to communicate, for Your Lordship's information, our remarks on it. We concur generally in Mr. Lawless' opinion "that the conditions of the Indian emigrant in Martinique and Guadeloupe has never responded to the desires of Her Majesty's Indian Government, nor has it been in conformity with the laws and regulations that have been framed for the purpose of guarding against any remissness in that direction"; and we notice briefly the chief abuses which have been brought to light in the report just quoted. We see that, from the outset, the arrangements made in Martinique for the reception and housing of the newly-arrived emigrants are by no means satisfactory; that the rations supplied to immigrants awaiting repatriation at the dépôt are of the smallest and scantiest character; that the arrangements for the distribution of the emigrants to estates increase the possibility of separating families,—a circumstance which should be most carefully guarded against; that the hospital accommodation on estates has been always most defective and unsuitable; and that the bad quality of the rations supplied is a frequent source of complaint. Following Mr. Lawless in his report, we further learn that the renewal of labour contracts has been suppressed, and the immigrant's right to a premium on re-engagement to which he is entitled, under Article IX of the Convention of 1861, is now absolutely denied; that the grant for the repatriation of 6,000 Indian immigrants who have earned the right to a free return passage has been refused by the Conseil Général; that the dépôt where infirm and other coolies await repatriation has been closed; and that the cost of the Immigration Staff has been reduced from 42,234 francs per annum to 8,800 francs per annum *plus* a grant of 12,719 francs for dépôt, hospital, and other charges. The Consul further states that the mortality among Indians is regarded as excessive, and is attributed to the relative insufficiency of the medical hospitals and other sanitary requirements; and that the estates of deceased immigrants are taken charge of in conformity with French law, and that the British Consul is never appealed to in connection with these questions.

9. In Guadeloupe, according to the report furnished, the state of affairs is not more satisfactory than in Martinique. Here we learn that the bounty to which the immigrant is entitled on re-engaging for a fresh term has been reduced from 250 to 150 francs, on the ground that the maintenance of the immigrant's right to a return passage after re-indenture justifies the reduction; that immigrants wishing to re-engage have to do so three months before the expiration of their engagement, while they are entitled to a delay of one year before coming to any decision; and that the arrangements for allotments to estates, as in Martinique, lead to much hardship. One of the most persistent complaints urged by the immigrants is that they are not paid their wages regularly at the end of each month, and that on a large number of estates it is customary, during the interval between each crop, not to make cash payments, thus deferring the settlement of immigrants' claims until the next crop opens; and it is calculated that the losses thus sustained by the immigrants have been considerable, especially when failures occur during the intervals referred to. The statistics furnished by the Consul relate to the year 1885. In Martinique the number of Indian immigrants on the 31st December of that year is stated to have been 11,909, of whom 5,332 were repatriated to India up to

1885, bringing away with them savings, it is estimated, to the amount of 125,000 francs. In Guadeloupe, the number of Indian immigrants in the colony up to 31st December 1885, is said to have been 19,236, of whom only 1,936 had been repatriated up to that date, and brought back with them, it is believed, a sum amounting to 235,605 francs. The Consul, we observe, is sceptical as to the savings of the Martinique and Guadeloupe immigrants, and believes that the amounts stated are greatly in excess of the actual savings. The statistics further furnish some noteworthy facts: for instance, the occurrence of eighteen suicides and seven violent deaths in Guadeloupe in one year alone.

10. The foregoing *résumé* deals with the chief points which seem to us to require reform in the administration of emigration matters in the colonies of Martinique and Guadeloupe. Consul Lawless' report shows that the Convention of 1861 has been broken in both colonies; that in both colonies, also, the vote for the immigration service has been reduced considerably by the Local Administrations, and in Martinique to an extent which renders it impossible to secure for the Indian immigrant the protection and privileges which he was led to expect that he would receive when he emigrated from India. Although we have no specific instances of ill-treatment or oppression to quote, the Consul's report indicates unmistakeably that the Conseil Général in Martinique, with whom the control of the immigrant staff rests, are hostile to the introduction of Indian labour, and that this hostility has resulted in a loss of the privileges to which the Indian immigrant is entitled. We do not propose to discuss in any detail the several points brought to notice by Mr. Lawless; but we must say that the general impression received from a perusal of Mr. Lawless' paper is that the system is bad in both colonies; and that, as in Réunion, its inherent faults "proceed less from any insufficiency of the laws and regulations than from the absence of an adequate independent agency for their impartial application." We presume that it is hopeless for our Government to demand that the immigration staff should be made independent of the Conseil Général; that its Chief should be appointed by the Home Government; and that the proper and necessary expenditure required for the protection and well-being of Indian immigrants should be entered among "*les dépenses obligatoires*" of the colony; but we must insist on the immigrant's right to re-engage and to receive a bounty (Article IX of the Convention), on his right to receive gratuitous medical treatment (Article VIII), and on his right to punctual repatriation. We must therefore enter a strong protest against the action of the French Authorities in the matters above referred to, and we are constrained to recommend that further emigration to Guadeloupe and Martinique should be suspended, for very similar reasons to those which have led us to deprecate any reopening of emigration to Réunion. We do not ignore the remarks of Mr. Lawless, that the planters in Martinique are, as a rule, "more lenient and patient than some employers would probably prove under the persistent provocation they are so often subjected to on the part of the lazy refractory labourers that immigration but too frequently furnishes, whom they are bound nevertheless to maintain"; and we do not for a moment suppose that in Guadeloupe and Martinique, as indeed in Réunion, there are not planters who treat our Indian subjects with kindness and consideration. But we are forced to the conclusion that in all these colonies the general tendency is towards oppression; while every new measure taken by the Colonial Governments seems to be attended with some disability to the immigrant. We view with alarm the reckless manner in which reductions are made in the protective service; and we think that the fact stated

by Mr. Lawless, that out of a total population of Indian immigrants in Guadeloupe of 17,591 at the end of 1886, 1,010 were vagabonds or deserters, indicates a very serious and dangerous state of things. In view, therefore, of our past experience, and of the hostile attitude adopted by the Governments of Martinique and Guadeloupe towards Indian immigrants, we doubt whether we are justified in continuing to allow our Indian subjects to emigrate to countries where their fair treatment and protection is not assured. It is true that for the past few years there has been no emigration from India to Martinique and Guadeloupe; but any demand that may arise for Indian labourers at the present time would have to be complied with at once; and although the Conseil Général in Martinique is against the importation of Indian labour, we observe that the Estate Owners are not of the same mind. A decision to suspend emigration will not, of course, secure an improvement in the immigration service; but, on the other hand, the announcement of an intention to close emigration would not remove the 10,055 Indians in Martinique and the 17,591 immigrants in Guadeloupe, the population as it stood at the end of the year 1886, from the protection of Article XXVI of the Convention of 1861, which provides that even in the event of the determination of the Convention, the stipulations relative to Indian subjects of Her Britannic Majesty introduced into French Colonies shall be maintained in force, in favour of the said Indian subjects, until they shall either have been sent back to their own country or have renounced their right to a return passage to India.

11. In para. 2 of our despatch No. 2 of the 10th January last, on the subject of emigration to Réunion, we expressed our satisfaction at the provision made in the new decree for making the cost of repatriation one of the "*dépenses obligatoires*" of the colony; and as this question is of paramount importance to the immigrant, we think that some measures should be taken to impress upon the French Government the obligation which rests upon it to send back time-expired labourers with as little delay as possible.

As regards the question of re-opening emigration to Cayenne, we shall address Your Lordship in a separate communication. At present we would only say that we have received the new Cayenne decree, and that we have had it reported on by the Governments of Madras and Bengal, and have at present their replies before us. But we still await Consul Wyndham's report on the condition of Indian immigrants in that colony; and when this has been received and considered, we shall acquaint Your Lordship with our decision on the matter.

We have the honour to be,

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's most obedient, humble Servants,

DUFFERIN.

F. S. ROBERTS.

G. CHESNEY.

A. R. SCOBLE.

C. U. AITCHISON.

C. A. ELLIOTT.

J. WESTLAND.

LIST OF ENCLOSURES.

1. From Government of Madras, No. 49, Public, dated 16th January 1888.
2. " " " No. 163, " dated 11th February 1888.
3. " " " No. 230, " 2nd March 1888.

FILE NO. 4.
SERIAL NO. 12.

No.

1888.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

REVENUE AND AGRICULTURAL
DEPARTMENT.

EMIGRATION.

No. 7, DATED SIMLA, THE 9TH JUNE 1888.

(Copy.)

*Letter to Her Majesty's Secretary of State
for India.*

SUBJECT.

Communicates the views of the Government
of India on the subject of emigration from India
to the French colonies of Martinique, Guade-
loupe and Réunion.

Copy sent to
Col. Warner 3/2
Cipher message received from Govt. of India

"Confidential. Your telegram of the 27th inst. Emigration to Guadeloupe.
Please see para 10 of despatch No. 7 of 9th June last forwarded
with No. 117 dated 24th inst. Until Govt. of India learns news
Secretary of State regarding recommendation to suspend emi-
gration to Guadeloupe, the Govt. General in Council does not
intend to take action under Section 9 of Act 21. of 1883.
Meanwhile he does not wish in any way to facilitate emi-
gration to French colonies."

S
29/July.

Record
944
22-7
Communicate confidentially
with - so. to Col. Warner
His
say

SUBJECT.

Communicates the views of the Government
of India on the subject of emigration from India
to the French colonies of Martinique, Guade-
loupe and Réunion.

[1] No 102
of 1888

ORDINARY, MS.

Public DEPARTMENT.	
G. O. DATED	11 Aug 1888
No.	799A

When given for copying

[Despatch Abstract.]

Madras Native Newspaper

Report on — for fortnight
ending 15th July 1888.