



*Rare section*

REPORT OF FIRST  
British Commonwealth  
Labour Conference

HELD AT THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS, LONDON, S.W.1

JULY 27 to AUGUST 1, 1925

X:9193.3r  
C6.2

239196

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
<b>DELEGATES</b> . . . . .	4
 <b>FIRST SESSION: MONDAY, July 27, 1925.</b>	
Conference Arrangements . . . . .	7
Publicity . . . . .	9
Inter-Commonwealth Political Relations, including the Position of States forming the <i>British Commonwealth</i> in relation to other States . . . . .	10
 <b>SECOND SESSION. TUESDAY, July 28, 1925.</b>	
Inter-Commonwealth (Political) Relations . . . . .	21
India . . . . .	21
Subject Peoples . . . . .	22
International Labour Legislation and the Ratification of the I.L.O. Conventions . . . . .	25
 <b>THIRD SESSION: WEDNESDAY, July 29, 1925.</b>	
Industrial Legislation and Labour Protection in the Mandated Territories . . . . .	38
Palestine . . . . .	38
Conditions of Indian Labour in British Colonies . . . . .	47
 <b>FOURTH SESSION THURSDAY, July 30, 1925.</b>	
Protocol of Geneva for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes . . . . .	56
Subject Peoples . . . . .	69
Conditions of Indian Labour in British Colonies—South Africa . . . . .	69
Inter-Commonwealth Political Relations . . . . .	73
 <b>FIFTH SESSION: FRIDAY, July 31, 1925.</b>	
Conditions of Indian Labour in British Colonies—South Africa . . . . .	78
Labour Conditions in British Guiana . . . . .	82
Migration . . . . .	85
 <b>SIXTH SESSION: SATURDAY, August 1, 1925.</b>	
Migration . . . . .	94
State Trading within the Commonwealth . . . . .	113
British Commonwealth Labour Conference, 1927 . . . . .	117
 <b>APPENDICES</b> . . . . .	 121
 <b>DIRECTORY</b> . . . . .	 146
 <b>INDEX</b> . . . . .	 147

## DELEGATES.

- AUSTRALIA** ..... Miss M. HEAGNEY,  
Australian Labour Party and Trades Hall  
Council, Victoria.
- BRITISH GUIANA** ..... Mr. H. CRITCHLOW,  
British Guiana Labour Union.
- CANADA** ..... Mr. P. HEENAN, M.P.P.,  
Independent Labour Party of Ontario.  
Mr. J. QUEEN, M.L.A.,  
Independent Labour Party of Manitoba.  
Mr. J. MACDONALD,  
Canadian Labour Party.  
Mr. J. SIMPSON,  
Canadian Labour Party.
- IRELAND** ..... Mr. T. JOHNSON, T.D.,  
Irish Labour Party and Trades Union Cen-  
gress.  
Mr. L. J. DUFFY,  
Irish Labour Party and Trades Union Cen-  
gress.  
Mr. W. McMULLEN, M.P.,  
Labour Party (Northern Ireland).  
Mr. W. BOYD,  
Labour Party (Northern Ireland).
- INDIA** ..... Mr. D. CHAMAN LALL, M.L.A.,  
All-India Trades Union Congress.  
Mr. N. M. JOSHI, M.L.A.,  
All-India Trades Union Congress.
- PALESTINE** ..... Mr. D. BEN-GURION,  
Palestine Jewish Labour Federation  
Mr. CHAIM ARLOSOFF,  
Palestine Jewish Labour Federation.  
Mr. I. BEN-ZVIE,  
Palestine Jewish Labour Federation.
- SOUTH AFRICA** ..... Mr. H. W. SAMPSON, M.L.A.,  
South African Labour Party and South African  
Association of Employees' Organisations.  
Mr. W. WANLESS,  
South African Labour Party.
- FRATERNAL DELEGATES.** International Federation of Trade Unions :  
Mr. J. W. BROWN.  
Labour and Socialist International :  
Dr. FREDERICK ADLER.

GREAT BRITAIN ..... . *Labour Party—Executive Committee:*  
Mr. C. T. CRAMP (*Chairman*).  
Rt. Hon. F. W. JOWETT.  
Rt. Hon. J. R. MACDONALD, M.P.  
Rt. Hon. Col. J. C. WEDGWOOD, M.P.  
Rt. Hon. A. HENDERSON, M.P. (*Secretary*).  
Mr. R. J. DAVIES, M.P.  
Miss MARY CARLIN.  
Mrs. HARRISON BELL.

*Trades Union Congress—General Council:*  
Mr. A. B. SWALES (*Chairman*).  
Mr. A. A. PURCELL, M.P. (*Vice-Chairman*).  
Mr. BEN TILLET.  
Mr. R. B. WALKER.  
Mr. A. FINDLAY.

*Labour Party—Parliamentary Party.*  
Mr. G. LANSBURY, M.P.  
Mr. R. SMILLIE, M.P.  
Mr. J. MAXTON, M.P.  
Rt. Hon. C. P. TREVELYAN, M.P.  
Mr. J. STEWART, M.P.  
Dr. L. HADEN GUEST, M.P.  
Mr. H. SNELL, M.P.

*Secretary:* Mr. W. GILLIES, 33, Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1.

## FIRST SESSION.

*Monday, July 27, 1925.*

Mr. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P. (Great Britain), presiding.

The CHAIRMAN, after welcoming the delegates, said the Labour Party had been trying for a considerable number of years to arrange such a conference. When he was Secretary of the Party he tried very hard to arrange such a function, but it could not be done, and very much to their regret they had to drop the project for the time being. It had always been lying in their hearts, however, and they had constantly been intending to have such a conference. Now he was very pleased indeed that at last it had been accomplished.

Continuing, he said there seemed to be an assumption abroad in this country that the Tory Party—the party of reaction—was the only party that cared anything about the Empire. This was all fudge and humbug. As a matter of fact, the first party that took any keen interest in the Empire—he was using the expression in the sense of the co-operative unity of nations and coming nations—was the Labour Party. They saw first of all that the Labour movement in the Empire and the whole development of Imperial life was of the utmost importance, and also that this development should be studied on the spot by men actively engaged in political life in this country who could manage to get abroad to foreign countries. The party that saw these things first of all was the Labour Party, and long before either the Tories or the Liberals ever dreamt of doing anything except talking of the Empire for political purposes the Labour Party was studying the Empire for the purpose of creating a unified movement.

As the Labour Party went on there was a thing they had to consider and keep constantly in front of them. There was no section of the industrial world that could pursue a policy aimed at raising Labour on high industrial and economic levels and on high morals alone. The more the Labour Party built up a democratic State—not only in the sense of political liberty but in the sense of industrial and economic power—the more their Party pursued that policy the more successful it became, and the more it was driven up against national privileges. If these conditions were against it its difficulties were enormously increased. They had to have in mind that Imperial Labour Legislation, international Labour legislation, agreements about standards of living and standards of wages and conditions, must be more and more common if the Dominion Labour Parties and the British Labour Party were going to carry out successfully the industrial and humane programmes they had placed before them.

There were always two stages of a big progressive constructive movement. There was the stage when the idea was conceived, when the doctrine was laid down and the end fixed. Then there was the stage when a considerable measure of success had been attained and when the movement was to shift from the position it then occupied and take up the position which its advocates would like it to occupy. He thought he would say that in every Dominion and also in this country the Labour movement was in the second position. They had now to build up a programme of active, practical action which would enable them to realise their ideals. In this they would have to face some questions that would call for the exercise of the very best and most generous goodwill between themselves.

Referring to the question of Preference, Mr. MacDonald said in this country it had become purely a Party issue. There was an idea that the Union Jack was a sort of trade mark to be used in every great national, Imperial or International matter to enable certain sections to trade who perhaps would not trade but for the propaganda associated with the Union Jack. There was also an idea that the Dominions gave us Preferential treatment at their Customs Houses, for which we were very much obliged, with the corresponding benefit, as they said, given to the Dominions by the Mother country modifying her fiscal policy in order that we might enable certain sections in the Dominions to supply us with certain kinds of food at prices which were admittedly higher than they would be if there had been no such preference. There was a great deal to be said for that, but it

was not good enough for Labour or for those who did not want merely to use the Empire to benefit certain sections of capital. Their conception of the Empire was very much wider, deeper and higher than that. Those from the Dominions might disagree in certain instances with them. They believed in Protection; but in our position—in our geographical position, in our industrial position, and still more, he thought, in our historical position—we had to adopt a policy which was not exactly the Dominions policy because their conditions and their history were quite different from ours.

The foundation of successful co-operation between different peoples living under different conditions was the power to be sympathetic so that they could understand each other's points of view. With their common Labour ideas they had to devise some means by which these Preferences, whatever form they might take, were given for the benefit of the whole community. We needed a scheme by which these industrial recognitions in the form of Preferences would be made in such a way that what we did for the Dominions was done for the community, and what the Dominions did for us was also done for the community. He could see no way out of that except by large wholesale purchases by committees under Government control. In this matter of bulk purchases the Dominion Governments must be willing to come under the scheme and our Government must do the same. In that way goods produced under fine Labour conditions, in such a way that the production maintained a high standard of working-class body, mind and soul, should be handled so that the whole of the countries co-operating would benefit as a community and not merely in capitalist sections. This was a problem which had to be worked out and which he hoped would very soon be worked out.

Referring to the question of foreign relationship, Mr MacDonal said one of the big problems we had to solve was Dominion foreign policy and Dominion relationships with the rest of the world. We wanted to assure them that in the case of the Geneva Protocol, which the Government had rejected apparently for no other reason but that it was devised by Labour, every Dominion represented was consulted, stage by stage, point by point, and with the full information and with the full knowledge that could be gained. With an understanding and grasp of the whole situation that had to be faced they came to the conclusion that this was the best that could be done. The experience of the Labour Party in these matters would make them very unwilling to take any responsibility for Foreign Affairs if they could avoid it. The idea that we were going to be the policemen of the world and put our noses into other people's affairs was a profound mistake, and the sooner we got back to limited responsibility and a trust to the self-development of peoples, the better it would be for the Dominions and for this country.

## CONFERENCE ARRANGEMENTS.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Conference to approve of the following Conference arrangements agreed upon by a preliminary meeting of the delegates.

### TIME AND PLACE OF CONFERENCE.

The six sessions of the Conference will be held at the British Empire Parliamentary Association Rooms, House of Commons, Westminster, London, S.W. 1, on Monday, July 27, 1925, and five following days

### SESSIONS.

Full sessions will be held in the mornings only, from 9.30 to 1.30 each day.

### CHAIRMEN.

The Chairmen of the six sessions will be as follows:—

Monday .. .. .	Rt. Hon. J. R. MACDONALD, M.P.
Tuesday . . . . .	Mr. H. W. SAMPSON, M.L.A. (S. Africa).
Wednesday .. . . .	Mr. A. B. SWALES.
Thursday . . . . .	Mr. J. SIMPSON (Canada).
Friday .. . . .	Mr. A. A. PURCELL, M.P.
Saturday .. . . .	Mr. C. T. CRAMP.

## AGENDA.

The Agenda will be as follows :—

1. Inter-Dominion Emigration (Britain).
2. Protocol of Geneva for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes (Britain).
3. International Labour Legislation and the Ratification of the I.L.O. Conventions (Britain).
4. Inter-Dominion Trade Relations (Britain).
5. Conditions of Indian Labour in the British Colonies (India).
6. Industrial Legislation and Labour Protection in the Mandated Territories (Palestine).
7. Inter-Commonwealth Relations, including the position of States forming the British Commonwealth in relation to other States (Ireland).

## ORDER OF DISCUSSION.

The subjects on the Agenda will be discussed in the following order, and the Chairmen will invite the delegates indicated to open the discussions of the respective subjects.

<i>Subject.</i>	<i>First Speaker.</i>
Inter-Commonwealth Political Relations, including the position of States forming the British Commonwealth in relation to other States.	Mr. T. JOHNSON, T.D. (Ireland).
International Labour Legislation and the Ratification of the I.L.O. Conventions.	Mr. R. J. DAVIES, M.P. (Britain).
Industrial Legislation and Labour Protection in the Mandated Territories.	Mr. BEN-GURION (Palestine).
Conditions of Indian Labour in British Colonies.	Mr. N. M. JOSHI, M.L.A. (India).
British Guiana.	Mr. CRITCHLOW.
Inter-Dominion Emigration.	Mr. J. OUREN, M.L.A. (Canada).
Inter-Dominion Trade Relations.	Mr. G. LANSBURY, M.P. (Britain).
<i>The discussion of the</i> Protocol of Geneva for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes <i>will be taken on Thursday morning.</i>	Rt. Hon. A. HENDERSON, M.P. (Britain).

## PUBLICITY.

The Chairmen's addresses may be reported by the Press, but otherwise the Conference will be private and an official communiqué issued to the Press.

## STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Mr. J. Simpson, Mr. Chaman Lall, M.L.A., and Mr. A. A. Purcell, M.P., will be the Standing Orders Committee, and will approve of the Press communiqué.

## VOTING.

It was agreed to recommend, if and when voting is necessary, that voting should take place by country—one vote for each country.

## RIGHTS OF DELEGATES AND VISITORS.

Only delegates will be called upon by the Chairmen to address the Conference.

## CONFERENCE ARRANGEMENTS APPROVED.

These arrangements were approved unanimously, with the exception of the paragraph entitled "Publicity."



## PUBLICITY.

Mr J MACDONALD (Canada) said that the Canadian delegation was unanimous on the question of admitting the Press. They realised that the Press was a capitalist Press, but still there was a large amount of interest in this Conference, and they thought publicity should be given. He did not see why the Chairman should run the risk of misrepresentation, and the delegations should not.

Mr N. M JOSHI (India) supported the motion that the Conference should be open to the Press. The Conference was going to have much value—value to posterity. By merely publishing a small bulletin at the end of the day they could not influence any section of Labour opinion in the Dominions or here. If they were going to solve difficult problems there should be some opportunity to discuss things publicly so that the world might know that there were difficulties. He did not see any necessity for excluding the Press from the ordinary proceedings. When necessary, they might go into committee.

Mr ARTHUR HENDERSON (Great Britain) suggested that the character of the discussions which would take place was just of the nature and character of the discussions which take place in the Commissions that usually occupy the greater part of the time of any Interna-

tional Conference; and it was because some of them wanted the freest, frankest expression of opinion—not to help the Press but to help themselves—that they desired the exclusion of the Press. They had nothing to hide, but they wished to have such conditions as would admit of the fullest, frankest and most faithful discussion that it was possible to have. He hoped the decision of the preliminary Conference would be confirmed.

Miss M. HEAGNEY (Australia) supported the decision of the preliminary meeting. It was the practice of Australia always to exclude the capitalist Press from their meetings; they knew that the capitalist Press was an integral part of the whole political machinery of their opponents, and they came to conferences to report only for their own political purposes.

Mr T JOHNSON (Ireland) asked whether a report of the proceedings was being taken, as the reply would influence the votes of some delegates. The Secretary answered in the affirmative.

Mr J. MACDONALD (Canada) proposed that the paragraph on "Publicity" be referred back.

Mr D. CHAMAN LALL (India) seconded. The motion was defeated. India and Canada voted for the reference back, Australia, Britain, Ireland, Palestine, and South Africa voted against.

## INTER-COMMONWEALTH POLITICAL RELATIONS.

Including the position of States forming the British Commonwealth in relation to other States.

*Mr. T. JOHNSON, T D (Ireland).*

Mr. T. JOHNSON (Ireland) regretted that the subject of Inter-Commonwealth Relations should have been placed first on the agenda, as he felt some of the delegates would be inclined to treat it as of academic, and not of practical, immediate importance. However, he was sure that the subject had an immediately practical importance, and while it might not be of the same class as subjects of industrial and economic interest, it had very important implications. It was important that they should understand whether within the Labour movements of the English-speaking world, at least, there was any general understanding of what the relations of those countries which are provinces within the British Commonwealth of Nations should be to one another. He was not at all sure that there was anything like general agreement as to the relations of England to Australia, Australia to Canada, Australia to India, India to Canada, and so on. He thought they should try to find out how close they were to a common understanding, and at least try to narrow the difficulties. Take, for instance, the newspaper reports of the building of the new cruisers, and the possibility of their intervention in war. He wanted to know to what extent the various parts of the world represented there were to be affected directly by any armed intervention anywhere, or by a declaration of war anywhere.

In the course of the Chairman's address, one was impressed by the importance of having an agreed terminology. The words "British Empire" were used, with a little hesitation as to whether that was the right term to use, in dealing with India, whether "British Dominions" was right as regards India, and whether the "British Commonwealth of Nations" would be an accurate description of this Conference, which had a representative from British Guiana. He doubted whether the word "Empire" was valid to-day, and did not think "Commonwealth" was a true description. He had not hit upon a word which would really describe this Association of Nations. He thought perhaps the phrase used by Tim Healy, the Governor-General of Ireland—"A Confraternity of Nations"—was good, though not quite as fine a definition as "Commonwealth." So also when the Chairman spoke of "Motherland," and "Mother Country," that was hardly accurate in describing the relations between Great Britain and India or

British Guiana. They did not recognise the term "Motherland" as affecting the Irish Free State. While they recognised that within the Community of Nations known as the British Empire the Irish Free State had the status of a Dominion, they did not accept the term "Dominion" in respect of the Irish Free State. "Dominion" suggested to him, and to most people, domination at some period or other. These were terms inherited from a past which he hoped would not return. They recognised that the people of Australia, Canada, and to some extent South Africa, New Zealand and Newfoundland had grown out of these islands, had been colonies in the first instance, and had grown in strength, authority and power in their own countries, until they were looked upon by most people—at least thoughtful people—as being free, equal nations. He thought he was right in stating that these countries claim that status of equality. But that could not be said of India; it could not be said of other countries which were represented there. From that point of view alone it was desirable that they should come as soon as possible to an understanding of what they desired their relations to be, and how they were going to treat one another, irrespective of what was said in the capitalist Press, and irrespective of the attitude of mind of statesmen, politicians, newspaper leader writers of other Parties than their own.

Mr. Johnson then referred to the Constitution of the Irish Free State, and showed how Ireland was affected by the position of Canada, Australia and South Africa in relation to Great Britain. The Treaty which was entered into between Ireland and Great Britain, upon which the Constitution of the Free State was based, made particular reference to the Community of Nations known as the British Empire. The first clause of that Agreement, which became the Treaty, read as follows:—"The Irish Free State has the same status in the Community of Nations known as the British Commonwealth of Nations, as the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, with a Parliament having powers to make laws for the peace, order and good government of Ireland, and an Executive responsible to that Parliament, and shall be known as the Irish Free State." He transposed that to read as follows:—"Ireland shall be known as the Irish Free State, and in the Community of Nations known as the British Empire."

shall have the same status as the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, etc., etc." Then a little further, there was a reference to the relations between the British Government and Parliament, or rather what was described as the Imperial Parliament and Government, and the Irish Free State. "The position of the Irish Free State in relation to the Imperial Parliament and Government shall be that of the Dominion of Canada"—and now came the point he wanted to emphasise—"and the law, practice and constitutional usage governing the relationship of the Crown or the representative of the Crown and of the Imperial Parliament to the Dominion of Canada shall govern the relationship to the Irish Free State." A great deal depended upon the use of that term "the law, practice and constitutional usage."

The people who drafted the Irish Free State Constitution adopted that phrase as a whole, "law, practice and constitutional usage" as the synthesis of a single body of ideas, and they drafted a constitution with that in mind, as well as that the practice and constitutional usage were of more importance than the law. They had in mind, for instance, the fact that the 1867 Act, laying down the basis of the Constitution of Canada, said one thing, laid down in a very firm way the relations of the Executive Authorities and the Parliament to the Governor-General and Crown, and that the practice and constitutional usage had developed into something very different.

He thought that Canada, Australia and South Africa had a just claim, and had established their claim that as far as the Government of the various countries was concerned, the Executive responsible to the Parliament was the governing authority, and that the representative of the Crown was in the same relationship in regard to the exercise of authority as the Crown in England to the Executive, and that in fact, the Executive Cabinet of the Government of the time was the sole authority in respect of those countries; that the nominal officer of State, the Governor-General, obeyed the orders of the Executive Government responsible to Parliament, rather than the other way round. Formally and legally, the other position was set down in the Act of Parliament, that the Government was the Government and the executive statesmen were the advisers, but in fact the Executive authority was really the Government.

They desired, while keeping fairly and strictly within the limits of Treaty arrangements, to establish in their Constitution the practice and constitutional

usage as well as the law. Unfortunately with regard to the Irish Constitution, the attitude of the responsible British Government of the time was first to make it obligatory—but perhaps that was too strong a statement—at any rate to impose sufficient pressure to make the provisional Government in Ireland respond to that pressure, and the phraseology was altered so as to embody in the Constitution not only the practice and constitutional usage, but the law; and they imposed upon the Irish a terminology which did not accord with facts. It presumably was intended to be a concession to Conservative opinion in this country. He was quite prepared to argue and contend successfully that even with all that formality and legal phraseology in the Constitution, no essential and valid difference was made, but the fact that the new phraseology was incorporated had made it very difficult to carry along as peacefully and as successfully as they had hoped. The importance of this point to the Conference was that the extent that Canada, Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand became clearly and freely autonomous by recognising their due constitutional relationships to the Crown, the extent that they were really autonomous, depended upon their position in the future. He was very anxious indeed to have the feeling that the Labour Movements of the world at any rate were going forward rather than backward in respect to self-government. There was a phrase that the Irish had had incorporated in the Constitution which they were inclined to emphasise, and to ask for support in that emphasis. The first article of the Constitution read. "The Irish Free State is a co-equal member of the Community of Nations forming the British Commonwealth of Nations." That Constitution was passed by the Constituent Assembly, and it was incorporated in an Annex to an Act in the British Parliament. It was a phrase supported in speeches by most of the Premiers of Britain, and, he thought, of Australia, South Africa, and Canada—Borden, MacKenzie King and Smuts, Bonar Law, Lloyd George and Baldwin, by the contention that these countries, self-governing Dominions as they were called, were co-equal in status, and it was not right to think of Great Britain as the senior—or rather the predominant—partner; that they must think in terms of equality—not of size, not of importance, but of status.

Also embodied in the Irish Constitution was a phrase which ran "Save in the case of actual invasion, the Irish Free State shall not be committed to active participation in any war without the assent of the *Cireachtas*." He wanted to lay special emphasis on that; without

the assent, definite considered assent of Parliament, the Irish Free State would not be committed to participation in war. He quoted from a newspaper the answer of Mr. Churchill to a question in the House of Commons —

“Mr. Churchill informed Colonel Archer-Shee that under Article 49 of the Constitution of the Irish Free State, the consent of the Irish Free State Parliament was necessary before active participation in a war. This Article, he said, must be read in conjunction with the preliminary words of the draft Constitution, which provided that the Constitution should be construed with reference to the Treaty, and that if any provision of the Constitution was in any respect repugnant to any provisions of the Treaty, it should to the extent of that repugnancy, be absolutely void and inoperative.”—(August 3, 1922)

That was Mr. Churchill's view at that time. He intended that the Constitution should find its basis in the Treaty. The Constitution said that all the powers of Government, and all authority, legislative, executive and judicial, are derived from the people of Ireland. The Treaty upon which the Constitution is based stated that Ireland should have the same constitutional status as the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of Canada, etc., with a Parliament having powers to pass laws for the peace, order and good government of Ireland, and an Executive responsible to that Parliament. Another clause of the Constitution said that the Executive power was vested in the Government. The Executive was responsible to Parliament. He thought that was a very considerable advance in the constitutional development of these countries. The Executive Authority, otherwise the Crown, was written down as being responsible to the Parliament, which was directed by the people.

Colonel Shee went on to say: “Is it not a fact that Article 49 is repugnant to the Treaty, in view of the fact that Article 7 of the Treaty says that we shall have harbour facilities, which, ipso facto, brings Ireland into any war”—in advance, that is to say. Colonel Shee continued: “Supposing the Irish Parliament refuses to allow their country to go into war, does that mean that Article 7 is going to be torn up?”

Mr. Churchill replied that “when the King declares war, all subjects of the British Empire and all the Dominions of the Crown are from that moment at war. As to the degree of active participation in the war, that is for the self-governed Dominions

to decide for themselves, and they have always been very jealous of their powers to decide.”

Colonel Shee: “Is not this an entirely different case from that of the other Dominions? Was it not specially laid down in the Treaty that we should have these harbour facilities, and if we go to war, does not that mean that Ireland is brought into war whether she wants to be or not?”

Mr. Churchill: “Canada, Australia and other parts of the British Empire are brought into war by the act of declaring war, and an enemy may attack them, may attack their ships or may imprison their citizens.”

Mr. Johnson was anxious to know what was the view of the Labour Parties in other parts of the world on this point; whether they were content to allow a course of conduct which might be taken by the British Empire in respect to attempts anywhere which might lead them into a state of war, whether active or not. He thought there was a very great probability that if Great Britain found herself committed to war, unless Ireland felt very definitely and deliberately bound to participate in that war, they would openly declare neutrality, and this, he believed, would be looked upon as an act of rebellion. He would like it to come about through the influence of the Labour Parties in other parts of this Commonwealth—or Confederation—that they should also come to the conclusion that they would not be committed to warfare without the definite and deliberate act of their own Parliaments, and that they would make it known to other countries outside this Association of Nations that that was their position; that they would understand this and let other countries in Europe and throughout the world understand that they would not be participants in any future war, no matter whether the British Crown made the declaration of war or not, without a definite and deliberate act of the Parliament of the country affected. He thought that until the nations of the world generally understood that this was the position, they would take the view of Mr. Churchill, which is indeed the practical constitutional idea as it had been understood, that once the King declared war in respect of any part of the Dominions, the whole was also at war, and open to attack. That was a position which he did not think they would be willing to continue very much longer. He thought that the Labour Parties, whether already in power, or going into power in future, should understand, that in respect to warfare, they were only bound by the acts of their own

Parliament, and that other countries, not members of the British Commonwealth, should be informed of the fact at an early stage

There was another consideration that had practical value, and that was with regard to the League of Nations. Within the League the countries in this Commonwealth were given the status of equality. But the United States had objected to come into the League, and one reason, or excuse, was that, while they would have one vote, the British Association of Nations would have six or seven, and they assumed that this Association of Nations was a unit in matters of foreign policy. Was that the case or not? And was it to remain so? He did not think it was correct to say that in all matters in which Britain might think herself greatly affected, perhaps imperilled, other elements forming the Commonwealth were likewise affected and their interests likewise imperilled. He thought it should be clearly understood outside as well as inside the British Commonwealth that on matters of foreign policy, foreign commitments, etc., the various elements comprising the British Commonwealth were units, and their association together was for mutual aid and assistance in respect of internal affairs, and that there was not necessarily unity in regard to foreign affairs. Ireland might have one view, and Australia another; they might be diametrically opposed. He thought one objection to the entry of the United States into the League would be removed if the position were made quite clear, and he hoped that the influence of the Labour Parties within the Dominions would be in that direction. They did not want to be held responsible for the acts of the British Government in respect to some of its Crown Colonies—for instance, in regard to Egypt, Kenya, etc., etc. If that were not possible, the question arose of how the responsibility was to be shared, and what influence was to be brought to bear upon the British Government in regard to these countries. He had no solution to suggest. He could not think of a single case in which the knowledge and influence of the Dominions would be as great as the knowledge and influence of Downing Street. In conclusion Mr. Johnson said that the matter he had discussed, while perhaps not having direct importance as affecting the social, economic and industrial matters which they had principally come together to discuss should, if not now, then later on, be discussed by a Conference such as this.

*Mr CHAMAN LALL, M L.A. (India).*

Mr CHAMAN LALL (India) said that this occasion was, to his mind and to the minds of the people whom he was there

to represent, a very important one, and he congratulated the Chairman, and those connected with him, in calling together a Conference of this kind. That did not necessarily mean that he was in favour of all that had been done by the Chairman and his colleagues. One of the most important subjects to be dealt with there was India—not Canada, not Australia, but India, with its 320,000,000 people. If the Labour Party ever broke up, if it ever reached that stage when it received not the plaudits but the discredit of the people, it would be by adopting the wrong policy in regard to India. He was not there to draw attention to the mistakes which were committed in dealing with India during the course of the Labour Cabinet. Let them not try to justify these mistakes; let them rather see that they were not committed in the future. When the Labour Party came into power, they did a great deal, but that great deal was not in the interests of India, but in the interest of the Imperialists who drove India. The first thing that happened—driven by force of circumstances—or perhaps by ignorance of the situation—and possibly because their hands were tied—was the introduction by them (the Labour Government) of the Bengal Ordinance into India. He was sorry that a Labour Government introduced it, and he was sorry that there was not found even one man who raised his voice against its introduction. What was the Bengal Ordinance? The right had been given to the officials in India to arrest a man without a charge being made against him, without informing him what was his offence, and he could be kept in prison at the goodwill of the Authorities. About 200 odd people were in prison in India to-day under that law. That was the political action that was taken.

Now, secondly, the political action that was not taken was this. There was in India a very strong party clamouring for what was nothing else than the principle of self-determination to which the Labour Party had pledged itself. Mr. MacDonald himself said that India must have freedom, and that the two essentials of that freedom were, first, that the Cabinet must be made responsible to the people of India, and that the finances must be handed over to the representatives of the people. When the Labour Party came into power, nothing was done in regard to this, and he understood now that the belief was that they did not know what India wanted. That could not hold water. They asked the Labour Government for a round-table Conference to discuss their position, and to tell them exactly what the Indians

*Mr Chaman Lall, M.L.A. (India)*

wanted The Labour Government denied them that Conference, and set going instead a paltry little Committee, the Muddiman Committee. Then they said that the Labour Party could do nothing for India as long as the latter pursued the policy of non-co-operation. They were asked to go back to co-operation with the British. The Committee said that the scheme under which India is being ruled to-day had failed. Every Minister in Bengal (barring one) who had taken office and had co-operated with the British Government for a period of five years, openly said that the scheme had failed, and that the time had come when responsible government should be introduced into India. In spite of all this—evidence, and the evidence of the United Provinces Government itself, that there should be no further tinkering with the scheme, and that the British Government must go the whole hog, the latter were still placidly preaching co-operation to the people of India. The people had made up their minds that they would not have anything to do with this scheme. They had gone in for the weapon of the general strike. Now it was said that that was a criminal thing to do.

It was the inherent right of the people to strike against the action of British Imperialists in India—which they considered to be unfair and unholy. What had the Labour Party done for India during the nine months they were in office? Absolutely nothing for the hungry, starving masses of India. Not even legislation, except a Trades Union Bill, which Mr. Chaman Lall himself presented as a private measure. A month later the Government brought in that measure. The conditions in India were that there were millions of people who could not get a meal a day; in one year 667 children out of 1,000 died in Bombay within a year of their birth; 6,000,000 people died during an epidemic of influenza; 30 people were living in one room, huddled together like cattle, for 4 rupees a week (1 rupee=1s 6d) they could get workers to work in the mills. The average wage in the different plantations was 8 rupees a month, 6 rupees for women, and 4 for children. Who was drawing the profits out of all this? 74 per cent. of the jute factories were owned by British companies, probably the same masters who owned the mills in Dundee. Practically all the tea plantations were owned by British people, and British manufacturers had £1,000,000,000, invested in India. The Labour Government could not ameliorate the conditions. They should have called the Round Table Conference, and they should have said to the people: "The time has come to put your house

in order." In addition to being pledged to the principle of self-determination they should take into account the economic factor, which inevitably must react against the conditions in this country. Take the question of unemployment. There existed a state of affairs where a British Imperialist would go to India, and invest money in India because he could get cheaper labour. Did they expect him to pay 40s. a week for labour here when he could get it at the rate just mentioned? He was not a philanthropist. And there were instances known where Dundee manufacturers had dismantled their plant and machinery, gone to Calcutta, and established their plant there. For 5d a day they could get cheap female labour in India. This condition of affairs in India, the bad housing, low wages, no provision for Old Age Pensions, Widows' Pensions and Unemployment Dole, the very low standard of living of the Indian workers must react on the standard of living of the workers in this country.

His friends from the Colonies would note, that one of their greatest objections to emigration was, not only the colour bar, but the fact that they were up against the competition of cheap Asiatic labour as against their better paid labour; that was a real problem. If they wanted to call themselves Imperial Statesmen, they might spread themselves out like peacocks and call themselves Imperial Statesmen. But he wanted them to look at the human factor, to get down to rock-bottom truth: the British Empire as constituted was an Empire of loot, robbery and theft. If they wanted to support this Empire they were welcome, but do not let them call themselves Labour men with Socialist principles, fighting for humanity, let them call themselves what they were, Imperialist brigands. There were 320,000,000 people in India living not only in bondage but in starvation. He asked the Conference to look at this from the wide human point of view. He was not interested in the League of Nations, nor in their petty little Councils. He was interested in his country, and took this opportunity of telling them something about his country, and asking them to do something for it. . . It was their bounden duty to do something, and he suggested a small resolution, which they would accept or reject as they thought fit. The resolution declared that the economic exploitation of subject peoples, which favoured a policy of political domination, was a policy of disaster, and called upon the Labour movements in the countries represented in the Conference to declare their unqualified support of self-determination for subject

peoples in the British Empire. He did not think a Labour man could be found who would discover anything extreme or extravagant in that resolution. If they did not want India to become the hangman of the world, to become the keeper of the British Empire for all that was evil and wicked, he asked them to accept the principle of the resolution.

*Mr. H. W. SAMPSON, M. L. A. (South Africa).*

Mr. H. W. SAMPSON (South Africa) regretted that the motion on India had been moved at this juncture. He did not think that the discussion should be sidetracked into a discussion of labour conditions in any specific country. He agreed that if they were trying to find some terminology, some common line of action, some final goal, they should have to have something to test that by. But he thought that it would be ill-advised to go into details.

He had listened very carefully to Comrade Johnson, but he had listened in vain for any positive certain position in his mind which they should reach as colonies by following his advice, and how they should benefit by it. He had lived in a country which had been turned topsy-turvy by the very issue. Mr. Johnson had been talking about, this very question of what their constitutional relationship should be with Britain, India, the Dominions and other countries. The Labour Party in South Africa had been trying to drown that question, trying to get it set aside at election times in favour of the more important questions of improving social and economic conditions. He did not pose as a great constitutional expert. They had the written constitution. It was true that under the Treaty of Versailles they were supposed to have received a new status. They were now supposed to be consulted, and they were consulted in the matter of peace. If the matter of peace was put before them they would also be consulted in the matter of war. In South Africa there were two white races, with the Dutch race predominating. When war broke out in Europe, the Union Parliament claimed the right to discuss whether it should assist Great Britain in that war. Long before their status was laid down in the Peace Treaty, South Africa considered themselves as free to choose. They chose entirely on the evidence before them as to the merits of war, as to what were the causes of war, and the amount of information which would induce them to enter the war. Ireland was in the same position to-day. He felt some little irritation when he saw on the agenda that they were going to discuss an academic problem, because it would drag into the limelight once more this old

question of constitutional relationships. The status of a Dominion would be determined altogether by its age, its experience, and its development, and nothing else would determine it. When a Dominion had reached a certain state of development Great Britain was powerless to hold that Dominion. It was their status in the world that determined this question—not what Great Britain recognised, but what other nations recognised, whether they recognised them as independent States or not. If other nations recognise them as independent nations, traded with them, and treated them as independent peoples, that independent status would come about by evolution. They criticised their opponents for habitually evading social and economic problems and confining themselves to discussing constitutional points. They were only one political party, and, generally speaking, the weaker one, but they must not give their political opponents occasion to throw back at them the taunt that they were afraid of these economic problems. With regard to India and the question as to whether he could assist the Indians in his own country to better their conditions, unless they could show him that by simply altering a Clause in the Constitution that could be effected, he had nothing more to say on the subject at this juncture.

*Mr. J. SIMPSON (Canada)*

Mr. J. SIMPSON (Canada) was convinced from the discussion which had already taken place that it was very clear a Conference of this kind was very important and very necessary. Some of the difficulties of the different parts of the British Empire in bringing about a united or uniform programme of labour legislation had been one of the chief things which he personally wanted to understand, because there were difficulties arising in every part of the British Empire which made it more difficult to obtain progressive legislation in one country than in another. In Canada they were keenly interested in some of the Constitutional problems which hampered any active labour legislation. Mr. Johnson had given some idea of the difficulties which the Irish Free State had to contend with.

He wanted to say that the workers of Canada were very keenly interested in the subject of war. They were taking steps to prevent another war if they could. The Canadian Parliament was greatly concerned as to the extent to which Canada would be involved in the next war if there were one. Although they had not many Labour men—only two who were really voicing the sentiments of the workers in their Federal Parliament—there were men representing other Parties

*Mr. J. Simpson (Canada)*

who were interested in the extent to which Canada would be involved in another war, and consequently they were asserting their right very carefully to analyse and examine the question with the idea that Canada shall not be a participant in the next war unless she feels there is some justification for such a struggle. In Canada they wanted to know whether it was going to be just a matter of a crack of the whip by a decision of Churchill or whoever he represented, that would precipitate their country into a conflict at a moment's notice. If Canada, as part of the British Empire, were subject to the Crown, and their country subject to the attacks of the enemy, they were anxious to understand what exactly their responsibilities were. He felt it was their business as delegates from the Canadian Labour Party to have that particular point cleared up right here in the seat of Imperial Government. After all, it must be remembered how great were the distances that separate them, and that their facilities for getting into touch with the facts were not as good as those of Great Britain, and in spite of their aspirations for independence of action, they still had to be guided and directed by the men who were in direct touch with Imperial affairs. They were trying to look to them for some guidance and for warning, should there be any traps set for them, in the event of a recurrence of such a war as the last.

He was tremendously interested in Mr Johnson's speech with regard to the Irish Free State. It occurred to him that it was in the mind of the British Statesmen when the Irish problem was settled, that before the Irish people should have all the liberties which they were supposed to enjoy in other parts of the British Empire, Ireland should justify herself that she could be trusted. In other parts of the British Empire there was a determined effort, an unmistakable desire on the parts of the peoples of the Dominions to have more autonomy in all directions, to be more and more independent; to have the Imperial Government feel that they were determined to have a say in everything that had to do with the well-being of the citizens of our Dominions. Consequently anything that there might be in their Imperial relationships in the way of interference with that desire they ought to know of. Unless they knew these things they were likely to be misled and deceived, and led into a trap when the crisis came.

They were keenly interested in India. The impression made on them by the Capitalist press and the Imperialist Press was that for some reason or other India was not fit for self-

government, that there were in India a number of intellectuals—men who were capable of meeting anyone and discussing any subject—and if all the citizens of India were upon an equal intellectual footing with these few intelligentsia, it would be all right to give India self-government. He was pleased to have this opportunity of meeting the representatives of India and to hear them discuss their own problems. The Canadian working-class were anxious that the people of India should have as much self-government as the Dominions, and that the Dominions should have as much self-government as they were entitled to. They were in favour of self-determination. So far as the Canadian workers were concerned, they were keenly interested in conditions in India, and the Indian comrades had their sympathy. Then there were other questions which justified the calling of such a Conference as this. For instance, there was the question of the Occupation of the Ruhr. They had had that brought to their attention. There should be unity of opinion and action on such questions—some common line of action, so that they could all work together for the good of all the Dominions.

*Miss M. HEAGNEY (Australia).*

Miss HEAGNEY (Australia) said that she was very interested in the address of Mr Johnson, particularly in the points raised concerning the constitutional obligations of the Dominions to Great Britain when the latter was at war, and in the constitutional power vested in the office of Governor of a Dominion. It was essential that these matters should be clearly understood. In Australia, Labour had had the responsibility of office. In the Commonwealth Parliament Labour formed the Government from 1910 to 1913, was defeated in the general election in 1913, and was returned again to power in 1914—a month after war was declared. Prior to the war they had never been conscious of any interference by the Imperial Parliament. Such pressure as existed came indirectly through trade associations and social and intellectual organisations. Further, the interests of the governing classes in Australia and Great Britain were identical, so things went smoothly. But with the advent of the Labour Party to power, a clash of interests became possible, and schemes for Imperial Federation were promulgated by various groups. Then came war. The Australian Labour Party declared a war policy based on voluntary enlistment, training, equipment and embarkation of troops, provision for their dependents, and the organisation of supplies of food and materials for war purposes. But it was soon found that there was scarcely any limit to their war



activity Just as Mr. Johnson pointed out in regard to Ireland, they were as completely involved as Great Britain Orders came from the Imperial War Office to the Australian Army and Navy At first this was done with authority of existing power, but later, the War Precautions Act was passed by the Commonwealth Parliament, and the power of the military organisation thereby strengthened The Labour Movement began in 1915 to protest against the military administration of the Labour Government Conscription was mooted. The Labour organisations declared against it, and were assured by the Prime Ministers—first by Andrew Fisher, who became High Commissioner in London in 1915, and later by W. M. Hughes, who succeeded him as Prime Minister—that under no circumstances would conscription be introduced. Then W. M. Hughes attended an Imperial War Cabinet Committee, and on his return endeavoured to enforce conscription Fortunately the Labour Movement in Australia was a strong one, and did exercise control over its members in Parliament, so the attempt was frustrated Nevertheless, through the expulsion of Hughes and other conscriptionists from the Party, the Labour Government was defeated, and the Party went into opposition after the first conscription campaign in 1916

Arising out of war and post-war experiences, a body of opinion grew up in the Australian Labour Movement which found expression in certain clauses of their political programme, and which indicated clearly that they wanted Australia to be an absolutely independent and self-governed community within the British Commonwealth of Nations These clauses were:—

(1) The cultivation of an Australian sentiment, the maintenance of a White Australia, and the development in Australia of an enlightened and self-reliant community.

(2) Complete Australian Self-Government as a British Community

No Imperial Federation

Unlimited legislative powers for the Commonwealth Parliament, etc.

Constitutional and electoral reform.

Administration on the advice of Australian Ministers only, subject to control of the Federal Parliament. All legislation except such as appears inconsistent with Imperial Treaty obligations to be assented to on the advice of Australian Ministers only. No further Imperial honours for Australian citizens

The High-Court of Australia to have final jurisdiction in all Australian causes

That the Commonwealth Constitution be amended to include a condition that no Australian can be conscripted for services overseas

The idea underlying all this was that Australia must be free of anything in the nature of control or direction by the Imperial Government in peace or wartime A steady resistance was growing up to the present procedure and to certain forms of government which needed to be simplified. The memorial submitted recently by the five State Labour Governments to the Imperial Government asking for the appointment of Australians as Governors was an indication of this

With regard to India, Miss Heagney wished to assure the Indian comrades that Australian Labour had warmly supported their demands for self-determination Many prominent Indians who had laid their case before members of the Movement had been well received The feeling of Australian Labour was that the Indians must take the responsibility for the change they sought Personally, Miss Heagney thought that they should not attempt to protect the Indians from themselves Whatever the result would be, she was sure Indians in power would deal far more kindly with the Indian masses than the Imperialists and Capitalists who had been ruling in the past The White Australian policy was not framed in the spirit of a belief in the superiority or supremacy of the white race The White Australian policy originated as a protest against the abominable conditions under which the Kanakas from the Pacific Islands were forced to work in the cane-fields of Queensland in the 'nineties The idea of the purity of the white race developed later Then as time went on and Labour opinion began to express itself, there was a distinct swing back to the economic reasons for the exclusion of Asiatics In the last five years, speaker after speaker in the Labour Movement had disclaimed any idea of associating the superiority of race with the White Australian policy The great idea behind it was the preservation of Australian social and industrial standards, and the prevention of competition with the extremely low standards of Asiatic workers. It was only since the war that they had begun really to take an interest in the affairs of other countries Before that, they were concerned with their own problems, but after having been drawn into the war, suffering its consequences and sacrificing the best of their manhood, they realised that they had a very close connection with Europe and Asia; and since then international problems were always discussed at their conferences But they could only express opinions, as they had not yet had direct responsibility in regard to foreign policy.

*Miss M. Heagney (Australia)*

Again, in the same connection, Miss Heagney mentioned that the Australian Labour Movement proposed to initiate a Pan-Pacific Labour Conference. This was an indication that they did not want always to look to Great Britain for guidance in these matters. They wanted their people to take the initiative and, in consultation with other workers most closely concerned, develop a policy with regard to peace before a crisis was actually upon them.

*Colonel J. C. WEDGWOOD, M.P.*  
*(Great Britain).*

Colonel WEDGWOOD (Great Britain) said that if the British Commonwealth of Nations was to endure, he thought it was quite clear that they must establish two firm principles: (1) The bond that united them must be an absolutely free bond, and there must be mutual approval of that bond. The chief bond was a common language, common ideals and a common history. That bond did not depend upon Parliaments; it was entirely independent of any State action whatsoever. As far as a bond compelling the Dominions to go to war was concerned, this must be voluntary. Britain could not coerce South Africa or any free State, nor could they coerce Britain. If they decided to have a common foreign policy it must be one that would secure the approval of the various sections of the Dominions. If Australia wanted to loosen the bond in any way, Britain was quite agreeable. She was bound to accept, as any form of coercion would wreck the whole structure. (2) It should be a Commonwealth of Free Peoples. It was obvious, even from this short meeting that they had had to-day, that they could not have part of the British Commonwealth sitting above the salt and another part sitting below the salt, because they were coloured people.

If they were going to preserve and carry on to far greater development the use to the world of the British Empire, it meant that they must somehow make India a participating partner in the Commonwealth. Anyone who listened to the bitterness of Mr. Chaman Lall's speech could not fail to realise that he felt he was at this Conference but not of it. Colonel Wedgwood said he got more and more indignant with Mr. Chaman Lall every time he listened to him. Most of the complaints he made he could remedy himself, if only he could get his Party to co-operate and to carry through the factory legislation which was required in India. It was not Britain, but Chaman Lall and his friends who were primarily responsible, as they were in a position to pass what Acts of Parliament they liked, in the Assembly and in the Councils, and

the complaint that Britain had not done it really did not cut much ice. In this country all they could do was to see that there was no opposition on the part of the permanent officials. Chaman Lall himself forced the Government to carry through the Trades Union Bill. If he could force that, he could force other things. As far as the freeing of India was concerned, Mr. Wedgwood thought that depended very largely on the way they made use of the powers they already had, and on whether they would tell them what further steps they wanted to take. "Tell us what you want us to do. If you have got a programme, for God's sake show it to us, and we will see that we do our best to aid you. Do you wish us to clear the army out of India, and the Indian Civil Service? If you have a programme, tell us what it is. It is all very well to say self-determination; we want to know what sort of self-determination you want." All these problems had got to be thought out. He was glad of Chaman Lall's speech, if only it made them realise that.

He thought one important result might come from that meeting. He had said that the second factor which was going to determine whether the British Commonwealth of Nations was going to be a permanent Union or not depended on whether it was going to be a Commonwealth of Free Nations. They had had admirable speeches from South Africa, Canada and Australia. All these speeches were animated by the same desire to secure equality of treatment, whatever be the colour, for all citizens in the Commonwealth of Nations. Sampson could not do much in South Africa to make it better for the Indians there. If they could manage to establish the principle that the coloured races such as the Indians would be entitled to the vote in Canada, in Australia and in South Africa, they should at any rate lay down a principle which they knew to be correct and which would lead more than anything to eliminating the bitterness of the Indians and perpetuating a real Union of the nations within the British Commonwealth of Nations. As far as keeping Australia white was concerned, that was the affair of the Australians. With regard to South Africa and emigration, they must, if necessary, stop British people or Indian people from going to South Africa; but let them see that those who were there had the ordinary rights of citizens. The Blacks had a vote, the Kaffirs had a vote, the half-castes had a vote, only the Indians had no vote. If the British Commonwealth of Nations was to endure, it must be as a Union of Free Peoples, free in their own country, and free and equal citizens in every Dominion of the British Commonwealth to

which they went. The breaking down of the caste and colour barriers was the noblest work to which the Labour Party could devote itself.

*Mr N M JOSHI, M.L.A. (India)*

Mr N. M. Joshi (India) was very thankful that the Canadian and Australian delegates had stated very clearly that the Labour Parties in their countries stood for self-determination for all the Colonies which were not yet self-governing within the British Commonwealth. He was very grateful to his colleague from Ireland for raising this question. The question of self-government of India was of very great importance to the Labour people in Great Britain, and perhaps also important to the Labour Parties in the Dominion. "Your Empire is based upon economic considerations; you take a colony in order to exploit economically the people of that colony and its land". He thought it would be admitted by all the Labour Parties that the political position of the Colonies within the Empire was bound to affect the economic condition of the Labour Parties in the different Dominions. Mr Chaman Lal had made it quite clear to them how conditions in India affected conditions in Great Britain and in the Dominions. Therefore, from the point of view of the Labour Parties, it was absolutely necessary to make it clear to Indians that the movement represented wanted to give them freedom, and wanted to give them freedom as early as possible. "We do not want you to protect us from ourselves". He was not under the delusion that if they gave self-government to the Indians to-day the conditions of the masses of India would be improved at once. But he wished to ask one question. How were the masses in India better off under the present Government? He did not ask the question whether they were better off under the Labour Government. That Government was in office only a short time, but it was for them to reply why did they not do more. He thought Col. Wedgwood knew the difficulties of private legislation. Members of Parliament here well knew how difficult it was to get any private legislation passed. "If the representatives of the Indian people opposed that legislation it was certainly their own responsibility and not yours; but if you expect private members to protect Indian Labour, you are expecting too much. You are expecting things which you cannot do in your own country."

From the merely Labour point of view they wanted self-government—"and I feel that the next Labour Government will give us self-government"—because then they would be able to fight their labour battles with greater advantage. To-day they found it most difficult to fight the battles of Labour because, in the first in-

stance, the forces against them were not Indian capitalists alone, but British capitalists and the British Government which supported them. "If you give us responsible government we shall have to fight, but we shall have to fight only the Indian capitalists and the Indian Government; the battle will be easier for us". And it was from that point of view that he wanted the Conference to pass a resolution that they were willing to give freedom to the subject peoples within the Dominions.

He knew that there was an idea, even among the Labour delegates, that if self-government were granted to India, internecine wars would follow. "There again, I say, please do not try to protect us from ourselves. What has your Government done during the last hundred years to reduce these divisions in India? If you ask my frank opinion I will tell you that your officers have done their very best to promote these divisions, not to reduce them. They have believed that their permanent stay in the country depends on these decisions. If you have not done anything to reduce these divisions, leave us free to fight our own battles. You stand as the trustees of the masses. What have you done during the last hundred years for the masses? You have not improved their position in any way. You have not introduced or passed any legislation. Your case as trustees for the Indian masses holds no water. As I said, I am not under any delusion that responsible Government will do very much for the masses at once, but if you give us self-government for India to-day our fight will be easier; the forces against us will not be so formidable."

The Conference must remember also that when a country was going through a great national struggle, it was easy for the capitalists to weaken the forces of labour in that country. Anything that Labour representatives did was interpreted as being against national interests—they were accused of being traitors to their country. The spirit of nationalism would not be so strong or so formidable when under self-government, and thus their work to better the lot of Labour in India would be easier. He, therefore, urged the Conference to pass a resolution on the subject. They had exchanged their thoughts. It was now time that the Labour Party of Great Britain and the Labour Parties of the Dominions should put down their thoughts and ideas in definite words. It would be a great satisfaction to them if the people of India thought that the Labour Party to-day, even after having had the experience of nine months' government; still stood for freedom, for responsible government in India; they would be

*Mr. N. M. Joshi, M.L.A. (India)*

very pleased to know that the Labour Party had the approval of the delegates from the Dominions in passing this resolution. He proposed that a Committee should be formed to consider the resolution of Mr Chaman Lall. The Indian delegates were anxious to have an expression of opinion on this most important subject from the point of view of the Indian workers.

*Mr. W. McMULLEN, M.P. (Ireland).*

Mr. W. McMULLEN, M.P. (Ireland): Although Ireland was represented by one delegation, Mr. McMullen said he came from a different part of Ireland to Mr. Johnson, and there were just one or two points that he would like to place before the Conference. He was struck by one remark made by Mr. Sampson, to the effect that it might be a useful thing to concentrate the attention of the Labour Movement on social questions rather than constitutional problems, which might have the effect of side-tracking the attention of the Conference to the exclusion of these social and economic questions. For years Ireland had been so engrossed in the question of Home Rule that they had forgotten everything else. . . . He appreciated Mr. Sampson's warning. Since the Northern Ireland Parliament was set up the Labour Movement had been able to make some progress. They had never been able to get members returned to the British Parliament, and as they had succeeded in getting Labour members returned to the Northern Ireland Parliament, they had got some results from the Treaty. But he had come to the conclusion that these arrangements were not

too satisfactory. If Great Britain were at war, for instance, their position was very unsatisfactory. This parliament would not be allowed to express an opinion as to whether it would be a participant or not. From the moment war was declared they would be considered participants also. Again, as the Conference knew, many of their services were Reserved Services. When they wanted to discuss the rebate on Super tax, for instance, he was immediately ruled out of order by the Speaker because this was a Reserved Service. "Our Parliament should be a real Parliament, not a mock one; we are simply playing at legislation. We have no real powers at all." He would be glad if the Movement would consider this aspect of the question, and consider whether it would be advisable for fuller powers to be conferred on the Government of Northern Ireland. In conclusion, he would say that it was significant that Ireland was represented by a united delegation at the Conference, and he hoped that it would not be long before Catholic and Protestant would be walking shoulder to shoulder undivided by the issues that had divided them in the past.

#### COMMISSION.

Mr. CHAMAN LALL'S resolution was referred to a Commission composed of GEORGE LANSBURY (Great Britain), N. M. JOSHI (India), T. JOHNSON (Ireland), D. BEN-GURION (Palestine), H. W. SAMPSON (South Africa), and J. MACDONALD (Canada).

The Conference then adjourned.

## SECOND SESSION.

*Tuesday, July 28, 1925.*

*Mr. H. W. SAMPSON, M.L.A. (South Africa), presiding.*

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, said:

Comrades, as we shall probably have to change our programme in a few minutes and we have only a short time to spare, I think you will forgive me if, in taking the honour which the Committee has imposed upon me, I only make a few remarks and confine myself merely to discharging the duty owing to those who sent me here to represent them. In the first place, I should like to say I was instructed to convey to all the representatives of organised labour from various parts of the Dominions who are present fraternal greetings and best wishes for their success. I am also instructed to return our thanks to the British Labour Movement for their endeavour, which has at last met with success, to bring us here. We are very grateful to them. We know something of the task which they have had to face in getting men from very long distances together to discuss our common problems, and we are not unmindful of the part played by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald. I was here about 14 years ago when he said that we should often meet and discuss our common programmes, but when we got back to our various countries all sorts of difficulties faced us

However, we have now met, and we hope these Conferences will continue and that we will not be discouraged by any difficulties that may arise. I hope we shall meet, if not annually, biennially, or more often, at any rate, than in the past.

The second point is a more personal one from our side. We are, perhaps, somewhat in advance of our country in our Trade Union and Labour Movement. There are many there who thought we started the Movement much too early, that we were before our time, but yet by force of circumstances the Labour Movement in South Africa had to have a commencement, and it commenced when it did. But because we did start it early, and in a country where things have hardly settled down, we have had to face difficulties which I am afraid are not properly understood in other places. Sometimes our motives are misunderstood, sometimes the steps we take in given circumstances are misunderstood oversea, and sometimes in the course of our fight we hear comments from oversea while we are still in danger, and they make our difficulties greater. I will content myself with putting it in that way, but feelings are aroused in South Africa, quite unnecessarily, against other parts of the world. Our feelings are like this: when you see a man doing difficult things, engaged in hazardous tasks, you do not interrupt him, but you wait until he has reached a point of safety, and all I have got to say—and I do not want to rub it in too much—is that we shall be extremely grateful, and we feel it is a duty you owe to us if, when you hear anything said in the capitalist Press against us, you will just suspend judgment until you hear the true facts of the matter. That is all I have to say in regard to South Africa.

We shall help this World Movement as much as we can. You have very little that is different in your countries from what we have in ours. We know what our common goal and mission is, and we are working in the same direction as you are. We may be a long way behind those countries where they have organised the working class, where there are not the same difficulties in getting cohesion between the political and industrial sections.

## ADJOURNMENT.

The CHAIRMAN then suggested that the Conference should suspend the business for a period which he (Mr. MacDonald) would suggest, and meet later.

Mr J RAMSAY MACDONALD (Great Britain) then suggested that it would be

a rather nice thing if the overseas delegates came and sat with the Parliamentary Labour Party at their weekly meeting for half an hour.

The Motion was formally seconded and carried, and the Conference then adjourned until half-past ten.

## INTER-COMMONWEALTH POLITICAL RELATIONS.

### *Report of Commission.*

On resuming, the Chairman said that the Committee that was appointed on the previous day had prepared its Report. He thought they might discuss it now.

This was agreed to.

#### INDIA.

Mr. GEORGE LANSEBURY (Chairman of the Committee), in presenting the Report, said they had devoted something over two hours to the discussion of the Resolution that was handed in by Mr. Chaman Lall on the previous morning, and also in discussing the general question of Resolutions, and at the conclusion they resolved to bring up the Report which Delegates had before them. The difficulty

they found themselves in was that whilst all of them as individuals had very strong views on everything under the sun, none of them had instructions to pledge any body to anything, and the Committee felt that under those circumstances they had better confine themselves to the one issue of India.

The Report was as follows:—

“The Committee, appointed by the Conference at its first session, reports to the Conference that considerable difficulty was found in arriving at any Resolution, especially in view of the absence of instructions to the Delegates to the Conference. The Committee

*Mr. George Lansbury (Great Britain)]*

have, however, arrived at an agreement on one Resolution in regard to India as follows.—

**“The Delegates at this Conference, having heard the views of the Indian Delegates, recommend their constituent bodies to support the demand of India for the immediate grant of self-government.”**

He moved accordingly.

Mr. J. MACDONALD (Canada) seconded the Resolution, and it was carried without discussion.

#### **SUBJECT PEOPLES.**

Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY then said the Delegates would remember that Mr. Chaman Lall's Resolution dealt, not only with India, but also the people of various Colonies, mandated territories, and so on. Very great difficulty arose when they came to discuss that. Their Chairman had pointed out that to pledge themselves in a wholesale way to that kind of Resolution would place him and others in considerable difficulty when they got home. He (Mr. Lansbury) did not want to enter into that discussion, except to explain that that was the reason why they brought up the recommendation which appeared on the Paper, and which was as follows—

**“The Conference desires to obtain the views of the various Labour Parties on the question whether it is desirable that the aim of Labour policy should be to develop the subject peoples so that they may ultimately be fitted to elect and control their own Government.”**

They believed that there would be no disagreement amongst Labour and Socialist bodies as to that being the aim which the Labour Movements, connected certainly with Britain, should have in their treatment of what were known as the subject races. It really embodied the principle that “You go amongst them and you stay amongst them, not in order to exploit them or dominate them, but to give them the hand of fellowship to enable them to come up—if there is such a thing as civilisation—to come along the road towards a higher civilisation.” He moved accordingly.

Mr. N M JOSHI (India), in seconding the Resolution, said that he appreciated very much what the Delegates had done for India, especially on account of the fact that there was a strong feeling on the part of several Delegates present that they should not pass definite Resolutions. He also hoped that the Resolution of the Committee as regards other subject people would bear fruit very soon. Although they did not bring forward a Resolution dealing with all subject peoples on the lines of the Resolution on India, he hoped this Resolution would lead to it in a very short time.

Mr J SIMPSON (Canada) said the implication of the Report was that there were subject peoples under British rule that were not fit for self-government, and he wished some Delegate to explain the definition of education, intelligence and competence amongst the subject races, including India, because the pretension had been put forward in this country by the Conservative type of mind that India was not fit for self-government.

Mr. LANSBURY here interposed and said that that point had been settled.

Mr. SIMPSON replied that he knew it had been settled, but that did not alter his judgment. He was speaking as a Canadian Delegate, and the implication of the Conservative Press of Canada was that India was not fit for self-government, that she was better under the present system of government, and he wanted to know what were the differences in the standard of intelligence between the average citizen of India and the average citizen of the other subject races of the British Empire. The implication here was that there were certain subject races that were not fit for self-government, and he wished to know what these races were so that they might know the difference in the standard of intelligence between one nation and another.

The CHAIRMAN, replying to the point, said the Committee did not feel competent to answer that question, and he doubted whether the Delegates could answer it. Perhaps the most competent person to answer it for Canada was Mr. Simpson, whilst he (the Chairman) might be the most competent person to answer for his country. They were trying to find out the proper lines for discussion at future inter-Dominion Conferences, and this obviously was one of those questions which in his country would lead to a good deal of thought and consultation. At future Conferences they would be better informed on this subject than at the present time. They seemed, however, to be pretty unanimous on the point that their policy should be in the direction of securing self-determination for subject races, but in the discussion at the Committee they had to cover a wider field and consider the position of a large number of native races of different types speaking different languages, and consider whether it was desirable to try to foist on a people like that, whose only law was the law of the Chief—to try to force on them what they meant when they spoke of self-determination. This was a matter they would have to consider fully in future. They were more or less paving the way for future discussions. This clause was framed in that sense, and in that sense alone.

Mr. T JOHNSON (Ireland) said that they were all agreed that some of these

subject people were not at present fitted to elect and control their own Government, but might possibly at some future time be competent to do so, and it was implied that self-government of that kind was desirable. There was a further implication that could be read into it, which was that the Powers should go into other countries which were at present unfitted and undeveloped to bring them to that state of mind where they would ultimately be fitted. He thought there might be read into the Report an implication of that kind, and it was desirable that some alteration might be made which would remove it.

Mr J. QUEEN (Canada) said he did not like this Resolution very much at all. The subject peoples had been an easy mark for exploitation in the past. That was why the British Empire had extended and included them. It had been the policy of the Labour Party to point out the conditions under which these people were exploited from time to time, and to demand for them a certain amount of freedom. The reply had always been that of course the British Empire went into these areas in a kind of benevolent spirit, and they were going to develop these people to the point where they could trust them with a degree of self-government. He would not like a Labour Conference to pass this Resolution with the words "that they may ultimately be fitted to elect and control their own Government" in it. He would rather have a Resolution framed along the lines that they were going to take back to their various organisations and discuss the subject of how they could render such assistance to these people that would enable them to get self-government. He did not like the words "fitted to elect." The only reason why they were not fitted to elect was because they were such an easy field for exploitation. If they passed the Report in its present form, the master classes in their arguments, and from their platforms, would say that even a Labour Conference recognised that these people were not ready for self-government.

Mr J. RAMSAY MACDONALD said that this Resolution bore on its face the difficulties which the Committee had surmounted, and he could imagine that they had adopted this form of wording in order to refer the whole thing back. But he thought if this Resolution was passed and issued in its present form it would do the Labour Movement a great injustice, because the only thing they did in it relating to what were called the backward people, or whatever name they cared to adopt—the only thing it did was to cast a doubt as to whether these people were ready for self-government or not. He did not think they should say that; he suggested that the Committee should sit

down and consider two or three big problems that required solving in relation to these people. It was a question of economic self-determination as well as political self-determination—not quite the same thing. There was the question of their tenure of land, and there was the question of how far their economic life could be used to co-operate with others. Supposing they gave the co-operative wholesale people in Britain power of control for pure economic processes. He did not mean exchanging goods. That would raise certain problems which he hoped the Labour Party would be clear about. He thought the Report should say "The following problems should be discussed and decisions arrived at for the purpose of a Labour understanding," and then go on to detail political questions, economic questions, the land, marketing questions, and so on, and then refer the whole of that as a local question to the various Labour Parties. He thought they were not in a position to take up an attitude, but they were in a position to construct a Questionnaire—and the Questionnaire should be a pretty full one—and then throw it back to their various parties and expect them to send in reports which could be published or decided to discuss further. He hoped this Conference would not pass this Resolution, because it would give rise to much misunderstanding about their position.

The CHAIRMAN suggested to the mover of the Report that he should agree to it being referred back for discussion.

Mr LANSBURY said he had no objection to it going back, but he certainly thought they would not get any real agreement from the Committee. On the political side so many questions were raised that they could not come to any decision, and if they sent the Report back they would be bound to have something very much like what Mr MacDonald had suggested, a series of questions written down and sent to the various bodies. On the one matter of self-government the point was immediately raised: "Self-government, yes, but safeguards for white minorities," and the whole question of mandated territories came up. If his colleagues on the Committee, one of whom had spoken against the Resolution, would agree to it going back, he had no objection.

Mr CHAMAN LALL moved the rejection of the Resolution, but the Chairman pointed out that this was a direct negative, and would not allow it.

The CHAIRMAN said he took it the suggestion from Mr MacDonald was that this should be put in the form of a Questionnaire. The Report was more or less a Questionnaire, but it was imperfectly

*Mr. George Lansbury (Great Britain)]*

framed. If it were more perfectly framed it would probably meet with general approval. If they were going to refer it back to the Committee for the purpose of it being re-framed, they need not discuss it further.

Mr. CHAMAN LALL said he was against the very principle involved in this Resolution. If they were going to refer it back to the Committee with the idea of it being re-framed incorporating the principles which were already in it, he was against it. He wanted them to realise that under no circumstances should any Labour Party that stood for Labour principles adopt the attitude of the Tory or the Liberal Party. The Tories and Liberals in this country had always been saying: "We want you to have Home Rule, self-government, but only at that particular stage when you are capable of governing yourselves." Were they, he asked, as members of the Labour Parties, and advocating Labour principles, going to follow in the wake of the Tory Party or the Liberal Party? He ventured to say that if this Resolution, or the principle embodied in this Resolution, were to go abroad in the Press it would do more harm to the Labour Party than any mistakes it had ever made. They would say that the Party was pledged to Capitalist principles, and they had no new ideas to put forward. If, in referring this back, they definitely instructed the Committee to take the sting out of the Resolution, the principle of guardianship, or trusteeship, he was quite willing that they should draw up a Questionnaire, but never with this principle hanging over the head of the subject races, "That you are the trustees, and you are the people to declare to the Colonies when they shall get their freedom."

Mr. MACDONALD (Canada) said he did not think any adequate purpose would be served in referring it back even for the purpose of framing a Questionnaire. The Committee had thoroughly discussed it, and they were only in agreement on the question of India. This Resolution was not thoroughly considered, but was brought in at the end. He was quite agreed that the inference here was that they believed the subject peoples were not fit to govern themselves, but he was inclined to think that the best thing to do was to leave this matter entirely alone. If they endeavoured to formulate a Questionnaire the suggestion contained in the questions would probably lead to the same objections as had been raised that morning.

Mr. H. CRITCHLOW (British Guiana) said that they had self-government in his country, but the money qualification was so high that the poorer class of people

had no chance to put people in to represent them at all.

The CHAIRMAN said he did not see how they could bring in the question of franchise at the present time. The matter referred to the Committee was "Inter-Commonwealth Relations." This was a different question altogether.

Mr. BEN TILLET (Great Britain) thought that if the Resolution were referred back the Committee should have new terms of reference.

Mr. JOSHI agreed with Mr. Tillet that unless they gave the Committee some instructions they would come to the same conclusion as they did on the previous day. Therefore, he must make it clear that they did not want to ask the Labour Parties in different countries whether the subject peoples were fit or not. They took it for granted they were fit, and therefore he thought they should include in the Resolution a recommendation that they should assist the subject peoples to secure self-government. Then the Committee could agree to some definite wording. With the permission of the Chairman he wished to move the Canadian proposal recommending the different Labour Parties to assist the subject peoples to secure self-government.

Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY pointed out that the question of mandated territories was going to be discussed by the Conference later on, and he thought that if the Resolution were going back the Committee ought not to deal with it until after that discussion on mandated territories had been taken. He was quite agreeable to it going back, but on the understanding that they would not be expected to bring up a Report until the mandated territories question had been discussed.

It was then agreed to refer the Resolution back.

Mr. JOSHI asked if they were going to give instructions to the Committee as to the general attitude of the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN said he gathered that the Conference agreed that the Questionnaire as at present framed was imperfect. The Members of the Committee had listened to the discussion, and they would be able to draft a Questionnaire of a proper nature to go to the Labour Parties in the various Dominions. If that draft did not satisfy the Conference it would be open to the Delegates to amend the Report.

#### COMMISSION.

Mr. JOSHI suggested that Mr. Critchlow, as representing British Guiana, should be added to the Committee. This was seconded by Mr. Lansbury and unanimously agreed to.



## INTERNATIONAL LABOUR LEGISLATION AND THE RATIFICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE CONVENTIONS.

The Conference then proceeded to discuss this subject.

*Mr R. J. DAVIES, M.P. (Great Britain)*

Mr. R. J. DAVIES, M.P. (Great Britain), in opening the discussion, reminded the Delegates that the International Labour Organisation was established under Part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles. It functioned under the League of Nations but operated separately from the work of the League. So far as he had been able to see the work of the Labour Organisation of the League of Nations, he had no hesitation in saying that he believed this part of the Treaty would remain long after the other parts of the Treaty had been forgotten, and after the names of many of the Statesmen attached to the Treaty had been lost in oblivion. By Article 23 of the Covenant of the League the Members of the League of Nations undertook that they "will endeavour to secure and maintain fair and humane conditions of labour for men, women and children, both in their own countries and in all countries to which their commercial and industrial relations extend, and for that purpose will establish and maintain the necessary International Organisations."

He thought he would be right in saying as regards the other countries represented here in the Conference that the same feeling had crept over their Governments as had crept over the Government here. They took no notice now of the high idealistic notions that were prevalent when this organisation was formed. All Members of the League of Nations were, of course, Members of the International Labour Organisation, but the International Labour Organisation may elect Members to that Organisation who are not attached to the League of Nations at all. At the moment Germany was the only country attached to the I.L.O. that was not attached to the League of Nations. He hoped that some day, and that in the near future, both the United States of America and Russia would be included in the organisation. Until they were included he did not think the work of the Organisation could be complete in any way. He explained that for the purposes of the organisation there were four votes at the Annual Conference, two on behalf of the Government, one on behalf of the employers, and one on behalf of the workers. In Great Britain the employers were represented by the National Federation of Employers, and the workers were represented through the Trades Union Congress, and the decisions

of the Conference were naturally the most important part of its work. Twenty first-class Conventions had been drafted, and they had been sent out to the various States, but not many of the States had put those Conventions into law. There were difficulties in the way. Some Governments had endeavoured to get out of the liability to bring forward these Conventions because of the wording of the Treaty itself. In this country it had always been assumed that you could not ratify a Convention unless the Convention was incorporated in an Act of Parliament. In other countries he understood Conventions could be ratified by a decree. It should be remembered that a draft Convention could not be passed by the Organisation unless it secured a two-thirds majority, and it was very essential in this connection to point out that when the Annual Conference of the I.L.O. was held it helped very much indeed in the advancement of social and industrial legislation if the Governments represented there were Labour Governments. Recommendations were also passed at the Annual Conference, but those recommendations were not obligatory upon any of the States represented. Then there were resolutions, which, of course, carry very little weight indeed.

The real reason for the establishment of the I.L.O. was the prevention of War. It was assumed even by the Capitalist representatives who drafted the Treaty of Versailles—the mere establishment of an International Labour Organisation is an admission of it—that the last War arose because of economic quarrels, because the several States quarrelled over economic issues, and the intention, whether they meant it or not, was that they would remove those economic difficulties in order to prevent wars in the future. Wars in the remote past had arisen from lust of power, imperialist acquisition, or religious or tribal differences. Wars in the last few decades had been on account of economic reasons. It was for the removal of the possibilities of war owing to differences in the conditions of the standard of life of the workpeople that the I.L.O. was established. In Great Britain they had listened to Debates in the House of Commons on these lines: The employers in one industry cannot pay wages, cannot reduce hours of work, simply because the conditions of workpeople in another country are such that we could not compete successfully in the markets of the world. That was a very old argument, and the argument is used oftener now than ever before. It is said that the proper way out of the difficulty is to set up tariff walls and give

*Mr. R. J. Davies, M.P. (Great Britain)]*

preferences He believed that neither tariffs, nor preferences, nor Free Trade would ever solve our economic difficulties. They could only be solved by laying down as far as possible the standards of life for workpeople in the several industries, taking into account climatic conditions. It was for the I.L.O. to achieve that purpose.

He referred to the difficulties that had arisen with regard to the ratification of the draft Conventions within the British Empire, taking first the question of anthrax. In this country they had established a disinfecting station at Liverpool to try to clean the stuff that came in. They had endeavoured to secure the co-operation of India and Australia, but, unfortunately, when he sat with the representatives of the Governments of India and Australia last year in order to get agreement within the British Empire to secure the Convention they failed absolutely. Strange to say, they had more agreement with other countries outside the British Empire than they were able to secure inside the British Empire. One of the very practical results which this Conference could achieve would be to secure agreement within the British Empire itself on these industrial problems.

They themselves brought a Bill before the House of Commons last year to embody and enact a White Lead Convention. That is to prevent the use of white lead in paint. The number of deaths from white lead poisoning in this country had increased during the last few years; in fact, it was becoming a little alarming to those who study these problems. We tried to embody the Convention in a Bill, but we found there were influences at work, not only from France, but even from Australia, where they produce white lead, and I want to make an appeal to the representatives of Labour from Australia in particular that they will help us to conquer this opposition and get over the difficulties in the way of securing the ratification of the White Lead Convention. I know the commercial difficulties; we have come up against them; but I do hope the few words I have uttered on this issue may induce the Australian Labour Movement to give us a lift in our effort to try to stamp out the awful disease of lead poisoning amongst our people."

The most important of the Conventions which had not been ratified was the 48-hour week Convention. Last year Mr Tom Shaw brought in a Bill in the British Parliament to ratify that Convention. It was no use disguising the fact that all the difficulties were not entirely difficulties from the Capitalist class. Some difficulties arose within our

own Movement. We had to get over them. Those difficulties had become so acute in this country that he understood the present Minister of Labour was endeavouring to do two things. He could not, he (Mr. Davies) presumed, ratify the Convention as it now stood, or would not if he could. The British Minister of Labour, therefore, proposed to call together a Conference of Ministers of Labour of the chief industrial countries of the Continent, and, if Mr. Davies' information was correct, to propose two things for their consideration. One was a completely new Convention to deal with the 48 hours' week. If the constitution of the I.L.O. will not admit of a new Convention, there was another proposal to be made, that an interpretation would be added to the present Convention in order to get over some of the difficulties which had to be contended within this and other countries. Whether that be so or not, the Labour Party in the House of Commons was continually raising the issue of the 48 hours' week and pressing the Government almost every week. Mr Davies was hoping to see the day come when the 48 hours' week, about which we had passed so many resolutions, would become operative in all the countries represented in this Conference.

Mr. Davies then said that he went to Geneva with the idea of advocating the total prohibition of night baking, believing it to be unnatural that men should work at night if they could do the work during the daytime. He felt sure the Conference would follow him. He felt sure that at any rate all the delegates from the British Empire would follow him. A representative from China declared on behalf of the Government of China and the employers that they would have nothing to do with a Convention of this kind as they did not eat bread at all, and a representative from Japan did likewise. But he was astonished that the representative of Labour from South Africa opposed it, and his argument was too powerful for anything Mr. Davies said. The delegate from South Africa said they in South Africa were quite willing to support the view that night baking should be prohibited, but during eight months of the year they, in their country, could not bake at all during the day because of the heat. Consequently, when representatives of Labour organisations within the British Empire itself criticised our proposals it was very difficult to proceed with the Convention.

There were two Conventions passed at the last Conference. It had always occurred to him as a monstrous thing that there should be people in this country going out for British firms into foreign lands, and sometimes into

our own Colonies and Dominions, and having been killed at their work in those countries, their wives and children were not entitled to Workmen's Compensation, merely owing to the fact that they were killed in a foreign land. Now the Convention recently passed lays it down as a principle that a workman—it does not matter what nationality or colour he may be—who is injured at his work in any part of the world should be entitled to Workmen's Compensation in his own right. In this country that was done. It did not matter what nationality a man might be, the mere fact that he was a worker, and had been injured in his employment, was sufficient for him to secure compensation. In some countries they only paid the nationals. In other countries there was no Workmen's Compensation at all.

The other Convention that was passed was one dealing with the prohibition of night baking. There was some difficulty in this connection, because the Convention as passed dealt not only with prohibition in respect of the operative; it even prohibits the master baker from baking at night. In this country we had always proceeded on the line of, first of all, securing the rights of the workman, leaving the employer to do what he liked. They had not bothered very much whether the employer worked at night, but they had endeavoured to safeguard the worker. On the Continent, however, in some Scandinavian countries, they had already by law prohibited baking at night by anyone, except, of course, in the case of families baking for themselves. When the Convention came before the British House of Commons they would have to face the fact that it dealt with the employer as well as the workman. In any case, the whole principle of international legislation, in his view, was that of give and take.

Mr Davies concluded by saying that the International Labour Organisation was a great instrument for collecting information even down to small detail. He was surprised when he walked into the office last year and was shown a document which was the first piece of Labour legislation ever passed in Persia. It was an Act of Parliament of two clauses providing two things. It reminded him of Great Britain of 100 years ago. The two points were these, that in future as from a certain date in 1924 no child under nine years of age should be employed in any carpet factory. The other point was that the stools upon which the children sat whilst performing their work must be at least 2 feet high. The reason for the second clause was that when these boys grew up to manhood their legs were so bowed that they could not join the Army or the Police Force. It reminded him of the legislation of Great Britain about 100

years ago. He trusted that we would take more interest in the international Labour organisation, and, at any rate, when any part of the British Empire moved towards a higher standard of social and industrial conditions we should not show our differences to the outside World.

Mr N. M. JOSHI, M L A. (India)

Mr. N. M. Joshi, M L A. (India), said that his study of the International Labour Organisation had led him to the conclusion that the International Labour Office had so far done very good work. The Organisation was started under good auspices, as the spirit of the World at that time was very different from what it was to-day, or had been before. During the first year they found that some of the Conventions were ratified, but when he attended the later Conference at Washington he found that a reaction had taken place, not only amongst Governments, but also amongst employers, the spirit had definitely changed, and year after year they found that the Conventions had not been ratified. The attitude of the British Government at the last Conference was that the Conventions must be such that they could be easily ratified, not only by the British Colonies, the Dominions of Canada and Australia, but by the Crown Colonies, protected territories, and mandated territories. The Conventions were of such a character that the Indian Government could easily ratify them. Labour should mark the fact that the spirit had changed; that they were up against a reactionary spirit even in the International Labour Organisation. He hoped the Labour Parties in this Conference would do their best to get that spirit changed, and if Labour Parties came into power, the first thing they would have to do would be to get rid of this reactionary spirit in the International Labour Organisation.

Then there was the question of the representation of the Colonies, Dependencies, and mandated territories on the International Labour Organisation. He raised this point last year at the International Labour Conference, and his friend, Ben Tillett, gave him the assurance that the British Labour Party would do something. They had not forgotten the Colonies, but he did not think they had done anything for the mandated territories, Protectorates, and the Crown Colonies in regard to their industrial conditions. Most of the reports in regard to the Colonies and Protectorates were to the effect that inquiries were being made, but it was now six years since the Conference was held at Washington, and the British Government had not yet finished its inquiries. He suggested that next year the Delegates to the International Conference should take with them some of their own people from British Guiana, Ceylon, Malaya, Mauritius, and other countries. Referring to his own

*Mr. N. M. Joshi, M.L.A. (India)*]

country, he said that the British Government sent Delegates from British India, but one-third of India was not British India; it was under Indian Princes. The Government of India took no interest in the matter. It was under the thumb of the British Government, and if the British Government asked it to ratify the Conventions it would do so. But this Government refused to ask them to ratify the Conventions. He wanted the British Labour Party to remember this, and to bring some influence to bear to get the recommendations and Conventions of the International Labour Conference ratified.

Referring to the case of South Africa, he said that Mr. Sampson represented that country on the International Labour Organisation, but he only represented the white workers of South Africa. What about the other workers, who were ten times more numerous? Did he represent them? Next time he should take with him one or two natives who should be allowed to speak and say what they felt about their conditions.

The opener had referred to certain Conventions which had not been ratified, and had specially mentioned the Convention on anthrax. No doubt the difficulty there came from India. That subject had been discussed for years, and he had taken the side of the British workers. But the real difficulty from India's point of view was this, that they expected the importing country to bear the cost of disinfection. It was a very costly process, but if their trade had been a very profitable one they would not have minded the expense. If their country had been a rich country he would have put forward the request himself, but if he had put forward a proposal to spend a large amount of money for the sake of the British workers—he had no objection to do it—it would not have received any support in the country at all. What he suggested was, that the British people should say they were prepared to bear some of the cost of disinfection, and then it would be easy for him and his colleagues at least to agitate in favour of this proposal. But to ask India to bear the whole cost was unreasonable, in the first place because the importing country had as much interest in it as the exporting country, and perhaps more interest. The financial aspect must be taken into consideration. In the second place, India was not so much interested in the question as Great Britain. There were more important questions from the Indian point of view than the anthrax question.

In regard to the attitude of the Indian Government towards Labour, he said it was reactionary, like other Governments. About a year ago they laid the Conventions before the Legislature and he made a speech, but they did not get any

further. This year he had seen no Convention before the Legislature at all. The White Lead Convention they put before the State Legislature, and it was rejected. They would not even give him the opportunity of making a speech. What was done was that they sent copies of the Conventions to the Provincial Governments with the request that they would take whatever action they thought best. They would not even lay the Conventions before the Legislature. In this matter the British workers could do something by raising questions in Parliament and making speeches. It had a great influence on the Government of India when they knew that speeches were being made in the British House of Commons. He hoped the suggestions he had made would be taken into serious consideration, especially by the Labour Movement in England, so that they would benefit more and more from the International Labour Movement.

*Mr. BEN TILLET (Great Britain).*

Mr. BEN TILLET (Great Britain) remarked that whatever might be said as to the Labour Party when it was in office, that it was a responsible body without the authority which came from real power, might be said with equal truth regarding the I.L.O. If they took the position of Mr. Thomas they would see that he also was confronted with great difficulties. He had to deal with a polyglot of nations and with circumstances that had arisen out of the European War. Countries like Czecho-Slovakia had become reactionary, and the workers had been divided into a number of Organisations which conflicted with each other. With regard to Great Britain, they had enough internal difficulties to deal with, but it was about the only country with co-ordinated and unified action. He regretted that whilst the British Labour Party was in office, for the sake of economy they took some support away from the I.L.O., although he thought he could say that Britain supported the I.L.O. with more money than any other Country. At the same time he did not know of any Country whose general gesture was more helpful than his own. He was most anxious for the maintenance of the I.L.O. It was a comparatively young body, and they had only to take the example of the British Labour Movement, or Trades Unionism, or any great effort that had been made in that direction, to see how slow progress was. Those who could go back 20 or 30 years would know that it had taken a considerable time to get any reform. There were new economic tendencies at the present time, and, so far as Europe was concerned, in an economic sense the giving of authority and power to new countries had not brought to Labour anything like what they had expected. They thought

that when these new countries gained authority Labour would enjoy a tremendous benefit, but that had not turned out to be the case. But because Labour had not come into the full authority that was expected, and received a share of the new dignity and racial independence which had been given—because of that the I.L.O. was weakened.

Referring to the question of anthrax, he said he did not know any body of men representing either Capital or Governments so damnably callous, so openly and avowedly callous, as those who spoke of the human life of the coolies with more contempt than they would speak of the lives of rats—those who laughed at the idea of the coolies having anthrax. He did not know a finer set of people than those who were represented by the Delegates before them (referring to the Indian Delegates). So far as getting the freedom which their friends had pleaded for, they might wait many a day for it. The one thing which would help the workers of India was the I.L.O. He regretted India's attitude on the question of anthrax. After all, they were here representing very serious difficulties, and they were all practically agreed as to their oneness and unity, and the necessity for a great World comradeship. The I.L.O. was dealing with this question, and he was very glad to hear their friend make his statement. He (Mr. Tillett) attached the utmost importance to it. The I.L.O. had done what none of them could have done separately. It had got the Germans to make experiments with commercial disinfectants. The Italians were emulating the Germans, and the French were doing what they in Britain had not yet done. In the matter of health, he said that they had found in the scientific men surrounding the I.L.O. the greatest humanitarianism, keenness, sense of democracy, and their reports were better even than some of their own reports from the workers' standpoint. Because of that alone he looked upon the I.L.O. as a great instrument, and it had his sympathy in the difficulties it had to contend with.

*Mr. J. SIMPSON (Canada).*

Mr. J. SIMPSON (Canada) said he wished to say a word on this very important subject from the standpoint of a Delegate from Canada, and to emphasise the tremendous difficulty they were experiencing in the ratification of the Conventions and Resolutions of the I.L.O. When Clause 13 of the Peace Treaty was accepted they naturally thought that a tremendous amount of good would result, and that progress would be made through the action of that body, but it was not long before they found a degree of insincerity on the part of their Canadian

politicians that made it impossible for them to make any progress in the ratification of the Conventions. Their difficulty was this. At the time of the Confederation there was an Act passed called the British North America Act, which was the basis of all power vested in their Provincial and Federal Governments, and when the Conventions were sent out from the I.L.O. the question immediately arose as to the powers of the Federal Government and the powers of the Provincial Legislatures, and at the present moment the workers of Canada could not see any light whatever in the direction of reconciling the demands of the Provincial Governments with the demands of the Federal Government.

Some idea of the inconsistency and perhaps the hypocrisy of the Federal Government was shown in their action in connection with the 8 hours' day. Although they had 56 per cent. of the workers of Canada working 8 hours a day through the power of their Labour Organisation, the Federal Government as such, although a party to the Peace Treaty and to Clause 13, even in great Government undertakings was making the workers work 9 and 10 hours a day, and had no regard for the 8 hours' day Convention. The moment it was suggested that Conventions should be ratified they passed them on to the Provincial Governments on the ground that, according to the strict interpretation of the law, their ratification by the Federal Government might be an interference with the rights of the Provincial Governments. The decision of the Supreme Court had not yet been given on the matter, and they were therefore in the position that at present the Federal Government denied its responsibility for the ratification of the Conventions, and the Provincial Governments denied that it was in their power to do so, and between the two there seemed to be no hope at the present moment of the ratification of these Conventions. If they studied the facts they would find that of all the nations affiliated to the International Labour Office Canada was one of the most backward in regard to the ratification of the Conventions. There was already an agitation for some change in the British North America Act. They felt that an Act which was passed when Canada was in its infancy imposed so many limitations that if they did not get some changes in it there would be great dissatisfaction in the Dominion.

It must be patent to everyone interested in the Labour Movement that, no matter what kind of instrument might be set up by the Peace Treaty, so long as the Governments of the World were in

*Mr. J. Simpson (Canada)*

their present form it would be impossible for them to realise their hopes and aspirations through such a medium. The I.L.O. was a magnificent organisation for the collection of information, material and data upon which they could base their arguments and enable them to bring home to the uninformed and uninitiated the true state of affairs. To that extent the periodicals, papers and documents that were continually being poured forth into all parts of the world by the I.L.O. were a magnificent contribution to the constructive work of the Labour Parties in the different countries. But these Conventions were of tremendous importance, and had all the greater value inasmuch as they represented, not only the idealistic attitude of the Working-class Movement itself, but when they got the employers to agree upon legislation that was going out to the different countries of the World it must carry more weight than if it were only the expression of the working classes themselves. Therefore, he, as a worker, representing Canada, believed in the potential and actual value of the I.L.O., and he thought they should use it to its fullest extent to get what they could out of it. The League of Nations was an institution that could be captured by the working-class Governments of the World just as a Nation could be captured, and therefore the more working-class Governments they could get, the greater representation they secured in the various Parliaments of the World, the more would the I.L.O., and the League of Nations itself, function to their particular liking. Therefore, if they were to get what they wanted they would have to vote for it, to fight for it, and to keep working for it. But he agreed that the I.L.O. was a valuable instrument for giving them what they wanted.

*Mr. F. W. JOWETT (Great Britain).*

Mr F W JOWETT (Great Britain) said he had no wish to enter into the general discussion on this matter of anthrax, but he had gathered from what Mr. Joshi had said that he was rather inclined to deprecate disinfection at the port of embarkation, or at least he put the responsibility upon the importers into this country at least to make a contribution towards it. He wished to emphasise the necessity of disinfection by the country from whence it was exported, because the workers who handled East Indian wool in India ought to be protected, and that could not be done by any disinfecting process at Liverpool. Mr Joshi's attitude seemed rather to disregard the risks which were run by those who handled wool in India; but surely it was their particular duty to disinfect there, because the wool had to be handled there, and it could not be handled with safety unless it was disinfected.

*Miss M. HEAGNEY (Australia).*

Miss M. HEAGNEY (Australia) said that the Trade Union Movement in Australia had not taken the I.L.O. at all seriously, probably because, in the first place, they were so far away from it, and, secondly, because the development of the Labour Movement was slightly different in Australia from other countries. In the course of years their Movement had developed along class lines, and where they were not absolutely in control they felt that the institution must be to their disadvantage. Without knowing the inner workings of the machine, known as the I.L.O., they felt that it could not function very seriously in the interests of Labour, that the forces ranged against them in that body were too great for the machine to be of any value to them in Australia. As a matter of fact, they were not well represented at the I.L.O. until the 1923 Conference. The first representative that went did not have the support of the Trade Union Movement as a whole. That was Mr Merrey, who represented Australia in 1920. He was really chosen by the Government, and Mr. Hughes in particular, who knew that he was not truly representative of the whole Trade Union Organisation, though he was nominated by one of the Trades and Labour Councils. They began to be properly represented at the I.L.O. Conference in 1923, when Mr. Holloway, the Secretary of the Melbourne Trades Council, was appointed, and each year since then they had been represented in a way that was entirely satisfactory to the Trade Union Movement. In addition to that, the Melbourne Trades Hall Council arranged for her (Miss Heagney) to spend two months in the Geneva Labour Office in order to find out more about its workings. The result of this later representation had been that there was growing up a better understanding of the possibilities of the I.L.O. and an appreciation of their responsibility in regard to ratifying the various Treaties.

So far, she thought, they had not ratified any of the Treaties or Conventions, but that was due, not to the fact that they had the difficulties outlined by Mr. Simpson, but to sheer lack of appreciation of the value of them to workers of other countries, because in actual fact industrial legislation in Australia actually came up to the standard of all the Conventions so far approved by the I.L.O., with the exception, she thought, of the one passed this year, where the amount of workers' compensation was laid down as two-thirds. Except in a very few details their legislation and industrial laws in Australia were up to the standard of the I.L.O. They were seriously considering the means that should be taken to ratify

the Conventions, and she had no hesitation in saying that within a year or two the matter would be dealt with by the Trade Union Movement.

The other point raised by Mr Davies was the attitude of Australia to the anthrax question. In that she thought the Trade Union delegation of Great Britain took up a very wrong attitude. They played the part of the heavy father or the dear mother, and told Australians what they ought to do, and how to do it, and, when they did not do it in the British way, wanted to castigate them. That was not the attitude which should be adopted. She thought the time had gone by for Britain in any sense to try to mother Australia. They wanted to be recognised as grown-up members of the family with equal rights and responsibilities to one another. She had read very carefully the Debate on this question of anthrax. The British Delegates had said: "We have set up a station at Liverpool; we have decided on the process of disinfection; we have settled the whole thing." That was not the way to deal with it, or to get the support of Australia. As a matter of fact, anthrax had been practically stamped out in Australia. She was sorry she had not the exact figures, but over a very long period of years they had had very few deaths, perhaps one or two, but, at any rate, something very small. The reason was that they were dealing with the question of anthrax at the point of production, and were not waiting until the wool was shorn and sent out of the country. There was another question that came into this proposal, and which must have influenced the Australian Delegates, and that was the difference of opinion as to the effect of this treatment on the wool itself. They were not sure whether the wool would deteriorate in the process. Now, for a great wool exporting country, this was a serious question, and had to be taken into account. She wanted them to understand that there might be sometimes differences of opinion between the British Trades Union Delegation and the Australian Delegation, but she asked the British workers to remember that the Australian workers were not overlooking, but placing first and foremost the humanitarian consideration in all these matters.

With regard to white lead, she said they were not really at variance with the British Delegation on that question. Their Delegate on that occasion was Mr. Merrey, with whose appointment they were not satisfied, and he did not reflect the will of the Australian workers. All this could have been prevented and cleared up if there had been any machinery in being whereby the Aus-

tralian workers could be consulted before the representatives met in the Council Room of the I.L.O. Where there was likely to be a difference of opinion the two Delegations should meet and have a consultation. They had not been consulted either before or after the Conference, so far as she knew, on either of these two questions. Personally, after her work at Geneva, she could say she agreed with Mr Simpson as to the value of that institution as a research department and an agency for distributing reliable information about Labour conditions in different countries. Of course, the value of the Conventions was merely educative until they had sufficient power in the different countries to force the ratification of them through. They did not wilfully want at these Conferences to work against the interests of the British workers, but they did want to be consulted, and consideration to be given to their point of view.

*Mr. N. M. JOSHI, M.L.A (India)*

Mr. JOSHI (India), referring again to the question of anthrax, said it had been imagined that he did not appreciate the danger to Indian workers. That was not so, but in India the problem was not so serious as some other problems, and they had to choose their problems according to their importance to Indians. The problem of anthrax was serious from the British point of view, but in India people were dying by so many other things, including starvation, that they did not think it so serious as the British people did.

*Mr. F. W. JOWETT (Great Britain).*

Mr. JOWETT pointed out that the danger from anthrax became very much greater if the disinfecting was left until the wool arrived at the port of destination, on account of the infection spreading during the voyage.

*Mr. H. W. SAMPSON, M.L.A. (South Africa).*

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Sampson, South Africa) said that the controversy that had arisen on the anthrax question revealed a common difficulty they would meet with in different countries, some would deal with the problem by tackling the effect, while others would tackle the cause. He thought they would find, generally speaking, that it would pay in the long run, although a little more trouble might be involved, if they accepted it as the policy of this Party to tackle the thing at its source rather than to wait and tackle the effect.

As a Delegate to the last International Labour Conference, and especially as the name of South Africa had been mentioned, he wished to say a

*Mr. H. W. Sampson, M.L.A. (South Africa)]*

few words. He would be very candid, and some of the things he would say perhaps would not be liked by those who put this particular idea of the Peace Treaty on a pedestal. Most of those present who were removed some distance from the seat of War seriously considered what would happen at the end of the War. Many of the workers who had had no military tuition, or knowledge of warfare, were taken from their jobs. They had been in a War where they had been divorced from their work for some considerable time, and had been under military discipline, and he and others wondered whether they would quite fit back into the old scheme of things of Capitalist exploitation. They fully expected, and he still thought, that if there had been no Armistice period those men would have gone back a much more independent body of workers than they had been before. But there was the breathing space of the Armistice, and the fact that the employers had also seen that problem looming ahead that the workers would be better organised, and when he (Mr. Sampson) opened the Peace Treaty for the first time, and read it, and considered the reputations of those who had framed it, to be perfectly candid, he thought that those who had framed that portion of the Treaty dealing with the I.L.O. must have spoken with their tongues in their cheeks, or saw that they had everything to gain by this palliative which they put into the hands of the workers. And when he remembered the men who went from his Country to sign that document he doubted very much whether they had even read that chapter of the Peace Treaty. He was sure that if they did they must have made up their minds at once that little would come of it.

Then came the fundamental defect in regard to representation provided in the Constitution of the I.L.O. itself. Personally he accepted no responsibility, and he did not think nine out of ten of the workers of South Africa would accept any responsibility. He did not hold himself responsible for the fact that he did not represent the native workers. That was the initial defect of the Constitution. The liberal interpretation of the Constitution was that the workers' representatives should be selected by the most representative Organisations, which limited it at once to the organised workers. The natives not being organised, he did not see how they could come into the scheme of things. So the defect was fundamental. In his country it worked out in this way, one Organisation alone was consulted for many years. That Organisation had now ceased to exist and the former Delegate was dead, so they started with a clean

sheet this year, and he had had the opportunity of becoming the chief Government representative at the Conference, but he had elected to be the workers' representative. The South African Government Delegates were the means of defeating the very important Convention relating to glass workers. He was not going to apologise for them, but he would take such steps as he could to see that that was remedied in the future.

As regards the I.L.O. itself he had the greatest admiration for the efficiency of that office and the persons constituting it. He placed the utmost value on the reports and information it disseminated. Commissions could travel the World over and not get the information which the I.L.O. disseminated to the various countries. But as for the Conference itself, he would not like to say that he had got a contempt for it—he had certainly not got a contempt for the people serving at the Conference—but he did not see how any reasonable body of men who thought for themselves could ever hope that the component parts of the Conference would do any useful or efficient work. To begin with, the dice were loaded against the workers. Last year, it was true, when they had a British Labour Party in power, things turned a little in the direction of the workers, but generally they would find that the employers had the biggest pull over the Government Delegates. He thought the constitution of the Conference was wrong in that it placed so much power in the hands of a constantly changing class of persons, for Government Delegates would change as often as Governments changed in the various countries, and they would not be consistent.

Then there was the language difficulty. He had sat on a Committee with Mr. Tillett, where they sat for hours sometimes without knowing what was going on. He was afraid that Conference was a failure, and he was also afraid that in the Dominions there would be a tendency—he knew it was coming from Canada—when they found that these Conferences were not doing any good, merely to regard the International Labour Office as a bureau, and either to dispense with the Conferences altogether, or put them at very long dates apart. He thought that would be a mistake, and it would not be tackling their job as a Labour Party. What they had to do was to see that they made it an efficient and practical body. One way in which it might be made practical was by trying to break up the group system that prevailed at these Conferences. He would not like it to be thought that he wanted to act alone, or



that others wanted to act alone in these Conferences, but primarily he was responsible to the people who appointed him, and he thought every other Delegate should be in the same position.

Take the difficulty that had sprung up with regard to anthrax. They, in their country, might be tackling the problem in a different way from those in other parts of the world. It did not follow they would all think alike. If they tried to stifle differing opinions they would stifle the best that was in them, and if the freedom of speech and vote was to be cribbed and confined, he was sure they would not be always working in the best direction for an International Conference. The employers had got their group, and they practically acted as one man, but he thought it was all a big mistake. The more they got that stereotyped line of action at an International Conference the more imbecile they would find the Organisation they had set up would become.

There was one thing which had been said which he wished strongly to support. There were nations that controlled the destinies of large bodies of workers in different parts of the World, and, generally speaking, those national Governments merely selected Delegates from their own peoples to go to the Conferences. He would have felt himself a much more powerful man, a better advised man, if some intelligent native had been by his side when he had to speak on questions affecting them. He still thought he could speak for those people, but undoubtedly he would have been much better fortified if he had had one of them with him. A very able suggestion, practically the only suggestion at this Conference, had been made along those lines, and he thought they should give effect to it; that where Governments had control of mandated territories, Crown Colonies, and other Possessions, they should send representatives from those parts in an advisory capacity with the Delegation to International Conferences. He wished to know Mr. Davies' views on that, and he hoped that something practical would come of it. He would undertake on his part to advise their Government that some one from mandated West Africa, and from some of the other races in Africa, should be represented at the Conferences.

*Mr R J. DAVIES, M.P. (Great Britain)*

Mr. R. J. DAVIES, M.P., said he was very glad to have listened to the generous way in which the Delegates had discussed this subject. He had endeavoured to be very practical in his opening remarks, but it was very difficult for a Welshman not to introduce poetry. Referring to the

language difficulty, he said he did not know how they could get over that unless everyone adopted Welsh (Laughter) With regard to the grouping at the Conferences, he said that the one he objected to most strongly was the group of all the Latin South-American Countries, Governments, employers, and workpeople.

He agreed that this Conference could not do anything better than endeavour to get the various Governments to send representatives of their native peoples. At any rate, the British Government might be approached in order to secure, say, at least one, if not more, persons from these parts to accompany the Delegation to each Conference. Sometimes there would be a question affecting some of these Colonies up for discussion, and he presumed they could ask the British Government whether this would not be possible. France and Portugal also had some Colonies, and the same thing might be done there. He thought it would be very useful, not merely from the point of the support and information they would get from these men, but it would be a very fine thing to awaken their interest in their own power, and to get them to report when they went back to their own people what was happening at Geneva.

Mr. Simpson had objected to the Labour representation being only one-fourth, but he wished to remind them that last year Great Britain had three out of four, simply because there was a Labour Government. So far as he had been able to gather, the tendency in Australia was towards the whole representation from that country being Labour, because the Government would shortly become the employer. It all depended upon the character of the Government in power. If they got Labour Governments throughout the world employers would not have very much advantage.

With regard to the point which had arisen between Mr. Jowett and Mr. Joshi, the fact of the matter was they were both right. When he came into intimate contact with the problem of anthrax he found that what happened was that the germ which attacked our people did not attack the Indian at all, and therefore Mr. Joshi was quite right from his point of view in saying that the disease did not affect their people. But it was not a question of wool entirely, it was also hides and bristles. What he wanted to impress upon the Conference was this. He did not wish the subject to die. It had got to come up again. At the moment it was dead; there was no Convention in the offing. They had to raise it again, and when they did so they wanted the co-operation of the Delegates who represented India and Australia.

*Mr R. J. Davies, M P. (Great Britain)*

Finally he wished to say that he did not look upon the I.L.O. as having reached its finality. There were many reforms he would like to see, but he was sure the I.L.O. could adapt itself to any changes. If the peoples of the World elected Capitalist Governments the I.L.O. must accept the situation. The I.L.O. could not determine the character or quality of any Government. When they had Labour Governments the I.L.O. would alter accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN here mentioned that they had present Mr J. W. Brown as a Fraternal Delegate from the International Trades Union Organisation, and asked whether the Conference was agreeable to granting him the indulgence of speaking.

This was agreed to.

*Mr J. W. BROWN (I.F.T.U.).*

Mr. J. W. BROWN (a Fraternal Delegate from the International Federation of Trades Unions) said he had no desire or intention of speaking, but as they had invited him to do so he would offer a few remarks in regard to the I.L.O. Personally he thought there was a great danger that they, the workers' side, should centre their hopes and aspirations in the International Labour Office. He thought the scales were heavily weighted against them in that Organisation, and the two points of criticism that had been made by Mr. Davies on the one hand, and Mr. Sampson on the other, should be borne in mind. In the first place, it was not an all-inclusive Organisation. Russia was not included, nor the United States, and there was not much hope of getting industrial legislation of importance that could be successfully applied in the various countries until these were included.

The second point was as to the efficiency of the I.L.O. In principle he thought it was very fine to have an International Labour Organisation where the workers' representatives could meet the Governments' representatives and the employers' representatives to work out some scheme of labour and social organisation for the benefit of the workers. They had seen, however, in the few years that the Labour Office had been established that more and more they avoided the controversial subjects, and were coming down to minor matters that were not so controversial, in order to get the support of the different Parties. Next year, he thought, the chief item on the Agenda was the conditions with regard to emigrants on board ships. That seemed a very small mouse indeed to require the attention of the whole International Labour Movement. He thought there was a danger of the real working-class International being side-tracked by centring

their attention and support on the I.L.O. There was a tendency to regard that as the centre of their International Organisation.

There was one further thing he wished to mention, and that was why the Labour representatives did not meet together. He understood that all those Labour representatives who belonged to the Organisation affiliated to Amsterdam did meet together to consult about industrial questions, but not only they, but the Government representatives and employers—those who were hostile to the Labour Movement—met with the workers' representatives, and they were meeting together in Geneva on the same terms as the Fascisti, and the clerical organisations, which were in vital contrast to the Labour Movement. He thought it should make them less enthusiastic when they realised that state of affairs, and his plea was that, however good the information bureau might be, they must not see there the final ideal of the International Labour Movement. Their strength was in their own right arm, and the measure of their success achieved at the I.L.O. would be the measure of success they could achieve through their own International Organisation.

*Mr. CHAMAN LALL, M.L.A. (India).*

Mr. CHAMAN LALL (India) said he was in entire agreement with what had been said by the last speaker. He thought they should regard the International Labour Office as a vehicle and not as the *sumnum bonum* of Labour aspirations throughout the World. That would display to the World the fact that the Labour Movement had become bankrupt. But a very valuable suggestion had been thrown out by Mr. Joshi which ought to be considered by this Conference. There were large tracts of the British Empire which were not represented at the International Labour Office. Let them consider, he said, whether they were going to participate in the activities of the International Labour Office on equal terms; let them consider whether that Office was going to continue its activities, the question was how could they make their own activities more effective than they were at present. That could be done, firstly, by trying to bring in the places which were not represented, particularly the mandated territories. If they wanted to do the best by the workers they must try to include all parts that were not represented at the International Labour Office. The second thing was to formulate some scheme amongst themselves so that they, who represented the workers of the British Empire at Geneva, should meet constantly amongst themselves to discuss matters of common interest. He agreed in the con-

demnation of the attitude of what was called the workers' group at Geneva. A more vicious system could not be found. There they had two or three men bossing the whole show, getting into touch with newcomers, one man becoming President and another Secretary. That system had to be broken, and they could only break it by getting British Empire Delegates to stand together as one man.

*Mr. T. JOHNSON, T. D. (Ireland)*

Mr. T. JOHNSON (Ireland) said as the I.L.O. had been attacked he thought it reasonable that another view should be put forward. The question arose whether they were agreed in effecting Labour and Social reforms by means of legislation, or whether they were going merely to trust to the organised Trades Union Movement in the respective Countries. Mr. Brown's view, apparently, was that they should not attempt to internationalise legislation, that they should not attempt to raise up the less forward to the level of the more forward. Those countries that were represented here, and had social and economic legislation of a kind which was in advance of other countries, the International Labour Office really did not affect, and therefore it appeared they were not going to trouble much about it. That, he maintained, was an entirely wrong view. He thought it was wrong to suggest that anyone supporting the International Labour Office proposed to concentrate the working class movement at Geneva. No one had suggested anything of the kind, and therefore it was useless for Mr. Brown or Mr. Chaman Lall to say that it was wrong to concentrate on Geneva. No one suggested such a thing. He was in favour of giving support to the efforts of the International Labour Office to systematise world legislation in respect of industrial and economic affairs. It was good to understand what each country was doing in these matters, to raise up the social legislation of the lower to the higher, and he contended that it was a profound mistake to bring the two movements into apparent opposition. One was complementary to the other.

There was a further point he wanted to make. Everyone had spoken in praise of the statistical and research work of the I.L.O., and the information which was disseminated through it. His inquiries had led him to the conclusion that many Trades Unions and Labour Organisations did not fully realise the facilities that were offered. They could obtain absolute libraries of information for £8 or £10 a year, and he advised them to subscribe for the literature and statistics issued by the Office.

*Mr. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P.  
(Great Britain)*

Mr. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Great Britain) said he wanted to thank Mr. Johnson for having struck an entirely different note to that which had run through some of the speeches regarding the I.L.O. He thought with him that it would not only be a mistake but almost a disaster if the feeling should go out from this Conference that they were either suspect of the I.L.O. or they did not appreciate the work it was doing. He wanted to tell the Conference that what impressed itself most upon his mind with regard to the I.L.O. was that many of the employers who had been brought into association with the I.L.O., and who knew the work it was doing, were very suspicious that already it had become part of the great Socialist and Labour Movement. They thought that it was doing the work that they themselves (the Labour Movement) ought to be doing, and that it was doing that work on money that they, or their Governments, assisted in finding. That, in itself, he thought, ought to bespeak for Labour people very much greater confidence in the work the I.L.O. was doing, and seeking to do. He had been surprised at the note struck by Mr. Brown. He had been associated with Comrade Adler in the Socialist International, and he had never heard a note of suspicion or alarm with regard to the I.L.O. in connection with the Socialist International. He moved also among those connected with the Trades Union International, and had not heard them express the view expressed by Mr. Brown. He thought they should all recognise that the I.L.O. had an entirely different function to perform than the functions of the Trades Union International or the Socialist International, and he believed himself that the stronger the Trades Union International became, the more it sought to impress itself upon the nations of the world to some effect, the more effective would the I.L.O. become. They could not expect the I.L.O. to go into some of the problems they themselves were responsible for, and certainly not to go beyond the volume of public opinion that they, in their propagandist movement, sought to assist in making in their respective countries. He had risen because he was afraid a wrong note was being struck. The employers would certainly strike the wrong note, and the more effective it became the more would employers seek to weaken the I.L.O. without showing their hands too clearly. He hoped they would all go out with the determination to use the I.L.O. This was the line he took at the Assembly last September, that the League of Nations as a whole had not learned to appreciate the I.L.O., that it was keeping it as a separate

*Mr. Arthur Henderson, M.P. (Great Britain)]*

organisation. He took the line that they ought to use the I.L.O. more, and he desired to strike the same note in this Conference representing different sections of their Movement.

*Mr J. MACDONALD (Canada)*

Mr. J. MACDONALD (Canada) said that unless they understood why the I.L.O. was born they would not understand why to-day it had been admitted that it seemed to be concerned with trivial and non-controversial subjects. At the time it was formed a high degree of international solidarity had been reached by the working-class movement all over the world. He believed it had done very good work, but only from the point of view of the employers' class. He did not believe that they could ride two horses. All that had been said as to the good work the I.L.O. had done so far as giving statistics and information and world-wide knowledge was concerned, that they had been incapable of getting before as a Labour Movement, was true, but that must not be confounded with the view-point of the working-class. He did not think there had been developed in the working-class organisation the idea that the I.L.O. was simply for the gathering of information and giving statistics to the Labour Movement, and there was a danger that the

working-classes would look towards this organisation, which was composed of employers, Governments, and workers, as some medium through which they could improve their conditions. With the exception of gathering information it had not been proved that the working-class had received any benefit. Was the Labour Movement so weak to-day that it could not gather its own statistics, that it could not have its own International Office?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Sampson), in closing the session, suggested that they should leave the course clear for a new subject the next morning. No one had suggested that they should adopt as a policy the abolition of the International Labour Office, and he did not think that was in their minds. But a suggestion had been made that they might do useful work in their various countries in regard to trying to influence their Governments to include in their Delegations to the International Labour Office a more representative body of advisers, especially in those countries which were not recognised as Members of the League. He did not think they needed any resolution, but he desired to make the statement that they had arrived at that conclusion, and he thought the Conference would be satisfied.

The Conference then adjourned.

### THIRD SESSION.

*Wednesday, July 29, 1925.*

A. B. SWALES (Chairman of the British Trades Union Congress General Council) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, said:

Comrades and Friends, as President of the British Trades Union Congress, I am glad to have the opportunity of presiding at this session of the British Commonwealth Labour Conference. It is my duty and privilege to voice the interest and sympathy felt by the Trade Unionists of the Mother Country in the questions of inter-Dominion relationships with which this Conference is concerned. We are passing through an intensive phase in the development of economic Imperialism which is creating serious and complicated problems for organised Labour in every country. To many of us, Imperialism in the form that we have it to-day marks the last stage in the development of capitalism. It represents the final effort of the groups which control financial and industrial capital in the most highly organised countries to secure for themselves markets for their goods and new opportunities for the profitable investment of their money. The Imperialists, of course, never tell the naked truth about their doings in this way. They camouflage the brutal fact that Imperialism means exploitation by talking about the "glory" of Empire, pride of race, advance of civilisation, and so forth. Economic Imperialism uses the language of patriotism and even of religion to disguise its motives—"one king, one flag, one law, one faith"; but the reality is exploitation and oppression of weaker peoples and the intensification of commercial rivalries and antagonisms that lead to war.

Imperialism in this sense is utterly alien to the mind and will of organised Labour. It involves definite perils and menaces that ideal of peace, co-operation, and goodwill between nations which the Labour Movement exists to promote. Labour is Internationalist, not Imperialist, in its outlook. But there are possibilities of inter-Dominion relationship, of unity of policy and development of common interests within the British Commonwealth of Nations, with which organised Labour must be concerned, and upon which it is essential the leaders of the Movement, both political and industrial, should consult together. Speaking in the name of the organised millions of Trade Unionists, there is, in particular, one problem which as Trade Unionists we can afford no longer to neglect. I refer to the problem involved in the exploitation by capitalist interests of the resources of cheap labour in the countries where capitalism has penetrated, and where industrialism is being established based on lower standards of wages, working hours, and conditions of employment than those standards which Trade Unionism has enforced in the older countries. British capital, British efficiency, British skill, and British management have been employed to create and develop industries in countries with an abundant supply of cheap labour, and the products of those industries are now coming into competition with our own. In the hands of the employers this fact has become a weapon with which to beat down the standards of our own workers.

The British Empire by its very nature makes it possible for the employers to divide up the workers and other toilers (such as a small peasantry) into different camps; hence, up till now, it has been an easy game to the employers to use one section of the workers, particularly the dependencies in Crown Colonies, against the workers of the Mother Country, and vice versa, so that on the one hand it is the business of the Colonial Slaves to work below any possible standard, and on the other hand it is the business of the workers in uniform to fight all the enslaved nations struggling for their freedom.

The main business of this Conference should be to put an end to this, and to bring together the workers and the oppressed against their common oppressors.

During the past year the Trade Union Movement of Great Britain has done its utmost towards mobilising the workers of the world. In this country we fight, and are continuing to fight, for unification and concentration of our vast but scattered movement. Outside this country we have succeeded in bringing together for the common purpose the young but vigorous Trade Union Movement of New Russia with our own Trade Union Movement, which is the oldest in Europe. But all these efforts for unity will be fruitless if we cannot bring about unity among the workers and toilers of the Empire itself.

After all, we are witnessing now an awakening of the enslaved nations and masses all over the world. A short 15 years ago the things we are witnessing to-day would have appeared to many to be unthinkable. To mention only the great fight of the masses of China, amounting to over four hundred million human beings—a quarter of the human race—there is not, and there cannot be, a single worker in the world who would not be in sympathy with the gallant fight of this great but oppressed people.

India, too, calls for our support and cordial friendship. The conditions under which we have to deal with the present difficulties in that country will be told by our comrades from India, who are delegates to this Conference. We must try to assist them to work out their emancipation. The same applies to other nationalities represented here.

It is a great tragedy that the enslaved nations which are fighting for their freedom look upon the British Empire as a whole, and consider that we are all responsible for their sufferings. But we must clear ourselves of this responsibility. This Conference must declare, openly and clearly, that the working classes of our country are in no way responsible for the crimes committed by the ruling class.

Our interests are common interests, our enemy the same enemy. It is for us to create the machinery which will unite all our forces, and unite them in fighting together for the common cause

The problem, under another aspect, faces the Labour and Trade Union movement in the self-governing Dominions, in the influx of great masses of immigrants from countries with a lower standard of life and labour conditions. These immigrants must always represent a menace to the superior standards of employment and wages ruling in countries like Canada and Australia. And I consider it to be a matter of imperative urgency that the representatives of Labour in the Dominions should tell us how they view the problem and what remedies they think we could jointly undertake to deal with it. There are tremendous difficulties and dangers connected with the growth and movement of population as between the Old World and the New, and especially as between this country and the Dominions, as well as between the Asiatic and Western countries; and it is important to recognise that the problem is the same, in the Dominions as at home—the problem, namely, of how to maintain the higher standards of employment won by Trade Union action against the competition of cheap, unorganised and abundant labour exploited by capitalism. We cannot get rid of the problem by shutting our eyes to it. Neither can we, in my belief, solve the problem by the methods of exclusion, discrimination and embargo practised by the United States in its immigration policy. In the long run such a policy creates the conditions of race war. We must find a better way of dealing with the problem of migration, and of the problem of developing the economic resources of the world, than the methods pursued by capitalist groups which look for nothing but markets, for opportunities for investment, and for sources of labour and raw materials which they can exploit. As I understand the aim of this Conference, it is to consult together with the object of coming to a common understanding as to the problems which confront us severally and collectively as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and to frame, if possible, a common policy for dealing with these problems. This gathering is, I hope, the first step towards a much closer and more intimate union of our Movement within the Empire, and I trust we shall not separate without taking measures to establish machinery for the regular and systematic interchange of information about our problems and our policies. (Cheers.)

## INDUSTRIAL LEGISLATION AND LABOUR PROTECTION IN MANDATED TERRITORIES.

*Mr D BEN-GURION (Palestine).*

Mr. DAVID BEN-GURION (Palestine), in introducing this subject, said he could not speak English very well, and asked for the indulgence of the delegates. Palestine had only recently become a part of the British Empire, being one of the Mandated Territories under the League of Nations. They had already discussed the political aspect of this question in the debate which had taken place on "Inter-Commonwealth Relations," but this was not the most important side. The main trouble with regard to capitalism, as the Chairman had pointed out, was not political, but economic. As he had said, Palestine was one of the countries which came under the new system of Mandated Territories. The Mandate of Palestine was given to Great Britain, and was defined as follows: "The Mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of a Jewish National home and the development of self-government." It also was to safeguard the religious rights of the inhabitants of Palestine. In Palestine they

had a special problem confronting them, which was not only political but economic, and that was the problem of doing justice, not only to the Jewish people, but to the whole of the inhabitants irrespective of race. Palestine was at present governed by a High Commissioner sent from England under the terms of the Mandate. But although they had been for some years under British rule, Turkish law still predominated, particularly in regard to labour questions. For many centuries it was one of the most backward countries of the world, and consequently capitalism was able to exploit it, and the Labour Movement had not had the opportunity of developing as it had done in other countries, but some very important changes had taken place during the last 40 years, since Jewish immigration into Palestine, and about 20 years ago the Labour Movement began to develop on modern lines. Palestine was mainly an agricultural country under a feudal system, and the masses of the peasants were exploited. There was no other industry of any importance. In regard to the Labour Movement, it was one of the

youngest branches, having only been established about six years ago, but it stood for all the aims and ideals of the Labour Movement throughout the world. They would not expect very much from a young movement like that, but they were progressing, and in those six years they had made about 20,000 members, which was not a small thing when they considered the difficult conditions and the size of the country.

Immigration into Palestine was very different, in one important respect, from immigration into such countries as Australia, Canada, or the United States, where the organised workers were afraid—and perhaps with some justice—of immigrants coming in with a different standard of life and competing unfairly with them. In Palestine just the opposite was the state of things. The new workers that were going into Palestine brought a higher standard of life, made bigger economic demands, and had a greater capacity for organisation than the workers who were already there. They were building up Trade Unions, Co-operative societies, and educational institutions, and so helping the workers of Palestine to organise and raise the standard of life. The danger they were up against was the competition of cheap Arab labour, which was not so apt as the Jewish immigrants were to resist capitalist exploitation. They were, therefore, struggling to organise the Arab workmen—to bring them into their organisations, so as to raise the standard of life, and that, as the delegates from South Africa had said, was not an easy matter. It should be remembered that these people were living under the feudal system, and being unable to read or write, it was very difficult to organise them, and it was here that they needed the help of organised labour in other countries and especially in Great Britain.

As he had said, although Palestine was under a British mandate, it was still under Turkish law and he would give them one instance of how it worked. If a workman was killed at his work, all that his dependants were entitled to under Turkish law was his day's wages, "even if he had not finished his job." That was all. There was no protection for the workman whatsoever. Employers could exploit children of 7 or 8 years of age, compelling them to work for 10 or 14 hours a day. They could also exploit women. There was no limit to what they could do. Recently their Union had organised a march through the streets and through the efforts of the Union they had established an 8 hours day, but so long as there was no real protection, they could not be sure how long it would last, because they were confronted with the ex-

istence of a very large number of unorganised workers who were ready to work for 10, 12 or 14 hours a day. They had also established a minimum wage, but, for the same reason, they were not sure that they would be able to retain that. The unorganised workers were often willing to work for half or less than half the wages demanded by the organised workers. There was no Labour legislation to protect them. They were not even sure that some day, when the Union got stronger, the Government would not—relying on Turkish law—close their organisation down. They had no recognised freedom to strike. Although up to the present time the Government had not interfered when they had a strike, they were not sure that when they organised a strike against the Government itself, say in connection with the railways, their organisation would not be closed down. The railwaymen in Palestine, although they were Government servants, were getting the lowest wages paid in any industry.

When the Labour Government came into office in Great Britain they hoped that this state of things would be improved, but the Labour Government was in too short a time and they appreciated the difficulties with which it was confronted, being in office but not in power. In these Dependencies of Great Britain, for which the British Government was responsible, they looked for help. They also looked for help from organised Labour in Britain. They believed that even out of office the Labour movement of Great Britain was a great force, and was therefore, to a certain extent, responsible for the fate of the Labour movement in all the Dependencies of the British Empire. They therefore looked to their comrades in Great Britain to help them to get at least the minimum of labour protection and labour legislation which the workers in England and other places were already enjoying. But the question in Palestine was not only that of Labour protection, there was the question of the land which affected great masses of peasants. The state of things in Palestine was horrible. The biggest part of the country belonged to a few landlords, who did not want to put it to use, but simply to hold it for speculation. While the agricultural workers and peasants could not find land—not to exploit, but to work for themselves—there were big tracts of land left uncultivated and kept by the Landlords for speculation. If they were going to improve the condition of the workers and if they were going to bring in more immigrants; if they were going to build up a strong Labour movement—and that was their aim—they must change the agrarian conditions in the country. They must make it easier for the workers to get land at rents that will enable them to

*Mr. David Ben-Gurion (Palestine)]*

live, and they must make it more difficult for the landlords to speculate with the land.

There was another question which was very important in Palestine, and he believed in other mandated territories. The population of Palestine was composed of Jews and Arabs. They had no question of race because they were both of the Semitic race, but there was a difference in nationality. The Jews had their national aspirations and the Arabs had theirs. They were associated as Labour men and wanted to establish a better state of things and desired to help each other. They believed this would be made possible when each national unit had full autonomy, and could administer its own national affairs. In their Labour Movement in Palestine there was no question as to whether the members were Jews or Arabs, but the majority were Jews because the Jewish workers were more ready to organise. Although the delegation to this conference was composed of Jews, it represented the Arab workers as well. They desired to establish in Palestine full national equality between the two nations, and they believed this would be brought about when each national community was granted national autonomy. This was the most vital question in Palestine. In the immigration policy of Palestine they were confronted with unjustifiable restrictions. The worker coming into Palestine had more difficulties to contend with than any other class. They contended they were entitled to the same labour protection, and the same industrial legislation, as were enjoyed by other countries, and he hoped they would get the assistance of the organised Labour Movement in Great Britain and the British Dominions to secure them. Some of the delegates had visited Palestine, and had seen their efforts, and he believed they recognised that their aspirations were not much lower than those of the best developed Labour Movements of other countries. But they needed the help of their comrades, especially in the work of organising Arab labour. When they went to the High Commissioner to ask for social legislation, they were met with the argument that they only represented a small proportion of the workers and legislation could not be enacted for one section of the Labour movement. They were of opinion that it should work in just the opposite way; that because there was one section of the workers who were in a higher state of development than the rest, therefore they should have legislation which would raise the general standard. They could only defend the interests of the unorganised workers like the Arabs—who were not able to organise themselves—by having Labour legislation. Secondly, they needed some alteration in the land laws

which would enable the peasants and agricultural workers to get land to work on. Thirdly, they expected help, especially from the Labour Movement in Great Britain, in their effort to get full national autonomy for the Jews, as well as the Arabs, in Palestine. And fourthly, they wanted help in their fight against the restrictions on immigrant workers.

*Mr. T. JOHNSON, T.D. (Ireland).*

Mr. T. JOHNSON, T.D. (Ireland), said he was not quite sure what Mr Ben-Gurion meant when he referred to Turkish law regarding organised workers on the railways. Did he understand that Turkish law prohibited the organisation of State employees, and that that still continued? (Mr. Ben-Gurion: "Yes.") So that there was a legal obstacle to the organisation of State employees? (Mr. Ben-Gurion: "Yes.") He also wanted to know what was meant by the statement that they demanded full national autonomy for both Arabs and Jews. Did he mean that they desired to separate them, rather than to bring them into one social organisation? Then he wished to know what in the main was the nationality of the employers. Were they Jews, or Arabs, or neither?

*Mr. D. BEN-GURION (Palestine).*

Mr. BEN-GURION said the employers were Jews as well as Arabs. There was complete internationalism in regard to the employers. An Arab employer would employ mainly Arabs, but he would also have a certain number of Jews. Jewish workers were mainly employed by Jews. The railways were operated by the Government, but there were many public works, such as road making, which were done by private contractors, and where the labour conditions were even worse than those imposed by the Government itself. In trades where the minimum wage of the industrial workers, who were mainly Jews, was 6s. a day, the Government only paid 3s. a day. That was on the railways, but for road making the employers were only paying 1s. a day, and they were employing women and children. One of the demands which his Federation was making was that not only should the Government pay fair wages, but that the contractors to the Government should have a fair wages clause inserted in their contracts, and that no contractor should get work from the Government unless he was prepared to abide by the conditions laid down by the Trade Union.

With regard to national autonomy, he had already said that their Labour Federation, which he represented at this Conference, comprised both Jewish and Arab workers. There was no question of nationality or race in their unions. When they spoke about national autonomy they



meant national autonomy for each community. They wanted each nation to be able to manage its own affairs, to develop its own national education, its own national culture, and keep its own language. They did not want one nationality to dominate the other, or to force its own national ideals on the other, but for each nationality to be free to develop according to its own aspirations, especially in regard to education. In Palestine they had some villages which were populated almost entirely by Jews, and others which were nearly all Arabs. And they had towns where the population was mainly Arabs and other towns where the population was mainly Jewish. They used to have municipal self-government, but now the municipal authorities were appointed by the Government. They were asking the Government to give them the right to elect their municipal authorities.

Mr JOHNSON asked how national authority could be worked jointly.

Mr. BEN-GURION said that when he spoke of national autonomy he was not referring to State Government. Certainly there must be one Government for the whole country. But there were things which were separated from the Central Government. He was referring more particularly to education. He thought each community should have the right to tax their population for the purpose of maintaining its own schools and its own national institutions. That was all he meant by national autonomy.

Mr D. CHAMAN LALL (India) said that this idea of the segregation of the two races was, to his mind, thoroughly pernicious. Were there not, he asked, people in Palestine who looked on the whole of Palestine as one entity, and were prepared to combine the two peoples in order to work up to one national community in that country?

Mr BEN-GURION denied that it was segregation they were proposing. It was merely self-determination. Here were two nations with different ideas. They accepted that fact, and they wanted each nation to be free. They did not want one nation to be dominated by the other. They wanted self-determination of the two national spiritual entities. They did not want Arabs to become Jews nor Jews to become Arabs, but they wanted them both to be what they were—each an independent national entity free to manage its own affairs. There must be equality as between the two nations. Palestine was a geographical and political entity, and it must have one central Government, but inside Palestine there were two nations, and both must be free and equal so far as internal affairs were concerned. For instance, they could not force the Arab to

speak Hebrew, and they could not force the Hebrew to speak Arabic. In their internal intercourse they would use their own language.

Mr CHAMAN LALL asked whether they were contemplating setting up two separate nations on an equality, no matter whether one set was in a majority or not [Mr Ben-Gurion "Yes"]. In spite of the fact that the Arab population in Palestine was by far the largest community, and the Jews were small, yet they were driving their idea of self-determination to such an extent that they wanted the Jew to be equal in political status to the Arab—was that the idea?

Mr BEN-GURION said if it was meant that each Jew should have the same rights as each Arab, that was so.

Mr. CHAMAN LALL said he was afraid he had not made himself clear. He did not deny that individuals should have equal rights, but Mr Ben-Gurion was suggesting that a minority of individuals forming one group should have equal rights with another group forming a majority.

Mr. BEN GURION: "Should have equal rights in that the Jews should be able to establish their own schools as well as the Arabs."

Mr GEO. LANSBURY said the point which bothered him was the Central Government that would have to do with the railways, the great main roads, and the army or police force. Who would control these? Was Mr Ben-Gurion claiming that the minority—the white minority—should have equal power with the majority, or was he saying that they would determine the rule at the centre by the democratic method, which meant that the Arabs would have the preponderating influence?

Mr. N. M. JOSHI wanted to know what sort of Municipal Government Mr Ben-Gurion would propose to set up in the towns where the population was mixed. Would there be two sections—one for Jews and the other for Arabs? Mr Ben-Gurion had said there were new cities being built up by the Jews. Would that prevent any Arabs settling there? If they allowed Arabs to go there, it would cease to be a community city. It was a very difficult problem for him (Mr. Joshi) to understand.

Mr BEN-GURION replied that Arabs as well as Jews might come into the community. As a matter of fact many Arabs were coming into the Jewish community, and many Jews were also working in mainly Arab communities. The Arabs had the same rights as the Jews. There was really no white minority in Palestine, they were either natives or immigrants, and there was no question of white or

*Mr. David Ben-Gurion (Palestine)]*

coloured people. But there was the question of the minority or the majority, and that question was no doubt present in other countries where they had minorities of different nationalities. With regard to the Central Government, the country was at present under British mandate, and was being ruled by a Commissioner appointed by the British Government. There was an Advisory Council and there was a project to have a Legislative Council. According to the project, there were to be two Jews, two Christians, and eight Moslems in this Legislative Council, and on the Advisory Council there were several Arabs and three Jews. When they had democratic Government in Palestine the majority would certainly be Arabs, but even in that case the rights of the minority should be protected. The main question was immigration. Palestine was an undeveloped country. The Jews were the only people in the world who had no place under the sun, and the only means of keeping from starvation the great masses of the Jewish people, especially in Russia and Poland, was emigration. Therefore, the only hope for their existence was emigration to Palestine and the upbuilding of Palestine as a country where the rights of the minority would be protected. They believed they had the right to undeveloped countries, because it was a question of their existence.

A DELEGATE asked if there was any Arab immigration in Palestine, and Mr. Ben-Gurion replied that there was not, because the Arabs had very big countries which were unpopulated, like Mesopotamia and Syria.

*Mr. ISAAC BENZEVIE (Palestine).*

Mr. ISAAC BENZEVIE (Palestine) said he wished to add a few words to what Mr. Ben-Gurion had told the Conference. First he wished to speak about the form of exploitation from which they suffered and the areas of exploitation. It might be divided into three areas. First, there was the economic Jewish area, which was mostly filled up by Jewish workmen, but not exclusively—the new industries like those founded at Haifa and Tel-Aviv. These contained about 1,000 people working in the heavy industries and they were mainly Jews. The Arab area was the agricultural area and the villages, and also a number of purely Arab cities. Then there was a third area, consisting of the Government employees and the municipal employees.

With regard to the Trades Union organisation, it was composed mainly of Jews, people working in the cities and also in the Jewish Colonies. They were mostly men who had come into

the country and who had had some practice in organisation and were anxious for Trade Union organisation. Their Union of nearly 20,000 men was organised according to trades, but individuals were also included. The organising was being carried out upon co-operative lines. It was thought that that part of the organisation which was purely Arab would be built up as an Arab section of the organisation, and the mixed portion, which was Municipal and Government, would combine in one organisation. Arab members, however, belonged through their Unions, to their central organisation. With regard to their national and communal relations, the two main points for the development of their organisation were (1) the organisation especially of Jewish labour, and (2) immigration. The people who were coming into Palestine were coming in really as members of the Labour organisation, and in that way immigration into Palestine was different from immigration into other countries. Seven years ago they had only 2,000 members; to-day they had 20,000, only a small portion of whom came from Arab labour. The great majority came in as immigrants from Europe or America. Their hope of developing the Labour movement on European lines lay in bringing in large numbers of Jewish workers. In Palestine they were as anxious for co-operative activities as for Trade Union activities. They were trying to organise so that the whole of the labouring class, through Trade Union and Co-operative activity, would be able to control national affairs.

*Mr. J. SIMPSON (Canada).*

Mr. J. SIMPSON (Canada) said that while listening to the speeches of their colleagues from Palestine, this thought went through his mind; that the more they got the true international concept, the less were they likely to defend what they called their national aspirations on national lines. Coming from Canada he wanted to put to this assembly the difficulties that would arise if, as a matter of principle, they were to endorse some of the views put forward that morning. The Continent of America was the great melting-pot of the world. There they were called upon to consider not only the national aspirations of the Jews, but also the national aspirations of perhaps 100 different peoples, and their problem would be made very difficult if they tried to satisfy the national aspirations of all the groups of peoples which composed their cosmopolitan body. Could they conceive of the difficulties they would be faced with in trying to build up an International Trade Union Movement if they were going to concern themselves with trying

to satisfy the national and cultural aspirations of the different peoples in countries with populations ranging from 40,000 or 60,000 up to three or four millions? If an organisation of this kind accepted the principle as good for one part of the world, it would have to accept it for other parts of the world. If they were going to have different systems of education, for instance, based upon national, religious, and other aspirations, where were they going to get the unity and solidarity they were looking for as a great working-class movement? They had in Canada a city where 40,000 of their Jewish comrades were working. The children were attending their schools, going into the playgrounds with the other parts of the juvenile population, there was intermarriage between adults, they were attending Trade Union meetings, becoming members of their political organisations, and entering generally into the community life of the city.

As an internationalist he saw tremendous difficulties in the way of adopting some of the ideas brought before them that morning. As an International Socialist he was not satisfied with protecting present culture—whether it was English culture or not; he was more concerned with creating a new culture, a new idealism, based upon the solidarity of the working-class for a Socialist State all over the world. Therefore, as representing Canada, he wanted to say that the purpose of the Labour movement of their country was not to bother their heads about helping in the development of the culture of any particular nationality, but in creating a new culture, based upon a new social order, that they were going to create for themselves. The culture of all past generations was based upon commercialism and capitalism; they had the genius to create their own culture, and they were doing it step by step. As they did that they would realise that there would fade away into complete oblivion the national jealousies which kept them apart. Therefore he was for international solidarity and international culture.

*Mr. N. M. JOSHI, M L A. (India).*

Mr. N. M. JOSHI (India) said he had great sympathy with the members of the Jewish community, and he sympathised with them particularly in their aspiration to have a national home, but he was bound to confess there was a conflict in his mind between his democratic spirit and his sympathy for the aspirations of the Jews, especially as they had been put before the Conference that morning. Let them take the position as it existed in Palestine at the present time. Palestine was an

Arab country, if they could judge of a country by the majority of its population. Before the Arabs went there it might have been a Jewish country, but if they started to go back to the beginning of the world he did not know what country any of them would belong to. (Laughter.) But if they took ordinary things into account Palestine was an Arab country, and he thought they would have to recognise that fact. Here was Great Britain, with perhaps a sincere sympathy with the Jews in their aspiration to have a national home in Palestine, but if that sympathy had been really genuine they would have found some other country where the Jews could have had a national home. There were vast tracts of land in Australia and in Canada still waiting for emigrants. Why did not Great Britain select a portion of Canada, or a portion of Australia for a Jewish home instead of selecting Palestine? It was all very well to select an Arab country for the Jews, but it was not their territory to select. He wanted the Labour Movement to remember that they could not create a national home for the Jews, with their separate culture, separate religion and separate language—he did not know what other separate things they had—without creating very great dangers. Their Labour Movement did not want to create complications in Palestine. Their Jewish friends said that their culture must be preserved, their schools must be preserved, and other things must be preserved against the majority. He knew that in certain respects the rights of the minority had to be respected, and if the Arabs compelled the Jews to learn their language, it was certainly not right, and the Jews must be protected, but he did not see how they could go beyond certain elementary rights in protecting the Jews.

He had had some experience of this community feeling in his own country. There they had Hindus and Mohammedans, and he had sometimes found that this creating of racial feeling was a capitalist endeavour to divide them. In his country some of the Mohammedan leaders told the people they must have a Mohammedan officer to protect them, but how could a Mohammedan officer drawn from the capitalist class protect the interests of the Mohammedan workers? If there was a dispute between a Mohammedan landlord and his tenant, the officer, if he had any bias, would certainly decide against the Mohammedan farmer and in favour of the Mohammedan landlord. He believed the capitalists encouraged this feeling simply because they thought by so doing they would be able to exploit the workers more easily. He therefore thought they should not foster it by doing what their Jewish friends had suggested, create a separate entity. This had caused a great deal of trouble in his

country, where Hindus and Mohammedans would fight on any small question. He advised his friends from Palestine to throw in their lot with the people amongst whom they were now living and endeavour to assimilate with the Arabs.

He could not really understand how culture could be different in one community from another. Culture was culture, and there was no such thing as Jewish culture or Mohammedan culture. They should aim at unity, but if their friends were going in the way they proposed there would be no unity. That was his view though they might not accept it. He, therefore, felt that while they were quite prepared to help their friends in Palestine as working-class people for their working-class movement, he did not think they could help them if they wanted to remain separate in culture and other things from the Arabs.

Mr. CHAIM ARLOSOROFF (Palestine).

Mr. CHAIM ARLOSOROFF (Palestine) said he was very glad, to a certain degree, that in the course of the present discussion they had got so far as to go into the very difficult problems of the Jewish question, which, he contended, were only going to be solved through their colonisation in Palestine. He thought everyone who understood the situation confronting the Jewish masses in the world would agree that they could not be satisfied merely with the expressions of sympathy which Comrade Joshi had been generous enough to give them. He had felt all the time this discussion had been going on that it was like a hungry man discussing the food question with men who had already finished a very good supper. Those who had spoken were not living in circumstances where their very national existence was in danger and their national culture was in danger. Their comrades from India were in a very happy condition when they could speak in the name of three hundred million Indians, who were living in India, whose national existence could not be endangered by any capitalist power in the world. The case of the Jewish people was quite different. They were struggling, in the present generation, for their very existence. The Jews had not even reached the stage of the most oppressed people of other nationalities. Millions of Jewish people were living under conditions where neither their social, nor their economic, nor their cultural, not to speak of their political rights, were safeguarded. No matter what social or political developments were taking place in the countries in which they were living, the tendency of those developments were towards the expulsion of the Jewish people. Even in

Russia, whilst the governing party was not discriminating against the Jews, most of the Jewish people were living under economic conditions which did not coincide with the Russian development. America, which during the last 30 or 40 years had taken some millions of Jews, was now closed against them, and other countries were developing their policies on the lines of restriction. The Australians were talking about a "White Australia." The Jews were emigrating, but there was no country in the world where they were admitted as of right, and any Parliament of any country might resolve to lock the door against them.

Had not the Jewish people a right to claim a place in the sun somewhere? During the era when democratic ideas were at full tide—the era immediately following the war—there was an agreement amongst all the democratic Powers, and it was endorsed by the Socialist International, that there must be created in some country of the world a place where the Jewish people would be admitted of right, to which they could emigrate and make a living, and build up their national life, and this place was Palestine. Not because it was a British Mandated territory, not because they were searching all over the world for a country—it was not to be compared with one of the great and rich Dominions—not because they searched the map to find a place, but because the Jewish people had been connected through all the centuries of its past history with Palestine. Delegates might remember that an offer was made in the days of Joseph Chamberlain. They were offered Kenya, Uganda. Even if the British Government had offered them another country they would have been unwilling to accept it. Jewish history had selected Palestine, not the British and not the Jews, and in this way the idea of a national home for the oppressed Jewish people was created in the minds of the workers.

Now what, he asked, were the claims of the Jewish emigrants which the delegates were so ready to dispute? They claimed free emigration—the open door for the Jewish emigrant all over the world. As Socialists and as Internationalists they would not dispute that. Therefore, how could they deny it in the case of Palestine? What they claimed—and they felt it was in full harmony with democratic ideas—was that Jewish emigrants to Palestine must be openly and freely admitted; that they must be given the opportunity of colonising, and colonising in the sense in which it was understood in some of the British Colonies. Not colonising by the rich in order to employ cheap labour. They were not going to do that sort of colonising. In

their agricultural colonising settlements they provided the man with forty acres of land, setting him on the soil and telling him to go and work, without adopting the white system at all. Palestine was an agricultural country, and agriculture comprised 80 per cent or more of its economic life. For such a colonising effort they were claiming their rights, and for such colonisation they were bringing into the country their people and creating in the country social and economic conditions which were unknown until this period in its history. They had brought to the notice of Arab peasants technical and other methods which they had not dreamed of during all the centuries they had been in the country. They had also erected the first modern industry plants known in Palestine.

Mr. ROBERT WILLIAMS (Great Britain) here remarked that these were all the arguments of the Imperialist.

Mr. ARLOSOROFF retorted that he did not know whether the interrupter had visited their settlements or seen their industrial effort, but if he had he would be very cautious in applying such terms to the efforts of the Jewish workers. He did not wish to take up time in explaining what social and economic efforts and what experiments had been made by organised Jewish labour in order to try to solve social and economic questions in accordance with Socialist ideas, but they were very far removed from any Imperialist undertaking. Their comrades from Great Britain who had been over there knew what they were doing, and that there were problems which were not met with in other countries. In conclusion, Mr. Arlosoroff said: "We have tried to put before the Conference the whole of the problems of the Jewish nation. We could, if we had wished, have passed over the question of the Jews in Palestine; we could have put before the Conference only very democratic and very Socialist demands, we could have claimed free emigration, and you could not have opposed it; we could have claimed Labour legislation and social protection only, and you could not have opposed it; we could have claimed free access to the land for the working people and the liberation of the Fellaheen from the yoke of the Arab landlord, and you could not oppose it; but we wished to put this question not only in its social and economic form, but we wanted you to realise that behind all these social and economic problems there is the life and existence problem of the people, people who live in the midst of the most difficult conditions that people can live in, and we thought that, within a Socialist Conference and within the scope of the workers' movement, that question would

be thought not less important than the mere improvement of conditions."

The CHAIRMAN said it was very difficult to cut the discussion short, but they had to have regard to the Agenda. They had had over two hours on this question. It had been intensely interesting, and they could go on discussing the subject the whole morning. The question had to be referred to a Commission, however. There they could further discuss the matter and try to arrive at some conclusion. Before asking Mr. Ben-Gurion to reply he thought they should congratulate their friends in Palestine on the fact that they had been able to raise their Organisation from very small dimensions to 20,000 in a very short time. Having got some measure of education he felt pretty convinced that people would work out their own destiny irrespective of whether the British or any other people agreed with them.

Mr ROBERT SMILLIE, M P (Great Britain)

Mr. ROBERT SMILLIE (Great Britain) remarked that their Comrade who had opened the discussion dealt with four main points, and he desired, and his people desired, the assistance of the organised Labour and Socialist Movement of the Colonies and this country to help the alien population which was building up a civilisation in Palestine. He thought the first thing could be unanimously accepted. They would all like to protect and assist in endeavouring to get protection against the employment of women and children. In fact, they would like to get for their comrades in Palestine all the rights that they themselves possessed. But the last proposal he made was an extraordinary one, namely, some form of dual government which, in the same community, would give the Arabs and the Jews the right of separate self-government. That had not been answered up to the present time, and personally he did not quite know what was meant by the proposal. If they were claiming that the Jewish population should have the right to exercise their own religion, and their own language, there could be no question. That was a thing they would claim for themselves. But if he understood the question correctly, they were asking for something that we in this country did not possess. There were profound differences of opinion on religion and other questions in this country, but they did not ask for different treatment for one as against the other.

He congratulated their comrades in Palestine on the magnificent struggle they were carrying on, and he wanted to say that if they had been able to secure for the people of Ireland 40

*Mr. Robert Smillie, M P (Great Britain)]*

acres of ground each in their own country there would be a larger population in Ireland than there was at present, and if they had secured for the Scottish people 40 acres of ground in Scotland—and it was there—they would have done something substantial. So long as their friends in Palestine could continue giving 40 acres each to the immigrant families they need not fear capitalistic exploitation. He wanted to know what was the real and full meaning of the fourth point put by Mr Ben-Gurion.

*Mr D. BEN-GURION (Palestine).*

Mr. DAVID BEN-GURION (Palestine), in reply, said they did not ask for sympathy but only for understanding. He thought they were entitled to have an understanding of their difficulties. He had listened with great interest to the Comrade from Canada, but it should be remembered that he came from a free country, and was enjoying rights which were denied to others. He advised him to go to Eastern Europe, where he would find the governing class trying to force all the peoples to accept their own point of view in the name of Internationalism. He claimed that they as Jews were entitled to keep their own language, and that was a privilege they had not got. That was so, not only of the Jews, but of other minorities in Eastern Europe. It was not altogether a question of religion, but they claimed that if an Arab or Jew wanted to keep his religion he should be allowed to do so. Internationalism meant the brotherhood of nations, and he did not think he need say that they were in favour of full Internationalism. They were out to promote International brotherhood and understanding in the working classes, but they were entitled to national independence, as well as the Indians and other nations. He agreed that political independence was one of the things the Labour Movement must stand for, but with them it was not a question of political independence, it was a question of their physical existence, whether they were entitled to exist or not. They were being compelled to emigrate from Russia, and those who were acquainted with the conditions in

Russia knew it. The same thing applied to Poland. They must have a place where they would be able to work. The only thing they were asking for was the right to work and the right to live, not only as individuals, but as a national entity. In England there was no national question. It was true they had their Welsh question and their Scottish question, but there was no real national problem. In other countries it was different, and they could not ignore it, especially if they were true Internationalists and were standing on the right of each nation to be free and equal. The English language was in no danger, and the English people were in no danger, but the Jewish people were in danger of losing their very existence. They were asking for a comradely understanding on the part of the Labour Movement in different parts of the World, but especially in Great Britain, which was to a great extent responsible for the fate of Palestine upon which depended the fate of the Jewish people.

#### AGENDA.

Mr W GILLIES (Secretary) pointed out that there was no place on the Agenda where the Delegate from British Guiana could speak, and he suggested that his statement on the Labour Conditions in British Guiana should have a place on the Agenda after "The Conditions of Indian Labour in British Colonies."

This was agreed to.

Mr. J. SIMPSON (Canada) said there was one very pertinent question that ought to be asked before closing the Palestine discussion. Were their Jewish colleagues satisfied with their present system of government, or were they making any demand for self-government?

#### COMMISSION.

The CHAIRMAN said they would make that clear in the Commission.

After some discussion, it was agreed, on the motion of Mr. J. MAXTOW (Great Britain), that the subject be referred to the Commission.

## CONDITIONS OF INDIAN LABOUR IN THE BRITISH COLONIES.

*Mr. N. M. JOSHI, M L.A. (India).*

Mr. N. M. JOSHI (India) : Mr. Chairman and Comrades, the problem and the question which I propose to lay before you now is quite different from the problem which we have discussed so much this morning. I am not asking for any special privilege for my people; I ask for them their human rights as individuals; I ask for their perfect equality, nothing more, nothing less. I would like to say this also, that if you find in my speech some strain of bitterness, it is not intentional. If you find in my speech certain things which may be unpleasant to certain delegates, that is not intentional. It is a part, perhaps an insuperable part, of the question with which I am dealing now, and that is about the condition, political, social and economic, of those Indians who have gone to the British Colonies to settle there. And when I speak of Indians, perhaps only as a matter of subsidiary reference I may speak also of the natives, and, if it is convenient, the whole question can be discussed together. If not, I shall be quite satisfied if you deal with the condition of the Indians alone.

Soon after slavery was abolished by the efforts of the Britishers, the capitalists in the Colonies, and in some other countries, began to find it difficult to carry on their exploitation. They thought they would come to bankruptcy unless the British Government, and some other Governments, discovered methods whereby their exploitation could be continued, and they thought that in the Colonies, where they wanted to make profits by the exploitation of cheap labour, they could find out some method by which that could be continued. They therefore took Indian people to those Colonies as indentured labourers. In my opinion indenture is a form of slavery. It means if a man breaks his contract he will be sent to gaol. In that way the Indians, about the middle of the last century, were taken to several British Colonies, and they were only taken there because the employers and the capitalists, particularly in South Africa, wanted cheap labour. They could not get slaves, and they were afraid to employ the natives, and they thought the best thing to do would be to get Indians there, because the Indians were more civilised than the natives, and, being smaller in number than the natives, they would not be troublesome, even if they went there in large numbers. Moreover, they remembered that the Indians were controlled by the same Government as that under which they lived. So they took Indians to South Africa, and also to Ceylon, Malaya,

the Straits Settlements, Mauritius, Trinidad, British Guiana, and several other Colonies. Indians also went, though not as indentured labourers, to some of the Colonies. But their number is small, and the problem is not so difficult. The number of these Indians who have been thus taken to British Colonies is about 2,000,000. More than 1,000,000 of them are working in Ceylon, 240,000 in Malaya and the Straits Settlements, 380,000 in Mauritius, 60,000 in Fiji, 124,000 in British Guiana, 121,000 in Trinidad, 30,000 in Kenya, 160,000 in South Africa, and the rest in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. That is the number of Indian people in the British Colonies.

Now, when the people were taken there, under the terms of the indenture, they were taken without their human rights being protected. Everything needed to secure the exploitation of these people was guaranteed to the employers by the law and by the force of the Government. They did not go as families; the employers wanted labourers, not families. The Government, to satisfy the physical needs of the people, sent a small number of women. The moral needs were not thought of. These poor Indians had no necessity for morality at all. Their housing was not cared for, and in every way their condition, physically and morally, was neglected. But now the Government of India has refused to send any more indentured labourers to any of these Colonies, though the indentured labour system still exists in some of the Colonies. But although we have stopped sending out indentured labourers, even now the questions of the physical and moral condition and the civic rights of the people have not been solved. Their condition certainly needs improvement.

"I will take each Colony separately, and will first deal with South Africa. I have told you that our people there number about 160,000, including besides these labourers some small traders. I will not speak about them to-day beyond saying that these small traders are practically labourers. They are mostly pedlars, and so they form a very useful community not only to the Indian workers, but to the white workers also. The Indians who are at present in South Africa were taken there many years ago, and their connection with India is now absolutely broken. In fact, the people who are now there are mostly the children of the people who were taken there as indentured labourers. When they went there they did not understand where they were going to. Our Govern-

ment allowed the employers to put all sorts of attractions before them—not real attractions, but attractions which were a misrepresentation of the facts. But now their children who have been born there have as good a claim to call themselves South Africans as Mr. Sampson or any other white workman or white employer, and yet their rights as human beings, as citizens of South Africa, are not recognised. The Indians in South Africa have not got the political franchise except in Cape Colony. They cannot send anyone to the South African Legislature. In certain towns they have the municipal franchise, but the white population there is doing its best to deprive them of that (A Voice 'Has deprived them of it.') I am told they have in Natal already been deprived of the municipal franchise for the future, though those who now have it may enjoy it for their lifetime. Their children will not have it. They have some labour legislation in South Africa, but most of it does not apply to the coloured labourers. They have to come under separate laws. I was discussing workmen's compensation at Geneva, and I found that the compensation paid to indentured labourers is different from that paid to other labourers; the ordinary compensation law does not apply to them. In regard to the housing question, the white workers now claim that they will not live in the same localities as the Indians. Well, the Indians are not anxious to live with the white workers, but they have the right to live on their properties. That is what we claim. We do not want to force our company on the white workers. The white workers are at liberty to go to any place they like, but they must allow the Indians to do the same. Then the education of our people is neglected in every way. The Government of South Africa is spending far more money proportionately on the education of the white people than they spend upon the education of the Indians. Not only that, but the white population of South Africa is doing its very best to place restrictions and difficulties in the way of the development of the Indians. Their desire now is to drive the Indians out of South Africa, and I want this Conference to declare whether it is right for any white population to drive the Indians away from South Africa—whether the Indians in South Africa have not got the same right to live there as the white population. The white population went there in search of food; the Indians went there in search of food.

"There is one thing I want to make clear. Our friends in Palestine want emigration. Some of our leaders thought that we claimed the right to free emigration into South Africa and that that would increase the

difficulties of the people already settled there. Some of them wanted, and I think very foolishly, the right for the South African whites to control the emigration of Indians, because they were very anxious to improve the condition of the people who have already settled in South Africa, but, as I have told you, we have stopped emigration, and, as soon as they found they were free from emigration, the white people began to squeeze out the Indians who were already there. A Minister in South Africa has made it clear that he wants to get the Indian population reduced, that he wants to drive them out. I want this Conference to declare whether it is right for any South African Government to send away the children of the Indians who are already settled there. It is not voluntary repatriation, and, even if it was voluntary, you expect a Government to protect its subjects. These people have no interest in India now. Perhaps they have forgotten the Indian languages, and why should they be sent back, whether by repatriation or any other method? What is the justification? I would like Mr. Sampson to tell me that.

The justification they put forward is that of cheap competition. Now, cheap competition, I admit, is a serious problem. I expect my people not to exploit other workers, and, if their argument is only to stop cheap labour, I sympathise with it. But they will have to prove that, and to prove that they are not going beyond that. In South Africa, no doubt, the Indian labour is cheap, but I want to know this: If Indians have any right to live in South Africa it is the duty of the white workers to see that their standard of life is raised. Now, have they organised the Indians to see that Indian cheap labour does not compete with other workers? The Government of South Africa is passing a Minimum Wage Bill. If you want a minimum wage law, by all means have it. If your problem is going to be solved by that, then solve it. But, at the same time, if you have a large Indian population there who will suffer by that law you must organise them, educate them, and see that they do not suffer. But the white workers in South Africa want to restrict even the employment of Indians. If the white workers feel they are more efficient, well let them show that they are, but why restrict the employment of Indians? Now, the white workers go further and say that no Indian, no Asiatic, shall be employed on certain jobs. That is quite unjustifiable. The white worker in South Africa is not an ordinary worker. He hates ordinary work, and he refuses to do certain kinds of work. He calls his work skilled work. Well, the Indians have some skill, and if they are not skilled they will



not get the skilled work, but they claim their right to do the skilled work if they are able. As a matter of fact, the white worker in South Africa is not really a skilled worker. He is a sort of foreman, or supervisor, and he calls it skilled work, and he wants to prevent the Indian from competing with him. Well, as I have said, the Indians are citizens of South Africa, and they have every right to get any work they can under fair conditions, and no South African has a right to say that an Indian shall not be employed on a particular job.

I want this Conference to express its opinion as to whether it is right for a South African worker to restrict the employment of Indians, for that is being attempted at the present time. Fortunately the Bill was not passed by the Senate, but the British worker in South Africa has made common cause with the Dutch landlord to drive away the Indian worker, and I want a very definite expression of opinion from this Conference. Mr. Sampson may say that there is a danger of the white worker being swamped. Well, there is no danger of him being swamped by the Indians. As I have told you, there are 160,000 Indians, while the white people number about 1,500,000, or nearly ten times as many as the Indians. So there is no danger on that score. Then they say that if the Indian's right for political franchise is recognised, what about the natives? So, because they do not want to give political rights to the natives, they want to deprive the Indians of their political rights. Is that fair? There is no danger, especially as we have now stopped emigration from India. Under these conditions I want this Conference to express its opinion whether it is not right for the Legislature of South Africa to give political rights to the Indians, and also I want the South African Delegates to say whether it is not the duty of the South African Government to do everything in its power to educate the Indians, and whether it is not the duty of Mr. Sampson to organise the Indians there. I want to make an appeal to the British workers in regard to this point. If the British workers feel they have a responsibility, and if a section of the workers in South Africa do not realise their responsibility, the British workers should send out two or three people to organise the Indians in that country. Of course, you will ask me why I do not go. If it is possible I will go. (A voice: "You will not be admitted.") But even if I am admitted, you must remember that our Labour organisation is a very small one. Our Movement is a new Movement, and we have not the money with which to send the people out. It is not only my duty to organise them; it is equally yours.

Referring to the case of Kenya, to which

place his people were taken to construct roads and railways, and where they were suffering under great disabilities, Kenya, he said, was claimed as a white man's country, but he could not see on what principle the claim was based. While he might recognise the right to restrict emigration in South Africa, he did not recognise that right in regard to Kenya seeing that it was not, he claimed, a white man's country. There were other Colonies where the same things exist. British Guiana, Straits Settlements, and Mauritius, all have their Indian labour, and there are hardly any laws to protect the workers. In most of these Colonies there still exists a law which makes a breach of contract of service a criminal offence. In some Colonies this law has been repealed, but not in all. I want the British Labour Party to take an interest in this matter, and to do their best to get the conditions improved. Wages in every case are very low. In Ceylon a man gets 9 or 10 rupees a month, which is equal to less than £1, and in Malaya £1 10s, and there is no legislation for the working class. Now, it is your responsibility to do something for these Indians in all these Colonies. Try to educate them so that they may get some improvement in their conditions; try to organise them. Send out organisers to all these Colonies. Their right to live there is unchallengeable.

Mr. JOSHI then referred to the position of Indians in other Colonies, and, speaking of Canada, he said that perhaps they were not taken there as indentured labourers, but Indian labourers went to Canada and settled there. India was not sending any more emigrants to Canada. They recognised that Canada was a white man's land. It was not a white man's land once, but it was now. He did not want to go into past history. The Indians in Canada were very small in number, and they were certainly not a menace to Canadian workers, and therefore he claimed that they should be left alone. They were found almost exclusively in one portion of the Dominion only, namely, British Columbia, and he claimed they should be given the right of full citizenship. They had the vote in every part of the Dominion but British Columbia, and even the Labour Party in Canada was against this small number of Indians being enfranchised.

Mr. J. SIMPSON (Canada) I do not know of any Labour Party in Canada that adopts that attitude.

Mr. JOSHI I want that statement from you. Continuing, he said that these people who were settled in Canada should be allowed to bring their families there. It was the Labour Party that was standing in the way of the Indians. They might do what they liked with the

Japanese, but the Indians were quite deficient, because they were very small in number, and there were no more going. He then read a Paper in which it was stated that a prominent Leader of Labour in Toronto (Mr. James Simpson) had said that if the religious workers of Toronto were going to stand by the Indians, the organised workmen would fight the Churches. In Australia he said the number was also very small, and he thought the Labour Party there was sympathetic the question could be solved. He was informed that in the two Provinces where the Labour Party had a majority the Indians had civil rights. He claimed for his people the right of franchise in Australia.

In New Zealand the problem was also a very small one, but there was one small Colony of Fiji which had been developed entirely with Indian labour. The number was about 60,000, and the white population was very small. White workers did not go to Fiji. It was only white employers who went there. What had happened was this: the employers wanted further labour in order to exploit the labour already there, and therefore they had tried to get more labour from India, but it had been refused. The employers were therefore doing everything within their power to break the spirit of the Indian workers. They taxed them more than other people, and it was done simply to humiliate them. When these people tried to go on strike in order to improve their conditions, British soldiers—he did not know whether they came from New Zealand, Australia, or England—were called out against them, and, if they were told to shoot them, they had to do it. Indian workers had actually been shot down during a strike in Fiji. How long was this going to be tolerated by the Labour Parties, he asked? The British workers should understand their responsibility in this matter. Perhaps they were not in office or in power when the Indian workers were shot down in Fiji, but there was no protest from the British workers. There was a protest from the workers in New Zealand, and it was very much to their credit. It was quite impossible for his people in Fiji to live well, but they should be given the same rights as other people possessed. They should have their political rights and educational facilities.

The British Labour Party should send out men to the different Colonies to organise the Indian worker. Especially should they send men out to South Africa. Mr. Sampson had not attempted to organise the Indians. They, in India, would also do their best to send out organisers if the British Labour Party would secure for them the right to go there. A good deal

of the injustice done to his countrymen, he said, was based on prejudice. If they thought the white man was superior to the coloured man, they had no right to go to the coloured man's country. He knew white people who had settled in his Country, and if there had been any real prejudice there would not to-day be a mixed population, but there was a very large mixed population. There was no real prejudice, but simply a desire to exploit people's feelings in the interests of capitalism.

In conclusion, he said: We Asiatics, whom you call coloured people, are very proud of our colour, and we shall not enter into international relations with you if you claim superiority for your race. We are willing to enter your Movement on terms of equality, but if you claim superiority we are not willing to be international; we shall have a coloured people's international, and, if we cannot co-operate with you, we shall fight you. Therefore, if you want the international spirit to grow amongst the working class all over the world, it is better for you to give up this prejudice, for, as long as you do not, you will not get to our working class. It is really for your benefit. The coloured population of the world is much larger than the white population. The capitalist Governments of the world are keeping down the coloured people. You are going to break that capitalist system and take possession of these Governments, and then, if the benefits are to be big, you cannot get them by using bayonets against other people. There will be a time when you will be the Governments. What will you do then? You cannot ask the people whom you have put down to join hands with you. Give up this idea of racial superiority if you have got it, so that the coloured people of the world and you will be able to work hand in hand to co-operate in reaching the goal which is common to us all. In order that this problem should be discussed—and I want it to be discussed in a Committee—I will just put down a Resolution which you may pass or not pass as you like. I do not insist upon it being passed, but I thought if I put down a Resolution it would be better for our discussion when we resume on Friday. Therefore, I desire to put this Resolution before the Conference. I know there is a feeling amongst some people that we should not have many Resolutions.

“The Resolution I move is:—

“That this Conference is of opinion that

1. In any part of the British Commonwealth neither race nor colour should be a bar, whether directly or indirectly, to employment, whether skilled or unskilled, in any capacity

2 Neither race nor colour should be a bar, whether directly or indirectly, to the franchise, to membership of a legislature, or in the method of representation, and that the franchise should be based upon equal qualification with the common electoral roll

3. Neither race nor colour should be a bar, whether directly or indirectly, to the exercise of any legal right or privilege

4. Neither race nor colour should be a bar to admission to membership of a Trade Union or to the exercise of any of its rights or privileges

5 Wherever it prevails in the British Empire, and in whatever form, legal segregation should be abolished, but that native reserves and rights should be fully protected.

6 Wherever it prevails in the British Empire, all forms of compulsory or servile labour, including indentured labour, should be abolished "

I suggest that this Resolution should be sent to a Committee. I am sure the Committee will give it consideration, and some good will come out of it, if not in the form of the Resolution I have proposed, in some other way. I thank this Conference for giving me so much time.  
• (Cheers )

The CHAIRMAN said they would consider the question of taking the Resolution later. He wished to remind the Delegates that they were only here for a week, and half their time had already gone.

*Mr W WANLESS (South Africa).*

Mr W WANLESS (South Africa) said he was bound to admit that Mr Joshi had made a very able and full statement on the position of Indians, especially as far as South Africa was concerned. Of course, this was really an economic question in South Africa. Mr. Joshi had stated that the Indians were brought there after slavery, but he would point out that so far as Natal was concerned—where the Indian question was the large question—there had been no such thing as slavery. The South African Indian question was really a Natal question. It was to Natal that the Indians were brought under indenture. The farmers who held the land could not get the natives to work regularly, and for their own profit they imported, through the Legislature, Indians under indentures. The people of Natal were not considered in this matter at all. They had even tried to stop the Indians from coming in, but, of course, they had to bow to the Government, and, after the

first term of indentures was finished, the Indians got a free right to stay in the country. The position was becoming an economic one. The Indians were brought to work on the sugar plantations, but, after the indentures were finished, they began to get into all sorts of jobs. They had, in fact, found Natal to be a land of Paradise, and so they had stayed there. They had been trying to solve this question for many years because they had a very large native population, and another coloured race coming in had raised very great difficulties. The Indians were looked upon by the white people with anything but pleasant eyes, and there was growing up a very strong feeling that it was not good for the country, and all sorts of schemes had been suggested, even that of segregation. It had been found that the Indians could not live in harmony alongside the white people. The feeling was that in order to preserve white civilisation in Natal something should be done, if possible, to raise the standard of the Indian, and, if that was not possible, the white man would go down to the level of the Indian. The Indians lived on a very low standard, and no matter what money they made, it never seemed to affect that standard. The consequence was that the Indian, with his low standard of living, competed with the other workers. He wished to apologise for the absence of Mr. Sampson, who was one of the greatest enthusiasts in the Labour Movement of South Africa. He had been called away, but he might be back in time to take part in this discussion. He was not going to discuss Mr Joshi's figures. He gave the number of indentured labourers as 160,000, but in Natal it was a fact that they were now swamping the white population. There were more Indians than whites. They had Mauritius in front of them, which was a white colony, but it was now becoming absolutely black. This was an economic question, and something had got to be done. A good many people were of the opinion that they could not raise the Indian to the standard of the white man, and, if the white man went down to the standard of the Indian, it would help the capitalist to get cheap labour.

The Labour Party in South Africa looked upon the Indian Movement with very great sympathy, but this was a question of the preservation of the white race, and that was the reason for the legislation they were putting through Parliament. The Government had tried to induce the Indians to leave. They had offered them sums of money, even up to £50 a family, to induce them to go back to their own country. There had been quite a number of prominent Indians in South Africa who had taken up the cudgels, the latest being Mrs Naidu, a most intellectual lady who had created a very favourable im-

*Mr. W. Wanless (South Africa)]*

pression amongst the white people. It was a fact, however, that the white people looked upon the Indians as an absolute menace to their standard of life, a standard which no white man should be allowed to descend to. That was one of the reasons for introducing the Minimum Wage Bill, which was now before Parliament.

It was entirely a question for Natal, because, with the exception of about 20,000 who slipped into the Transvaal, there were very few Indians in other parts of the country. But, so far as Natal was concerned, the question was a very serious one, and unless something was done, and done quickly, the whole white population would be forced to leave, and it would become entirely an Indian province. They found that Indians were now buying property in Durban and other places, and, whenever an Indian bought property, the man next door rushed off to sell his property, with the result that it depreciated in value. The rapid rate at which land and property was being bought up by the Indians would be realised when he told them that they now owned practically about one-third of the town of Durban. The question had come to this. There was great enmity existing between the two peoples. There were Indian boys growing up, and white boys growing up, and they would not speak to one another, and, if this was going to continue, it would lead to very serious results. The question had been talked about for such a long time that they now felt something should be done. He suggested that it would be a very good thing if a conference could be held between the delegates from India and the delegates from South Africa in order to thrash the question out. The Labour Party of South Africa was very sympathetic towards the Indian as an Indian, but they were faced with a very serious economic problem. No one would deny that the Indians were entitled to equal rights. There was one town in Natal where there were more Indians than whites, and they practically dominated the Council, although they had not a representative on it. White South African boys and girls were leaving schools in large numbers, and it was impossible to find work for them. The thing was getting so bad, and white men were being undercut by cheap labour to such an extent that they were leaving South Africa and going to other lands. White immigration had practically ceased. He was not going to weary the conference with a long statement of facts and figures, but that was the position so far as Natal was concerned.

*Mr. J. SIMPSON (Canada).*

Mr J. SIMPSON (Canada) said he wished, first of all, to congratulate Mr.

Joshi on the very fine spirit in which he had discussed this and other questions at the Conference. His quotation, however, from the periodical required some little explanation on his part. He had therefore risen to make an explanation which would, perhaps, qualify the position so far as Canada was concerned. A large portion of Canada had never been seriously affected by what was called the Indian problem. It was practically confined to the Province of British Columbia. The workers of British Columbia were at one time in a great state of alarm on account of the thousands of Indians that were being brought into Canada through the Pacific ports, and naturally it was brought to the attention of the Trades and Labour Council, and, as soon as they represented the problem as an economic one, it received a very sympathetic hearing from the delegates from other parts of Canada. The argument was advanced that it seemed entirely unfair and un-British to prohibit the Indians from coming into Canada inasmuch as India was open to the missionaries and others sent out by the Churches. Some of the religious leaders were trying to discuss the problem from the standpoint of their denominations, and refused to discuss it from the social point of view at all. They were debating the question in Toronto at the Trades and Labour Council, and he stated there that that was the only point of view that they, as a Labour organisation, should approach it from, and for this reason: that the religionists—and with this his friend would entirely agree—believed that in sending out missionaries they were lifting the heathen people out of darkness into the glorious light of the Christian religion. They were not inclined to discuss it from that point of view, and he had said that if they were not going to take it from the social point of view, then they (the workers) would have to discuss it from the purely economic and social point of view, and that not with any idea of race prejudice, for everyone knew that if there was a country that had opened its door to the coloured man it was Canada. He always felt it was a refuge when he was being chased by the slaveowner of the United States. In the City of Toronto they had a large number of coloured people, and he, personally, did not know what it was to have what was called race prejudice. It was simply that the British Columbia workers felt that the Indians coming in in such large numbers would undermine their standard of living. He pointed out in the discussion at Toronto that, so far as they were concerned, if other people were going to discuss it as a religious question, they (the workers) would oppose that point of view and compel them to come down and discuss it as a social problem.

He wished to say that as an official of the Labour Movement he was not entirely independent in his mental attitude. He was the servant of the Movement he represented, and, if the Movement took up a certain position, he had to carry out their desires. This question was that of the British Columbia workers bringing their case before the Trades and Labour Congress in Canada and taking up that position as a security for the social standards. Mr. Joshi had called their attention to the fact that although Indian emigration had ceased, there were still 3,000 Indians in British Columbia who were disfranchised. In regard to that, he and his colleagues would go back to Canada and do their part towards seeing that they were given the same voice as every other citizen. If the different races got together more and more as they were doing in this Conference they would have a broader view which could not but result in a better understanding of each other. All he could say was that if the Indians in British Columbia in any way approximated to the Indians in this Conference, they were entitled not only to the franchise, but to all the citizen rights enjoyed by every citizen of Canada, and, as representatives of the workers, they would do their best to see they got them.

*Mr CHAMAN LALL, M L A (India)*

Mr CHAMAN LALL (India) congratulated Mr. Simpson and the Movement he represented on the statement he had just made. It was in the minds of all of them who represented India and the subject races that the day of the complete success of the British Empire Labour Movement was not far distant if the attitude Mr. Simpson adopted was the attitude of the representatives of every Colony of the British Empire. But there was a great difference between the statement made by Mr. Simpson and that made by Mr. Wanless. Mr. Simpson had said that he was going back to work in his country to bring about the state of affairs which the Indian delegates desired on behalf of their countrymen, but what had Mr. Wanless said? He had started off by making a few stray excuses why the South African Labour Party could not live up to those Socialist principles which he flaunted in the face of the people. He had said that the economic level of the Indian was such that the white workers had to protect themselves. Was that correct? He (Mr. Lall) had read not long ago of a strike in one of the hotels at the Cape where the Europeans went in when the Indians would not work. It was very strange if the Indians were working at very low wages that they had been able to buy such a large amount of property as Mr. Wanless had told them of. And he had also said that property went down in value as a result. Surely the two state-

ments were contradictory. Here was a statement made by Dr. Norman Leys which gave the direct lie to this propaganda in South Africa. Dr. Norman Leys said "European immigration has not filled and cannot fill the spaces in Africa left empty by the slave wars and by the kind of exploration which since slavery was abolished has prevailed in the French and Belgian Congo, as well as in Kenya. Indian immigration could fill these empty spaces. Also, our Empire contains immense scantily populated areas in Canada and Australia which Asiatics may not enter. Second, it is necessary to warn the reader against the usual explanation of the state of mind prevailing among people of British descent in the Colonies. It is often said to be economic in nature. It is urged that an Asiatic or an African can subsist on far less than a European, who would thus, under free racial competition, be crushed out. That is not true. The quantities and ingredients of food necessary to health are identical among Europeans, Asiatics and Africans. There are millions subsisting in European cities to-day on less than the inhabitants of the more prosperous parts of Africa get to eat. Race feeling furthermore is never so fierce as when the race formerly content with inferior conditions of life demands food and wages as good as those enjoyed by Europeans."

That was the real crux of the matter. The Indians in South Africa were demanding human rights, and they were being denied them. Mr. Wanless had stated that in a particular part of Natal the Indians refused to vote, and sent a European to represent them. In that, he contended, they were quite right; they did not believe in racial prejudice. Mr. Wanless had further said that they wanted to save white civilisation, but was this white civilisation? Indians went out to Natal under the indentured labour system in order to save Natal from bankruptcy. Mr. Wanless to-day had spoken, not the language of the Labour Movement, but the language of the capitalist. He (Mr. Lall) was here to tell them they had no bitterness in their hearts. They merely took their stand upon a principle. They were fighting a great fight for freedom, and that fight could not be won unless the South Africans and others got rid of their class mentality. It was not the mentality of the vested interest or privileged class that they wanted, but the mentality that would help the down-trodden and oppressed workers throughout the world. Mr. Wanless had said that the Indians in Natal were swamping the white population, but in answer to that he would point out that during the last ten years the Europeans in Natal had increased by 40 per cent. while the Indians had only in-

*Mr Chaman Lall, M.L.A. (India)*

creased by 5 per cent ; and the Europeans had had free immigration, whereas the Indians had not. Therefore, there was no question of swamping. They had been told that it was only a question of self-preservation, and it was stated that in the Free State they had no Indian question. And yet, did they not have an economic question in the Free State? Of course they had. He claimed that it was not the economic question that was preventing the Indians getting their rights, it was not the question of living under low conditions, but it was really the bias of class mentality which was doing it. In

conclusion, he asked the Conference to join with them in their desire to help the oppressed, and to take its stand upon the only principle that was consistent, the principle of the brotherhood of man

#### COMMISSION.

The CHAIRMAN said that Mr Joshi had suggested that his Resolution should be referred to the Commission, and he wished to know whether that was the opinion of the Conference or not. ("Hear, hear")

It was then decided that the Resolution be referred to the Commission

The Conference then adjourned

### FOURTH SESSION.

*Thursday, July 30, 1925.*

Mr. J. SIMPSON (Canada) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, said: "Comrades, I think a word of explanation is necessary before we commence our deliberations this morning. The strike, or the anticipated lock-out, is commanding the attention of the Trade Union section of our representation this morning to such an extent that it is affecting our early attendance, and considering the magnitude and importance of that situation I am sure we can excuse the delegates who are absent, and who otherwise would be here. Looking over the delegates we see that there is either a partial or a full representation of the various parts of the British Empire present.

"I wish to say that I fully appreciate the honour which has been extended to me as representing Canada. I take it more as an honour conferred upon the Canadian Delegation than as a personal honour. Our delegation consists of four. We are working together in the best interests of the country we represent and in the best interests of the movement which this Conference represents, and therefore I do not wish to accept any honour conferred on me as a personal one.

"There are one or two observations I wish to make as your Chairman, following the precedent established by previous chairmen, in order that the delegates from the various parts of the Empire may understand that Canada, with other parts of the Empire, is making a distinct contribution to the general progress of humanity and the progress of the Labour Party in different parts of the world.

"One thing has impressed itself upon my mind, and that is that a Government in Great Britain is a very different thing from a Government in any Dominion of the British Empire. The complexity of the problems which have to be dealt with by this Government is something which is unknown in the Dominion of Canada, inasmuch as we are more concerned with the affairs of the Dominion, the development of its natural resources, the social and economic well-being of its people, while the Government here is concerned with all the problems which have to do with the Governments of all parts of the British Empire, and particularly the Crown Colonies, the Protectorates, and the Mandated Territories—something we hear nothing about in the administration of affairs in Canada. I have been tremendously impressed with the difficulties that the Labour Government must have had to contend against in endeavouring, with 191 members out of 600, to govern the British Empire, and I am sure it must influence even the most exacting to be very tolerant and considerate with any Labour Government that is trying to meet the various problems of different parts of the Empire and to satisfy the thousand and one demands which are made for adjustments and changes in order to improve the conditions of the various peoples.

" This morning we are going to listen to a presentation of the virtues of the Protocol. Now we have a certain mental attitude in Canada. I am speaking more particularly of the working class of Canada, because I want to make it clear that I have a recollection of England, as being born here and living here for 14 years, and therefore I am interested in the political development of the Mother County, and very early I learned to discriminate as between British Empire and Dominion affairs and to learn that the aspirations of each were entirely different. Therefore when I am speaking of Canada in this particular, I am trying to interpret the desires of the working class of Canada. We are interested in the efforts that are being made by the representatives of the different countries in arriving at a basis whereby the disputes which arise between nations in the future can be settled by a better method than a resort to arms. The idea of peace is very deeply imbedded in the Canadian mind, inasmuch as we have lived for more than 100 years in peace with another nation with simply a boundary line between the two. The idea of peace, therefore, is something which is prominent in the minds of our people, and the discussion of this subject this morning will be of tremendous interest to us. We are not after all, as closely in touch with the Conferences and Conventions which are held from time to time to deal with this very important problem as you are, and I am satisfied that there is a feeling in Canada that we do not want, if at all possible, to be involved in the embitterments and jealousies which arise in Europe and other countries of the world from national aspirations or economic demands. Our desire is to make a distinct contribution to the social and economic betterment of the working people of all countries of the world.

" I want to dwell for a moment on one of the distinct contributions Canada has made to world progress. Since we have been here—and indeed before we came here—we have been interested in the fact that the workers of Great Britain are reaching out towards the nationalisation of mines and railways, and a greater measure of the effective ownership of the means of life. Within the last decade Canada has made one of the greatest contributions to that particular problem of any country of the world outside Russia. Our 27,000 miles of railway system has been taken over by the Government of Canada out of the hands of private owners, they having made a complete fiasco of it after the Canadian Government had been most generous in money grants, land grants, and guarantees. The taking over of that great system, valued at one billion eight hundred and fifty millions of dollars, is one of the greatest steps in the way of Government ownership taken by any country of the world. In addition to that, the use of the water powers of Canada to develop electricity is a very distinct contribution to Government ownership. In Ontario to-day we have one of the greatest hydro-electric plants in the world—regarded by many as the greatest. Let me give you very briefly some particulars.

" In Ontario scores of municipalities have come together to assist our provincial government in the development and transmission of electrical energy to be distributed to the people of the various towns, cities and country areas of the province, and so successful has that co-operation been that over half the population of Ontario is now served by that great hydro-electric system. Its estimated value is 250,000,000 dollars, and up to the present time it has not cost the people one cent. The municipalities guaranteed the bonds that were issued for its construction, and the provincial government issued and sold the bonds. The municipalities are responsible for the distribution of power. The private corporations with which the hydro-electric system was competing went round to all the large power users, and obtained five years' contracts from them in order to prevent, if possible, the success of our undertaking. Therefore the provincial government stepped in and by legislation exempted the municipalities from the payment of interest for a period of five years. At the end of the five years the hydro-electric system was so successful, the exploitation of that field was so successful, that the large power users realised it was to their interests to come into the system, and the private corporations were glad to get out of the business. The result is that to-day we have practically the monopoly of the electrical energy of the province of Ontario, and their revenues have been

sufficient to meet the sinking fund and interest, and provide for the five years' interest that was exempt. To-day we have that particular plant, and in less than 30 years from the time it was started that 250,000,000 dollar plant will be the property of the people, and it is increasing in value. I am a resident of the City of Toronto and occupy an 8-roomed house. We have 30 lights, electrical power for ironing, sweeping, opening the door, an electric bed-warmer, and various other things, and I pay \$1.85 for two months' electric energy. We are getting power for less than ½d. per kilowatt hour. Sixty-eight municipalities in Canada are to-day owning one or more of these great municipal undertakings. Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba own their telephone systems, and in Manitoba the City of Winnipeg has one of the most up-to-date hydro-electric plants in existence. The City of Toronto has this unique distinction. The lifetime of an individual is divided into eight hours' work, eight hours' sleep, and so on, and to-day over 100,000 children of Toronto attend the school, their education is provided by the municipality, their play is organised by the municipality, and by the time the child reaches 16 years of age he is entirely socialised. In addition, the hydro-electric system and the 35 public services of Toronto controlled by the municipality means that a large slice of that eight hours of work has been taken away. That gives you some idea of the progress we are making in taking over the great public services of our country. I may say that the province of Quebec is the most backward in the way of public ownership. In New Brunswick they have a hydro-electric system similar to that in Manitoba, and the same thing applies to Nova Scotia.

"I want to say this in closing, that so far as Canada is concerned, as a part of the British Empire, there is a very significant development going on in regard to the investment of money. After all we are interested in investment in our capitalist system because it means the development of our natural resources, and the extent of employment for our men and women. There has been a tremendous drift of investments from the United States instead of from Great Britain. Whereas in former years investments from Great Britain used to overshadow investments from the United States, the opposite is the case to-day, and the United States is absorbing Canada from an economic point of view to a far greater extent than is Great Britain. Possibly that is because of certain happenings in connection with Canadian enterprises. The Grand Trunk shareholders of Britain, for instance, felt that they were not dealt fairly with. But now people are beginning to discriminate and to realise that Canada is a safe place for the investment of money. The currency question was also a factor against the investment of money.

"I want to say that I fully appreciate the position I occupy this morning, and I have made these remarks as showing the interest we have in world progress, and what our contribution has been to some phases of Labour progress." (Cheers.)

## PROTOCOL OF GENEVA FOR THE PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES.

*Mr A HENDERSON, M.P. (Great Britain)]*

The Rt. Hon. ARTHUR HENDERSON, M.P. (Great Britain), in introducing this subject, said: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates, the subject which I have to introduce is the Protocol of Geneva for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes. In considering this subject, it is essentially important to keep in mind not only the purpose of the Protocol, but the conditions out of which the instrument was forged. May I remind the Conference that for ten years the world has lived under the domination of war passions and

militarist mentality, that a profound sense of revealed insecurity continues to influence the minds of the peoples of several European countries, causing great apprehension of danger. Other factors in creating a vast amount of unrest are: (1) the appalling loss of human life, treasure, and material which the world-war entailed, and (2) the failure to secure a just and a permanent peace, which has caused some communities to regard the question of national security, not only as of paramount importance, but as a matter of life and death. Then, sir, these apprehensions have been increased by the fact that



the world has inherited a legacy of war problems, which have been intensified by vacillation on one hand, and the violation of the principles of international justice and co-operation on the other. These apprehensions have been further intensified by the knowledge that militarism continues to be a dynamic force in the world, and that the militarist mind thinks only in terms of armaments and military alliances. Another disturbing factor is the knowledge that the world's fighting forces are represented by six million men under arms, whose maintenance and equipment impose an intolerable economic burden upon the respective peoples. These things must be appreciated if we would profitably consider machinery for stabilising world peace. Now, Labour's policy in every part of the British Commonwealth, I take it, is pacific in its character. We all believe in the international solidarity of peoples and co-operation with all other nations, as opposed to a continuance of fear and factions of hatred and hostility, of competition and chaos.

May I now ask the delegates to consider the actual situation with which we were confronted last September at Geneva? There was a scheme upon which the members of the League had been working to deal with the problems of armaments. The Covenant of the League clearly laid it down, in Article 8, that "the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations." It was recognised by the First Assembly that the economic difficulties in which Europe was involved made it everywhere necessary to lighten the terrible burden of armaments on the existing scale. But it was also realised, no less clearly, that it was impossible to reduce armaments without dealing with the problem of national security. There was a desire to reduce armaments. Reduction had indeed begun. But the process could not be carried further until measures had been taken to ensure the safety of nations by some form of common action. Thus, at the Fourth Assembly, it was decided to deal with the question of reducing armaments from the point of view of providing, first a guarantee which individual nations could accept as adequate that they would be safeguarded against attack, or if attacked would provide them with the help they were entitled to receive in resisting aggression. It was, therefore, proposed to put forward the draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance.

There was much to be said for this scheme, in default of a better plan. Eighteen Governments approved the Treaty of Mutual Assistance in principle.

But it was felt — and by none more strongly than by the British Labour Government — that the draft Treaty had some very serious defects. We felt that it did not promise that immediate and almost automatic execution of the Covenant pledge to reduce armaments. The Treaty offered guarantees of national security, but they were guarantees that in a certain sense reposed upon armaments. It did not, in our opinion, inaugurate the new era in which reliance could be made, not on force, not on military arrangements, not on pacts and alliances of a military character, but on the moral solidarity of the nations, and on the extension of arbitration and international law as a method of settling international disputes, as disputes between individuals are settled in civilised society. The British Labour Government felt in particular, that the Treaty of Mutual Assistance was conceived in the old atmosphere in which partial alliances of an ostensibly defensive character were made. We feared that it would lead back to the old world, in which one group of armed Powers faced another group in hostility and suspicion. We believed that the political tension thus caused would lead in the long run to an intensification of armament competition, precisely as the old Balance of Power diplomacy had done. Emphasis would be placed once more on the idea that war was possible, instead of upon the idea that peace must be maintained. The Treaty, in our view, would lull the nations into a false sense of security, security of a military kind. What we want to give the nations is the sense of security that comes from the knowledge that reason, justice, and international law are regnant in international affairs. In the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance we felt that the emphasis was too much upon the need of preparing against possible war, instead of upon the importance of organising the world for peace.

If the work done at the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations is examined, it will be found that the British representatives faced with deliberation and determination the world situation which I have briefly described. It was on their lead that the first deliberate step was taken to secure a departure from militarist conceptions of what constitute national security. They induced the representatives of 54 Governments to face the problem of organising the world for peace on a moral rather than a militarist basis with the same conscious intention as they formerly organised for war. The Protocol treats war as an international crime, and seeks by means of arbitration, security and disarmament to eliminate the danger of conflict so as to maintain universal peace. The Protocol recognises that

*Mr. A. Henderson, M.P. (Great Britain)]*

States are unwilling to agree to any satisfactory scheme of reduction of armaments without some measure of effective security. The Protocol endeavours, therefore, to ensure the application of the greatest measure of conciliation and arbitration to international disputes with a view to their pacific and just settlement. The Protocol lays down in precise and specific terms a set of concrete proposals, a definite plan for maintaining the peace of the world.

What, may I ask, is the purpose of the Protocol? It is "to settle by pacific means all disputes which may arise between States." The Protocol embodies, therefore, a system of arbitration from which no international dispute, whether juridical or political, can escape. It lays down as a fundamental condition of international intercourse that all disputes shall be settled by pacific methods. It defines and prescribes the sanctions which may be applied against any State which fails to observe its obligations. It states the criteria for deciding which is a Covenant-breaking State. The Protocol embodies recognition of the fact that as there can be no disarmament without security and arbitration, so there can be no security or arbitration without disarmament. The Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes is an instrument which makes reason, justice and law—not force and the might of armaments—our first line of approach in disposing of the differences between nations. This instrument represents a practical, a realistic development of the moral principles contained in the Covenant of the League of Nations and applies them to the concrete problems involved in the relationships of nations. We endeavoured in the 21 clauses of the Protocol to close every avenue by which one nation might make aggressive war upon another nation, without incurring the moral condemnation of the whole community of nations. The Protocol embodies the true sanctions of peace and constitutes the first definite recognition of the fact that peace is more than the mere absence of war, more than a cessation of strife, that peace is a positive and not a negative condition.

The first principle of the Protocol is, therefore, Arbitration. The general application of this principle would provide a great measure of security by the elimination of the causes of dispute. Security is aimed at through the operation of the financial, economic, and, in the last resort, the military and naval sanctions provided. Provision is also made for a World Disarmament Conference which would have resulted in an immediate reduction of armaments, leading finally to disarmament, or only the retention of the minimum force necessary to execute the common will against any defined aggression.

Then the reduction of armaments is a part of the Protocol. The Protocol does not come into force until a World Conference for the reduction of Armaments has met and has adopted a general programme for the "reduction and limitation of armaments." This Conference will declare when the plan should be carried out. If the Council of the League declares that the plan has not been carried out by that date the Protocol becomes null and void. Three months before this Conference meets the Council must communicate to the Governments a draft programme of reduction. It was contemplated at Geneva that the Conference itself could meet on the 15th June, 1925, but the action of the new British Government resulted in delaying the deposit of ratifications and caused the delay in the calling of the Disarmament Conference. I repeat that the conditions of holding a Disarmament Conference were laid down very clearly to ensure that if there was no satisfactory plan for Disarmament—there was no Protocol. A majority of the members of the Council of the League and ten other States must deposit ratifications before the Conference is called. France has given the lead. At Geneva, they signed the Protocol itself and the Article agreeing to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent High Court of International Justice. Fourteen States have now signed the Protocol, and it has been ratified by Czechoslovakia. Twenty-two States have signed the Protocol relating to Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court. Great Britain has signed neither.

Moreover, the Protocol is the indispensable complement to the Covenant. If the plan of the Protocol does not come into force, there is a danger that the Covenant may fall into disuse, as States may tend to hold it in less and less respect. If States really believe in the Covenant, they will support the Protocol. If they oppose the Protocol, their adherence to the Covenant becomes suspect. Indeed, one writer has put the question: "If Great Britain opposes the Protocol, is it worth her while to remain in the League?" We have condemned partial Treaties. If we are against the Protocol and against partial Treaties, what is left? A policy of isolation, or British security resting only on the strength of the British Army and Navy, and, in the last resort, an exclusively British interpretation of our international rights. This is Imperialism. There is a curious impression abroad that to keep out of the Protocol is to keep out of war. If the Protocol does anything, it diminishes the chances of war; if not, we should not support it. When the chances of war are diminished for other States, they are diminished for Great Britain. If war takes place again along the Eastern or Western

frontier of Germany, or along the frontier of Russia from the Baltic to the Caucasus and the Black Sea, who is confident that Great Britain will not ultimately become involved? The experience of the last war is altogether against that presumption.

A number of objections have been raised to the Protocol. I cannot do more this morning than notice one or two of the most important. Take first the question of the revision of Treaties or the maintenance of the status quo. Now, apart from the Protocol, treaties may only be revised and new frontiers established by consent of all the parties to the treaty, with or without League conciliation, or by war. The effect of the Protocol is to declare that treaties may not be changed by war. Those who oppose the Protocol because of this must desire that the League of Nations should leave the door open for the revision of treaties by war. They must believe that war abolishes injustice. From our standpoint that position is untenable. The Protocol is not an instrument for changing treaties. Its object is the abolition of war. To discover how a treaty may be revised without the consent of all the contracting parties is a separate and different task. In time, the accumulated experience and wisdom of the League may find a way out of the difficulty. Art. 19 of the Covenant provides that "the Assembly may from time to time advise the reconsideration by members of the League of treaties which have become inapplicable, and consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world." After a League war the political independence and territorial integrity of an aggressor State will be respected (Art. 15). This is something gained. A "private war" for the redress of injustices is certain to add to them.

The next objection is one which will appeal to this Commonwealth Conference. It is the objection that the Protocol may lead to the break-up of the British Empire. Mr. Tom Johnston on Monday referred to the point that when Great Britain is at war, the Empire is also at war. Under the Constitution as it is, that is a fact of international law not created by the Protocol, and not altered by the Protocol. It is of the highest importance for the delegates from Overseas to notice that the different parts of the Empire are not under any obligation by the Protocol to co-operate in military operations. They may, or they may not, as they desire. Their "geographical situation" will protect the Dominions from even the consideration of any recommendation of the Council that they should co-operate with their forces on behalf of the League in a League war not involving their vital interests. If the matter is considered, the British vote on the Council,

which must be unanimous, can prevent it. It has been argued that when Britain is at war, the Dominions or outlying parts of the Empire may be attacked. The argument has its roots in the fallacy that the Protocol makes for more, not fewer wars. If that did happen, the other signatories to the Protocol would come to their assistance.

I now come to the objection as to the effect of the Protocol upon the relations of Japan and Australia. Japan demands that Australia shall accept Japanese immigrants against her will, Australia claims that the dispute arises out of a matter within its domestic jurisdiction. The Council is compelled to take the advice of the Permanent Court on this point. The decision of the Court would necessarily be in favour of Australia's contention, and the Council or the arbitrator must then confine themselves to registering this conclusion in their award. Sooner or later hostilities break out, owing to some frontier incident, to some form of reprisals, or to any other cause. As the Protocol at first stood, Japan would in this event automatically be declared the aggressor unless the League Council were unanimous in acquitting it of aggression. According to the text, as it now stands, that is to say, with the "Japanese Amendment," aggression would only be presumed against a State which, in the above circumstances, had failed to appeal to the Council or the Assembly (under Art. 11 of the Covenant) after the decision that the matter was one of domestic jurisdiction. In other words, Japan, despite the Court's decision, considers the matter as of such vital importance that she returns to the Council or the Assembly, asking for it to be dealt with under Art. 11 of the Covenant, which authorises the Assembly or the Council to deal with any question "which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends." Under Art. 11, the Council cannot arbitrate, but can only conciliate or recommend. The Council, therefore, tries to suggest a peaceful solution but it cannot impose one.

Mr. Chairman, as my final point, I would ask what is to be our attitude to the Protocol? In deciding our attitude to the Protocol, we must first consider whether we accept the Protocol in principle. The British are already committed to the principles of arbitration, security and disarmament by the speech of the Labour Prime Minister at Geneva. It must also be kept in mind that the Labour Government in its King's Speech before the dissolution said: "Following the close understanding reached between the British and French Delegations at Geneva, the Fifth Assembly of the League

*Mr. A Henderson, M.P. (Great Britain)*]

of Nations by formulating proposals for dealing with the problem of general arbitration and security has made an important advance on the road to the reduction of armaments. The issue of its discussions has been embodied in a Protocol which will be laid before Parliament as soon as possible, and which it is hoped will lead to the first practical measures for lightening the heavy burdens under which the nations are suffering."

Moreover, international decisions cannot be ignored. A special National Conference of the organisations affiliated to the Labour Party and the Trades Union Congress was held in London, on Friday, December 28th, 1917, to adopt a "Memorandum on War Aims," which may be quoted with special appropriateness: ". . . It demands, in addition, that it should be an essential part of the Treaty of Peace itself that there should be forthwith established a Super-National Authority or League of Nations, which should not only be adhered to by all the present belligerents, but which every other independent sovereign state in the world should be pressed to join; the immediate establishment by such League of Nations not only of an International High Court for the settlement of all disputes between states that are of justiciable nature, but also of appropriate machinery for prompt and effective mediation between states in issues that are not justiciable . . . and for a solemn agreement and pledge by all states that every issue between two or more of them shall be submitted for settlement as aforesaid, and that wherever necessary common cause will be made against any state or states by the use of any and every means at their disposal to enforce adherence to the terms of agreement and pledge." The point of this quotation is that it was agreed upon in 1917. It was only put into a Protocol in 1924, and seeing that the Labour Party came to this decision in 1917 it can be fairly well claimed that it is not only the author of the League of Nations, but the author of the idea that disputes between nations should be dealt with in the three-fold way that is incorporated in the 21 Articles of the Protocol.

I think perhaps I have occupied more time than I ought. I have not touched anything more than a fringe of this very great subject, but I hope I have said sufficient to induce the Delegates present to give the matter very serious consideration. I am not convinced that the principles of the Protocol have been killed by Mr. Chamberlain, and the more we can do in keeping the Protocol alive, the more we can insist upon this world-wide disarmament Conference being held, the

more will we be doing our duty in the interests of those thus Conference represents. (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN said that before any questions were asked he was sure the Conference would wish to hear something from Mr. Ramsay MacDonald.

*Mr. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P. (Great Britain).*

The Rt. Hon. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P. (Great Britain): I did not mean to take part just now. I wanted to hear some of you. But as the person who started it at Geneva I might say a word, and I shall try to be very brief. I am sorry I was not able to be here at the beginning of Mr. Henderson's statement, and if I cover the same ground you will excuse me. But I should like you to get—quite apart from the details of the Protocol, and quite apart from the arguments for or against it—I should like you to get the mental attitude of the Protocol, because, after all, that is the important thing. If we have the right mental attitude, then we can bargain with each other for this detail and the other detail. What I feel, and feel rather oppressively this morning, after the Debate in the House of Commons yesterday, is that the defeat of the Labour Government last year was the first stage in a new European War. They are going back to the old methods, the old apprehensions, the old ideas of security, the old ideas of how to maintain peace, and how to protect ourselves. Yesterday in the Debate I saw 1906, 1907, 1912, 1913 over again. "We are building not for aggression but as a means of insurance." How often have I heard that before the War, and there we are at it again. So far as yesterday's Debate was concerned, there might have been no war; the whole of the years from 1914 to 1918 might have been an absolute blank. Therefore, this morning I feel melancholy about European peace. The War will not come, perhaps, in our lifetime, but unless there is a change in the mental attitude shown yesterday that War is as inevitable as the War of 1914 became ten or twelve years before it happened.

What I had in mind, and what my colleagues had in mind, was this. Our first desire was to change the whole mental orientation of the League of Nations. We had all sorts of proposals for pacts, and every sort of thing, and what we went to Geneva for last September was to twist the whole thing round. Well, we did it. If we did nothing else we did that. As soon as that was done a document was agreed to by the Assembly of the League of Nations. We had two things then in mind. I will not say which was first or second as marking

priority, but there were two things which we held to be of equal importance. One was, that we should at once get the Empire—I am using the word in the same sense as I used it at the beginning of the Conference—we should at once get the Empire to understand exactly what we had done. We knew it could not be done by telegram or correspondence. What you have to do is to get your responsible men face to face, talk the whole thing over with them, and get them to understand the problem they are facing. If you read this document which I hold in my hand\* you will see that, with some excellent detailed criticism, the whole point of the Protocol has been missed by every Government that has sent in a message. There are some excellent points in it, but from the point of view of understanding the spirit and disposition and the elements of the problem, there is no gleam of illumination in this document. I do not blame them or criticise them. It can only be done by a face to face talk when the whole of the circumstances are explored. That we did with the representatives at Geneva, and the result was they went away understanding the problem, and on the whole—it would be very unfair to commit them—but on the whole as the result of our consultations, our explorations and explanations, I think I am doing them no injustice when I say that on the whole they went away feeling that this really was a substantial contribution to a problem they would like to solve in the interests of the Dominions themselves. But that Conference was never held. The whole thing has been dealt with in this imperfect way, and you are no farther advanced at the end of July in 1924 than you were at the end of July, 1923, in spite of the tremendous things that have happened in the interval.

The first thing you are up against when you are considering Protocols, or Pacts, or anything else, is security. You have got to accommodate yourself to that. You cannot get over it; you cannot get round it, you have got to face it—that European nations, whilst willing to submit to arbitration, still do not feel confident that when the Arbitrator's decision has been given it will be carried out. They do not feel confident that even if they themselves are going to play an absolutely straight game, whoever is going to be their enemy or opponent for the time being is going to play the same game. Therefore, they come and say: "We will submit to the court of arbitration all the crimes against international unity you have in your minds; we will begin to build upon that, but we do want you to give us this feeling of security, and when we have put it to the test, put

it into operation, and we are still attacked, that you will help us." Now, that is the thing. We may be pacifists, disarmament people, or anything you like, but, if you are dealing with European nations you have to face it. We faced it. Undoubtedly there are things here on which I have two attitudes. I do not like them at all. But, secondly, I do not believe they mean a brass farthing's worth of risk provided the spirit of the thing can be carried out. That is the risk that we took. I wish some of you would contribute, not words, phrases and ideas, but actual proposals which would enable us to get out of that difficulty. I cannot get out of it, and I do not believe you will get out of it. I believe what we must do when we return—if ever we do return—facing the problem of world peace—is to take that risk in such a way as to make it absolutely negligible. Give us 20 years. If we were younger, with 20 years' work I guarantee with a Labour Government here, and with Labour support in the Dominions, those paper risks would be made almost negligible. Until we can get people who will get up and face it, we will never be able to give you a guarantee of world peace. The point we have to drive at is this. We have to get the nations of Europe into the habit of arbitrating. That is the whole point, and I believe if we secure that, all your military sanctions will become museum specimens stuck in a book just like the Cromwellian helmet in someone's hall, or the Australian boomerang which you can see hanging on my wall. These clauses will be of the same value, and the same historic interest as my boomerang is to me when I cast my eyes upon it. What we have to get is the habit of arbitration, the judicial habit, the habit of reason, the habit of saying "I believe I am right, and my belief is so great that I will put it before any impartial tribunal, and I feel perfectly certain I will get justice." Once you get that into the minds of nations, then you can say "We will back you up; that does not amount to anything."

The other thing is this: the man working at these problems, apart from the man writing about them and laying down ideas about them, the difference between us to-day if we were actually a Cabinet at this moment—the difference between the men actually on the building with their coats off and their towels in their hands is this: these men have always to face the problem of what is to be done in the meantime. It is the carrying on during those uncertain years, when we cannot carry absolute principles, but where your mind and activities must be so alert that when you are mixing up-

\* Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes. Correspondence relating to the position of the Dominions London Cmd. 2458. Price 6d

*Mr J Ramsay MacDonald, M.P.*  
(Great Britain)

error with good you are doing it with a full knowledge of what you are doing, and in such a way that the good is coming forth through the harmonies put into it, and the error is going to be eliminated. That is the whole problem. In the meantime what are you going to do? If you solve that problem—and understand that is the problem of the Labour Government, or any other Government—you will all have to face it by and by, and I hope you will face it very soon—but that is the problem you will have to face as soon as you come in. You have to face it and overcome it, and, in facing it and overcoming it, you will get criticism, just as we have had during this Conference

Now, the other thing you have to remember is this—~~that~~ the only alternative to our Protocol is absolute cutting off ~~from~~ all international relations. This talk about a Pact. It is nothing at all. I am not going into it, it would take too long a time. But the only thing I would ask you to reflect upon is this. I brought out a part of the argument in the House of Commons when I said, "Your Pact guarantees the frontier on the West as it stands between France and Germany." "Now," I said, "you do not require to guarantee that; all you require to guarantee is an inch of that, one-eighth of an inch, one-quarter of one-eighth, and that is a door big enough for the whole forces of the European Countries to go through, because, the moment you get into trouble, the point that is guaranteed will naturally be assailed in order to bring in the whole of the Allies separate and individual." You know quite well that if you have a Trade Union guarantee, and you are in extremis, and you go out for a fight, it is not because you are devils but because you are men that you will use every weapon. If you had a railway truck which is declared to be sacred, and you wanted to bring it, you would see that the thing guaranteed would at once be brought into the fight. It is sheer folly for people calling themselves Statesmen to say: "We are only giving a nice little reasonable guarantee of this frontier, and over and above that we guarantee nothing at all." Sheer rubbish. Before you know where you are, you will be in a European war as you were in 1914. You cannot say: "This is Nation A., and this is Nation B." in Europe and treat them as quite separate, because Nation A. has its little alliances, its friends, its commitments, and Nation B. is exactly the same, and, if the conflict comes, it goes down at once. It is like a nervous impact. You have all the operations of your limited guarantee becoming at once a general guarantee. The Pact must either be a Protocol, or a military alliance of the old-fashioned, bland, absurd kind, leading to war. The advantage of the Protocol is

that you are going to secure yourself against the military risks. Everything that is done that is likely to put obligation under the Protocol into active operation must be done in the open. You must recognise no private and secret and individual policies of Nations A., B., or C. Everything that brings your Protocol into active operation must be something done in open conference like this. We secured that. Everything and anything that can bring the Protocol into operation must come before these public bodies with everyone present. That is not so under the Pact, and cannot be under the Pact.

The final point, and I mention it only, is this. The Protocol was not a separate instrument. It was united on the one hand to the Covenant of the League of Nations, but, still more important, it was united to an agreement still to be come to by a disarmament conference. You cannot separate them; they are all of a piece. I made that perfectly clear at Geneva. No nation is under any compulsion. I said: "We are going to unite these things. We may deal with one before the other, but no one can become an effective obligation until the others are settled." This agreement that we were then contemplating, which ultimately became the Protocol, contained arbitration, security, disarmament. When these three are settled they will all come into operation. I hope you who have come from abroad will go home and have this document, which is an official document—I am sorry it should be a sort of final statement up to date—and I hope you will criticise in a helpful and constructive way your own Government's position. I hope you will take with you the Protocol as we published it before we left office. I hope you will take one or two pamphlets which have been issued by the Labour Party, including certain speeches made in the House of Commons. I hope when you go home you will study these things, and, in so far as you are interested in general world peace, I hope you will try to help us to keep the spirit of the Protocol alive. Never imagine that Henderson, Parmoor, or myself, are prepared to say if this little thing is taken out of the text we will not be in favour of it, and do not make the mistake of assuming that we are heartily in favour of everything in the text, but take the view that the text as a whole is the best first draft you could get, that it was always subject to further negotiations, that you never can get an agreement without taking certain risks, and, when you weigh them up, ask yourselves is the scale one way or the other? That is the Protocol, and that was what was in our mind when we started in Geneva and when we got it through the Commissions that were appointed. (Cheers)

*Mr. T. JOHNSON, T.D. (Ireland).*

Mr T. JOHNSON (Ireland) said he wanted some guidance, not on the merits of the Protocol, which at the moment was in abeyance, but as to what attitude they should take up with their respective Governments in regard to the Pact; whether they should endeavour to frustrate it, or allow it to be entered into without opposition. That was a practical issue, and they would be very greatly helped if the discussion would lead them to a decision on the point. He thought it was true to say that if there was anything like universal condemnation on the part of the various Dominions the Pact would not become an accomplished fact.

*Mr. A. HENDERSON, M.P. (Great Britain).*

Mr HENDERSON (Great Britain), replying to the question, said that the Pact did not come within the scope of the subject he had to take charge of that morning, and he thought the best thing he could do in answering Mr. Johnson's question was to state the position which the British Parliamentary Labour Party National Executive and the General Council of the Trades Union Congress had reached as contained in the following Resolution: "The Parliamentary Labour Party considers that the proposed Pact of Security as set out in the White Paper, having regard to its limited scope, to its grave military commitments and undefined responsibilities, and its failure to make provision for a mutual and general reduction of armaments, is not calculated to secure Franco-German conciliation, or to stabilise European peace. It conforms more to the system of partial alliances against which the workers have so often protested, and is inconsistent with the spirit and ideals of the Covenant of the League of Nations to which this country adheres. The Party strongly urges the extension of the League to include Germany and Russia, and the setting up of an all-inclusive Pact of Security based on the principles of arbitration, security and disarmament as contemplated by the Geneva Protocol."

Mr. Johnson, he said, might say that that was not quite definite so far as the Pact itself was concerned, but they had not yet seen the Pact. When they discussed it in Parliament they only had it on the statement issued by the Government, by the correspondence which had taken place between Germany and the former allied nations. Even up till now he thought no actual document had been published. They were still negotiating, and they might go on for many months. That, however, was their general attitude. They feared it was intended by this Government to be a substitute for the Protocol, and, in their judgment, it was a very bad substitute.

*Mr. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P. (Great Britain).*

Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Great Britain) said that all that had been published up to now was the Parliamentary exchange of documents. As soon as the basis was settled, the Government would begin to draft an instrument, and this instrument would have to be presented to the Governments of the Dominions before it could be ratified. Then the Governments of the Dominions would have to decide whether they were going to be parties to the Pact or not. If they declined to be parties to the Pact, the Home Government would have to decide whether for the first time in the history of the Empire there was going to be partial obligations taken on by them without involving the whole constitutional obligations of the Dominions always to follow the orders of the Home Government. There was a tremendous issue involved in it, and he had that in mind when he made his opening statement at this Conference.

*Mr. T. JOHNSON, T.D. (Ireland).*

Mr JOHNSON (Ireland) said that if there was a general understanding that this was a proposal that should not be approved they might be able to influence their respective Governments, and he did not think the British Government would be anxious to proceed with it if there was going to be distinct opposition from the Colonies. If, in the course of the discussion, they could clarify their minds in such a way as to satisfy themselves that the Pact was a bad thing, then they could influence public opinion in their respective Countries.

*Mr. H. W. SAMPSON, M.L.A. (South Africa).*

Mr H. W. SAMPSON (South Africa) said that they felt a little overawed in the presence of the authors of the Protocol in expressing some simple thoughts that might be in their minds. He certainly had a feeling of diffidence in regard to the matter. They owed a great debt of gratitude to Mr. MacDonal and Mr Henderson, not only for what they had said here, but for the most excellent principles they had put on record in connection with the Fifth Assembly at Geneva. He was quite certain the arguments used there were unanswerable. He had a very vivid recollection of the day when they received news of the outbreak of War in Europe, and the Prime Minister of South Africa placing on the Notice Paper a resolution that they should give unconditional support to Great Britain. Their little Labour Party added a proviso: "Provided steps should be taken at the conclusion of the War to lay down machinery for the settlement of international disputes by arbitration." It was

*Mr. H. W. Sampson, M.L.A. (South Africa)*]

a very unpopular amendment, and was defeated, but that did not alter their view. That little proviso, which seemed so hopeless at that time, was seed sown in South Africa which had borne fruit.

He had not had the opportunity of testing public opinion in South Africa in regard to the Security Pact, the outlines of which had only been published since his departure, but he knew there was an adverse feeling to anything of that kind, and they would understand that if they bore in mind the component parts of the population of South Africa. They generally looked upon Great Britain as the aggressor in all international disputes, and the tendency certainly was not to side with Great Britain. He thought the proposals under the Security Pact must be brought out in strong relief, in South Africa when they considered what would be the position in that country if, say, France went to War with Holland. That must have created the impression that the proposals now before the world in regard to the Security Pact would not meet that situation, and was not complete for the purposes for which it was intended, and the tendency would be to look to something on the lines of the Protocol.

It might be asked why they had not paid greater attention to the Protocol when the idea was first mooted. The position was this. South Africa had a great many problems arising out of the War, and they had been more inclined to attend to their own "parish pump" than to international affairs. The consequence was that Great Britain was left to nurse the baby, and the greater problems arising out of the War were thrown into the lap of the British Government for them to solve. They were even willing to leave the representation of their affairs at Geneva in the hands of Lord Robert Cecil, contenting themselves with reading his reports, because he (Mr. Sampson) had no recollection of any general report reaching South Africa other than newspaper paragraphs in regard to these matters.

He did not think anyone in South Africa could state what were the outlying principles of the Protocol. He was speaking of the ordinary man in the street. But the Security Pact had brought the Protocol into relief, and when people studied the Security Pact and recognised its fundamental difficulties, and that it did not fill the bill in regard to what they wanted, there was a likelihood that they would turn back to the Protocol and make a more thorough examination of the document than they had ever done before. The discussion at this Conference, therefore, would be of very great use in its educational effect. The arguments which had been put before them seemed to him

to be unanswerable. He could see no other way for world peace than that contained in the Protocol. He recognised at the same time that there had been tremendous misrepresentation which had borne fruit, and which would have to be counteracted before any favourable opinion could be created in the Colonies. But there would have to be a change in the mentality of the people in some of the Colonies who would have to put their own separate national desires a little in the background in the interests of international peace. He thought, however, that it was possible to bring this about. He had noticed amongst the South Africans he had met over here that they were by no means keen on the Security Pact, and they were disposed to discuss the Protocol with less acrimony than formerly. So far as the representatives of South Africa in this Country were concerned, as soon as he got into touch with them in London he found there was a keen desire to get into touch with Mr. Henderson and Mr. MacDonald to know more about the Protocol and discuss the matter. He believed that they were making progress, although it seemed pretty hopeless a few weeks ago, towards the fulfilment of the good work which the Labour Government had set on foot. He was of opinion that if they allowed the Security Pact to go through without protest the people would get back into the old groove, and the Protocol would become more or less a matter of history. Therefore he thought the sooner they got to work and enlightened the various bodies in their different Countries as to the necessity of opposing the Security Pact, and supporting the Protocol, unless they had something better to put in its place, the more they would be helping on the world at large. He urged that line of action; that they should ask their Governments why the Protocol had been allowed to slip into the background, and unless they were able to bring forward a better plan for securing world peace, that they should give it their earnest support.

The CHAIRMAN said that Mr. Sampson had expressed what had been in the minds of many of them, that owing to London being the centre of government for the Empire they in the Colonies were ignorant, and were inclined to leave these things alone. He was satisfied that he knew a good deal more about some of these things than when he came into the Conference, while the Delegates, no doubt, knew something more about Canada than they did before.

*Mr. J. MACDONALD (Canada).*

Mr. J. MACDONALD (Canada) asked whether Mr. Henderson could tell them why France had ratified and endorsed the Protocol and Britain had endorsed the



Pact Was it because that Article 3 of the Protocol excluded from any possible arbitration the alteration of the present Treaties: in fact, maintained the *status quo*?

*Mr A. HENDERSON, M.P (Great Britain).*

Mr. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Great Britain) could not say that that was the opinion he had formed himself. The French representatives they had the privilege of working with at Geneva were exceedingly anxious to get a genuine instrument for the preservation of world peace. They may have magnified what he (Mr. Henderson) had described as revealed insecurity, but it was there, and they could not get away from it. He wished to point out that the Protocol did not make any change with regard to the revision of Treaties, and if they were going to argue against the Protocol merely because they thought boundaries had been wrongly set under the Treaty of Versailles, then the logic of that was, they were going to keep open the possibility of having those boundaries re-set as the result of War. Personally he was of opinion that War created more injustice than it removed. He could not associate himself with the idea that France was using the Protocol to stereotype existing boundaries.

*Mr. CHAMAN LALL, M L.A. (India)*

Mr CHAMAN LALL (India) asked whether Italy refused to consent to the Protocol on account of the Riffian trouble, and that Mr Chamberlain, when he went to Rome, had a discussion with M. Mussolini at which this Pact was discussed, and it was alleged that Italy's opposition was in view of what France was doing in Morocco. He wished to know if that was correct.

Mr. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Great Britain): I am in a position to say there is not a word of truth in it. It is sheer moonshine

A Delegate asked to what extent the British Navy, or the Australian Navy, would be placed under the control of the League of Nations if the Protocol were adopted.

*Mr A HENDERSON, M P. (Great Britain).*

Mr HENDERSON replied that the League of Nations had no control over the British Navy or Army, or the Army or Navy of any other country. He would read the actual words as to expecting each country to discharge the obligation into which it had entered. It was left to the Governments of the respective countries to decide what form of military assistance would be given in any particular case of aggression, and the extent of

that assistance. The clause read: "As soon as the Council has called upon the signatory States to apply sanctions, as provided in the last paragraph of Art. 10 of the present Protocol (That was 'The Council shall call upon the signatory States to apply forthwith against the aggressor the sanctions provided by Article 11 of the present Protocol, and any signatory State thus called upon shall thereupon be entitled to exercise the rights of a belligerent.')

The obligations of the said States, in regard to the sanctions of all kinds mentioned in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 16 of the Covenant, will immediately become operative in order that such sanctions may forthwith be employed against the aggressor. Those obligations shall be interpreted as obliging each of the signatory States to co-operate loyally and effectively in support of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and in resistance to any act of aggression, in the degree which its geographical position and its particular situation as regards armaments allow" They had to co-operate loyally and effectively, having regard to their geographical position and the measure of their military power

*Mr J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P (Great Britain).*

Mr RAMSAY MACDONALD said, in reply to a question by Mr Queen, that Egypt was at present outside the sphere of the League of Nations and therefore any question with Great Britain was regarded at the moment as an internal domestic matter. With regard to Italy and Greece, if Greece were the victim she would certainly have complained to the Council of the League of Nations, which would have set up the machinery provided for, and if, in the meantime, Italy had attacked Greece, Italy would have been declared the enemy of the whole of the League of Nations, and the sanctions would have come into operation

Mr QUEEN said it would not have prevented Great Britain making that attack on Egypt.

Mr. RAMSAY MACDONALD replied that it would not have prevented Great Britain dealing with Egypt. Referring again to Mr. Chaman Lall's question, he said that Mr Lall was evidently talking about the Protocol of Tanger. Italy had refused to sign the Protocol of Tanger.

*Mr. CHAMAN LALL, M L.A. (India).*

Mr. CHAMAN LALL said he did not want any impression to go abroad that he had mentioned this matter as in any way against the Labour Party. He wished to take the opportunity of saying that one of the finest effects Mr. MacDonald's Government and the Party produced in India

*Mr. Chaman Lall, M.L.A (India)*

was the result of his activities which had brought forth the Protocol. The reputation of the Labour Party throughout the world went up by leaps and bounds as the result of this courageous action taken by Mr. MacDonald. He thought the Labour Party when it lived in history would live as the protagonist of world peace on these lines, and the credit must naturally go to the Leader of that Party, Mr. MacDonald.

*Mr. T. JOHNSON, T.D. (Ireland)*

Mr. T. JOHNSON (Ireland), referring to Egypt, said that the question raised by Mr. Queen was a very important one as affecting the self-governing parts of the Empire as compared with the non-self-governing parts. The League of Nations, as he understood it, had got the habit of referring to the British Empire as Great Britain, and the Crown Colonies and Dependencies, and treating Canada, Australia, and Ireland, and other parts which were separately associated with the League of Nations, on their merits as units. While it might be correct to say that in the case of a dispute between Australia and Great Britain the parties would have the right to appeal to the League of Nations for a decision, that position had not yet been formally accepted by Great Britain. They were putting in queries as to whether that was the true state of things. Of course, in respect of the parts of the Empire which were not separately members of the League of Nations, as Mr. MacDonald had pointed out, it was an internal matter, but he wanted to emphasise the necessity for realising that the members of the League of Nations, even though they might be component parts of the British Empire, were entitled to all the protection and assistance and every right of membership which the League of Nations gave to other parts of the British Empire.

*Miss M. HEAGNEY (Australia).*

MISS M. HEAGNEY (Australia) said she was rather diffident about entering into this discussion, because she felt that so far as the Australian Labour Movement was concerned they took up an entirely negative attitude upon this question. They might say that was wrong, but it was a true statement of fact. With regard to the whole question of Australia and foreign affairs, the Government of Australia during the last few years had not adopted that attitude entirely, but the Labour Party as a whole had not developed a positive programme concerning foreign relations.

Mr. HENDERSON said he did not want to interrupt the speech, but was it not a fact that the Australian Labour Party had recently, on the initiation of Mr. Charlton, carried a resolution in favour of the Protocol?

MISS HEAGNEY did not think that was so. She had read very carefully through the last decisions of the Inter-State Conference and could find no reference to it. Mr. Charlton did give support to the Protocol in Geneva, and had spoken in favour of it since he had been back, but, so far as any foreign policy proposals were concerned, she thought she could show that they had not yet been thrashed out by the Australian Labour Party. It was her intention to place this matter very clearly before the Party, because she felt that they could no longer adopt a negative attitude. If Delegates would recall what she said the other day in dealing with the constitutional relations of the Australian Government with the British Government, they would remember she had told them that every resolution in their fighting platform was of a negative character—no Imperial Federation, and so forth. The same remark applied to the question of foreign relations. Referring particularly to the Protocol, she said she had been away when this question was brought forward, but she had carefully followed the Australian Press, and she had in her hand the binding document of the Commonwealth Labour Party—that was the decisions of the Federal Conference held last October—and she found no reference to it there, or, if it was there, she had overlooked it.

Delegates must remember that they had approached the question of foreign relations from a Labour standpoint, regarding the people in control of foreign affairs in Great Britain as opponents of Labour—Imperialists of a kind whose policies they did not and could not endorse. To begin with, she did not know whether the Australian Labour Party was prepared to commit the Australian people to fight even to preserve the *status quo* of the British Empire. There were all sorts of questions in the Protocol which had not yet been thrashed out, and she could only say in her contribution to this discussion that Australian Labour had not considered the Protocol in its full bearings, and she did not know how far Australian Labour people would support the commitments and obligations of the Protocol. They were moving very diffidently at the present time on the whole question of foreign policy. The Political Labour Party had developed during the last 25 years, and their ideas and general social attitude were not quite the same as that of Labour in Great Britain, and they had very little in common with the other British people who had been dealing with foreign policy. The Conference might say that it was wrong to stand aside, and that they ought to be prepared to take their place in world affairs, but the position so far as Australia was concerned was as stated.

X:98<sup>6</sup>3,3r  
CG.2  
239196

millowners. What for? So that frequently the self-same owners can have the means of establishing mills in Bombay, Calcutta and Cawnpore, in Shanghai, in Egypt, to carry on the same process of exploitation with the workers in those places, denying by that very act the workers of Lancashire the means of obtaining a livelihood.

Why, indeed, should any body of capitalists—being capitalists and thus being wholly concerned with getting the largest profits possible—be satisfied with, or worry about, small percentages obtained in this country, when undertakings in India and the other colonial countries can be made to yield 100 per cent., 150 per cent., and so on? British capital, the wealth wrung from the workers of Britain, has flown to those parts of the Empire where the raw material is immediately available, and where there is a plentiful supply of cheap labour. Millions of people, men and women, and even very little children—black, brown and yellow—who previously lived under primitive conditions, have been drawn into the industrial vortex, and have been transformed into wage earners in the modern capitalist sense. Thus it is that we have Indian miners working for sixpence a day; Indian cotton and jute workers getting about six shillings a week; “niggers” working for almost nothing—compelled to work to pay hut taxes—to the exclusion of the white workers, in the African mines; “subject” workers—Malays, Kanakas, Hindoos—tied to sugar plantations to indentured slavery—all exploited by British concerns. Right well and truly has it been said that the British Empire is one huge slave plantation of the British ruling class.

There are some who have talked about Empire development as a means of alleviating the unemployment in this country. In my opinion, the intensification of capitalist industrialism within the Empire will add to rather than lessen the evil of unemployment. Every new industrial concern you establish within the Empire—every additional thousand of Indians, Africans, or Pacific Islanders you draw into industry—you are adding to the world's competitive factors and making the chances of the workers of the Mother Country still more precarious.

The solution to the problems affecting us here in Britain and in the countries of the Empire does not lie that way. We must now realise that the economy of the world is now so highly developed, so technically efficient, and so extensive, that infinitely more can be produced than consumed under capitalism. The markets of the world are now overflowing with goods that cannot be purchased, and the means are available for enormously increasing the overflow. Every extension of capitalist industrialism—and capitalist industrialism is extending at a very rapid rate, both within and outside the Empire—establishing mills, factories, and workshops, building railways and sinking mines with feverish activity—adds to the capacity for increasing the overflow of output, while, at the same time, not increasing the powers of consumption to anything like the same degree. Such is the inevitable result of capitalist economy, with its creation of surplus value. And in that fact lies the fundamental crisis of capitalism to-day. That is the terrible irony of the present situation. Capitalism is stifled in its own fat, and is failing to function.

The solution to our pressing problems lies along an altogether different road, in my opinion. The time has come, when we have got to admit frankly the failure of capitalism, and to take steps to break the capitalist system, and reconstruct the world economy on an entirely new basis.

To do that it is necessary to develop a power capable of smashing capitalism and reconstructing society. The only conceivable power is the power of the organised working-class movement.

Even to make any headway at all in the present circumstances we must take steps to build up, to strengthen, and to make world-wide the organised working-class movement. We know, we talk of, and we pass resolutions about the terrible conditions of the workers of India, China, Egypt, and the other countries. All our talk, all our resolutions, will result in nothing unless they lead to the development of Trade Union organisation in those countries. Whenever the capitalist has gone, there must we go too, to carry on our organising and educational work, and to encourage resistance to capitalist oppression. If

the cotton mills of Bombay had been in London, there is no question but that the Textile Workers' Unions would have sent organisers along to organise the mill workers. Why have not the Textile Unions sent organisers to Bombay, Calcuttá, Cawnpore, to Southern China and Egypt? Why has not the M.F.G.B. sent organisers to India, where miners work for sixpence a day? How is it possible for coal produced in South Wales to compete with coal produced in India under such conditions?

It appears to me that the first steps towards stemming the tide of the industrial decline in this country, and the worsening of the conditions of the workers of Europe generally, is for the Trade Union Movement to establish a sanitary cordon of proper wages and working conditions round the world, in all countries of the world.

To do that even we need to have a real, live, aggressively vigorous Trade Union International. Only a Trade Union International—such as several of us have visualised for a long time, and have been consciously endeavouring to bring into being during the past twelve months—which is internationally a great combatant force, a world power, can be strong enough, big enough, to effect radical changes in the tragically depressed standards of the workers of the subject races, and to lead on from that to the conquest of power for the workers of the world. (Cheers.)

## REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE.

Before proceeding to consider the Report of the Committee, Mr. QUEEN (Canada) asked whether an extended report of the proceedings was going to be issued to the Delegates.

The SECRETARY said that he had arranged for a full report of the Conference to be taken by a professional reporter from the moment that the question was raised. The first day's report had been

taken by a member of their own staff, but for the other days a professional reporter had been engaged.

MISS M. HEAGNEY (Australia) wished to know whether they would have the opportunity of discussing the Agenda for the next Conference. She had two items she wished to bring up on behalf of Australia.

The SECRETARY replied that they would, of course, have to consider the question of future Conferences before this one closed.

## INDIAN LABOUR IN SOUTH AFRICA—REPORT OF COMMITTEE.

Mr. JAMES STEWART, M.P. (Britain), on behalf of Mr. Lansbury, presented the following Report of the Committee:—

“The Committee again considered the Resolution proposed by the Indian Delegates. The Committee is of opinion that no resolution on this subject should be passed at this Conference, but that the Secretary of the Conference should write to the Labour Parties and Trade Unions in South Africa and to the All-India Trades Union Congress informing them that the question of Indian Labour in South Africa had been discussed, and suggesting that the two Parties might arrange a special Conference between representatives of Labour in India and South Africa. It is understood that if no agreement is reached at such a special Conference the question will be raised for discussion at the next Conference of Labour Parties and Trades Unions of the British Commonwealth.”

*Mr. N. M. JOSHI, M.L.A. (India).*

Mr. N. M. JOSHI (India) said that when the last Report on this subject was presented to the Conference he reserved his statement, because he thought it was no use taking up the time twice over. While he was grateful for the little mercy the Conference was willing to show him regarding this subject, he wished to make it quite clear that he was not satisfied with what had been done. The Resolution which he proposed to the Conference was a very simple one. It was that whatever ground there might be for the policy in regard to employment, franchise, the necessity for segregation, mere colour, or mere race, should not be that ground. The question of depriving a man of his franchise, or employment, or segregating him, was a very simple one, and he did not say that there should not be educational qualifications for the franchise. They could put any number of qualifications they desired, but his

## SUBJECT PEOPLES—INDIAN LABOUR IN SOUTH AFRICA—REPORT OF COMMISSION.

Mr GEORGE LANSBURY, M.P.  
(Great Britain).

Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY (Great Britain), in submitting the Report of the Commission, said that there were three subjects which had been remitted to them. On the previous afternoon the full Committee had met from about 5 to 7 o'clock, and arrived at certain conclusions with regard to subject peoples, mandated territories, and Inter-Commonwealth Relations. But on the question raised by Mr Joshi in regard to Indians in Africa, they left the South African Delegates and Comrade Joshi as a small committee to continue the discussion in order to see if they could arrive at any conclusion. He believed they continued their discussions until 11 o'clock at night, and he regretted to say they had been unable to arrive at any conclusion, so that on that question of the Indians in South Africa the Commission was unable to report. He understood that all the Delegates had got copies of these Reports. With regard to "Subject Peoples (including Mandated Territories)," he begged the Delegates to remember that they were not being asked to pledge themselves except to put the questions contained in it to their constituent bodies. The Commission maintained the position that they had no authority to pledge anyone to anything, but they felt they had the right to put questions which they hoped the constituent bodies would reply to between now and the next Conference, so that they would be able to come to that Conference prepared to discuss them. The Report was as follows—

"The Conference, desiring to obtain the views of the various Labour Movements on the questions arising out of the presence of subject peoples in the British Empire, decides to request each organisation to send fully considered statements on the following questions to the Secretary of the Conference for communication to the other organisations and discussion by the next British Commonwealth Labour Conference: (1) Whether these peoples should be granted self-government immediately? (2) If not, how to apply our principle of political self-determination to these peoples? (3) How to prevent their economic exploitation, including the safeguards necessary to protect natives in the ownership and use of their land and the measures to be adopted to prevent slave labour or forced and indentured labour? (4) How to secure their surplus products for the consumption and use of other nations and maintain a satisfactory exchange of goods between them and the rest of the world? (5) Where

different races inhabit the same country, how all sections can be secured in peaceful existence and how the Labour Movement can assist to that end? (6) How the education of these peoples may best be promoted?"

He moved the adoption of that Report

Mr CHAMAN LALL said he took it thus referred to all subject peoples, but they had already unanimously passed a Resolution about India

Mr. LANSBURY said he thought, having already passed the Resolution referring to India, it would be understood that India was not included. The Committee would be quite willing to insert words to that effect

It was agreed to insert the words "excluding India."

Mr H. W. SAMPSON, M.L.A. (South Africa)

Mr. H. W. SAMPSON (South Africa) supported the acceptance of this Report. He had studied the items before them with a good deal of knowledge, and he thought they had brought out all the points upon which they would like information before settling down to study some declared policy which might be the declared policy of the Movement throughout the World for many years to come, and he would promise, for his part, to see the matter was placed in the hands of the most competent people who would give the fullest replies, and he thought the same obligation should be placed upon every other Delegate, without any idea of hiding the difficulties, but with the one object of assisting the Movement as a whole. He regretted very much that owing to a prior engagement he was prevented from being present on the previous day and hearing the discussion which took place. He had, however, no doubt heard it previously, and it was still fresh in his mind. He had also heard from his colleague a great deal about the complaints against the treatment of Indians in South Africa. He had also attended the meeting on the previous evening, and had attempted to advise his colleagues in regard to the matter, and had entered into an obligation which he was now going to fulfil. He wanted the Conference, in the first place, to understand that when it specifically picked out the condition of Indians in South Africa it was entering into an attempt to settle an old-standing difference between the two countries, Africa and India. In both countries—certainly in South Africa—the Indian question was a first-class political question, to which a great deal of attention

*Mr. H. W. Sampson, M.L.A. (South Africa)]*

was paid in Parliament, and by various political parties. He gathered, too, from what he had read in the newspapers that it was likewise a first-class political question in India, and, he believed, in other parts of the World, but more so between those two Countries.

Now, this Conference had been asked to go into that dispute and to express opinions upon it. In his opinion, it would be very unwise to do so until all the facts were in front of the Conference and Delegates were in a position to judge on the merits or demerits of this question which had been outstanding for half a century or more. Again, he wanted to impress upon the Conference that most of the Delegates present, he was quite sure, had no clear mandate on the question, nor did their organisations expect that they would, by means of a resolution, commit them to a policy. Therefore, his advice was rather to have a watching brief in the meantime and to study the problem further. That brought them to the point of what steps might be taken in the meantime perhaps to bring about agreement between the two countries chiefly concerned. He and his co-delegates discussed this at the Geneva Conference with Mr. Joshi and Mr. Chaman Lall, and they were agreed that, instead of bringing into the dispute all their aunts, cousins and brothers, they should first try to bring about some discussion between the parties. Former Conferences had brought about no settlement of the problem, in fact they had intensified it in the various countries. Speeches were made and ridicule poured forth in both countries, and, as a matter of fact, people who were not much concerned in it before were now quite inflamed. His idea was that some sort of semi-official or informal conversations might take place between persons of influence in both countries which would pave the way to better understanding, and possibly to a settlement of the thing. He had derived that idea from the fact that various well educated people from India had visited Africa in recent years, more especially Mrs. Naidu, and they had not been denied the right of discussion with any section of the community. They had met most of the political parties and discussed the question with them, and some progress had been made in the direction of concentrating thought on the problem without either side taking up the attitude that they were too proud to discuss it. He thought that had paved the way to what might be brought about.

He had been told on the previous night that approaches had been made by the Indian Government to the South African Government with respect to such discussions, but personally he was not aware

of it. Then it transpired that formal communications between Governments such as India and South Africa, India being a Dependency—though she was an Empire by name—had to go through the Imperial Government. Knowing the feeling that things that go through the Imperial Government had upon his people in South Africa he thought that would be a tremendous obstacle to the bringing about of what they had in view, namely, a conference between the representatives. Therefore, he thought the best method would be for the Indian Government to issue an invitation direct to the South African Government for a meeting of Delegates without any plenary powers—there being an obstacle to that—to meet and discuss these matters and report back to their various countries with a view to those countries, perhaps, ultimately devising some plenary conference. He undertook last night to do this, and his colleague was agreeable; to go back to the Labour Party—they had a minority in the South African Parliament, but they had some influence to-day which they never possessed before—and through their Conference to try to influence the Cabinet to agree to the proposal if it emanated from India with regard to these discussions being started. He said this as a token of goodwill towards their Indian friends, and because they knew the desire existing in the Labour Party in South Africa for a settlement. He hoped the Indian Delegates would be satisfied to know that if that Movement came from India they would give their most ready support to it, and endeavour to secure the co-operation of their comrades towards that end.

Mr. JOSHI said that before proceeding to make a few remarks in regard to what had fallen from Mr. Sampson, he wished to ask the Chairman of the Committee whether he considered any further discussion of his Resolution should take place, or whether he thought the failure of the Committee to arrive at a concrete resolution on the previous day had closed that matter in the Committee. If the Committee was not going to discuss the matter further, he wished to make a few remarks now.

Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY replied that of course the Committee could do as it liked. If the Committee met again and said they would take up the discussion amongst themselves, well and good, but on the previous afternoon they had decided that in their view a majority decision either in favour of Mr. Joshi's or Mr. Sampson's position would not carry them very far, for they would be imposing a majority decision on one side or the other on a question upon which some of them held very strong views. Therefore, they decided to

ask the two sides to meet together and see if they could bring a concrete recommendation to the Conference. They had not been able to do that. He could not say, as Chairman of the Committee, that he was going to rule out any further discussion, or that they should discuss it. It was a matter entirely for the Committee to decide.

Mr. JOSHI said that he wished to make a few remarks in the hope that the Committee might fall in with his suggestion.

At this point Mr. DUFFY rose and said that if the Committee was to meet again, as he understood they had explored all the avenues, would it not be better that the statement which Mr. Joshi proposed to make now was reserved?

The CHAIRMAN said it seemed to him before the Conference allowed this question to be discussed in the open the Committee should meet again.

("Agreed.")

Mr. SAMPSON suggested that the question at issue was this. Mr. Joshi desired some resolution expressing the views of the Conference on the Indian problem. He (Mr. Sampson) was against any such Resolution being passed, believing it would compromise the discussion they had in view, or, at least, that he had in view. The question they had to decide was whether there should be a Resolution from this Conference, and, if so, in what form, or, on the other hand, whether they should report that they did not think a Resolution should be passed?

Mr. J. MACDONALD (Canada) thought it should be impressed upon the Conference that the Committee was very reluctant to pass any Resolution. Only one Resolution had been passed at this Conference, and that was the Indian Resolution. He did not mind it going back again, but he thought the Conference should realise the difficulties.

Mr. CHAMAN LALL said that what they were doing would not pin any particular Labour Party down to any particular view. They would notice in the Indian Resolution they were merely recommending that such a course should be brought before the various Labour Parties. It was a recommendation they had to accept or reject. Now, the question raised was not merely a question relating to South Africa, but to the whole of the British Empire. Mr. Joshi was asking the Delegates to tie themselves down to a definite principle—equality for all Nationals within the British Empire. If they were not going to tie themselves down to Labour principles, if a Labour Conference was not prepared to accept Labour principles, they were merely talking shop and did not mean business, and at future Conference, they would probably find it very difficult to get people from different parts to come

simply to listen to beautiful speeches. He was grateful to his friend for the suggestion that a joint Conference should take place, but did Mr. Sampson realise the difficulties that he and his people were in? They had no hand in foreign policy, and if a Deputation came from India it would be a Deputation representing the vested interests, the capitalists, or the British Government. It would not be a Deputation representing the people of India. But, even so, what was there to discuss? All the facts were known. He considered that instead of going into all these details they merely wanted to affirm a principle.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that in Section 5 of the Report it was asked "Where different races inhabit the same country, how all sections can be secured in peaceful existence, and how the Labour Movement can assist to that end?" That particular clause was an endeavour to cover the position taken up by Mr. Joshi. Since the matter was in the hands of the Committee, and the Committee had referred it to the two most interested parties to come to some agreement, and they had not done so, to refer it back to the Committee would probably mean they would come back and say that that clause covered the situation.

Mr. LANSBURY said that it did not entirely cover it, because Mr. Joshi and Mr. Chaman Lall had asked for equality of position among States in all constituent parts of the British Dominions. That meant if an Indian came to this country his status would be the same as his (Mr. Lansbury's), and if he went to Canada or South Africa, it would be the same as the Canadian or South African.

Mr. J. MACDONALD (Canada) thought they should decide now whether they wanted a Resolution, and, if they were going to refer it to the Committee, give them instructions to draft a Resolution.

Mr. DUFFY said that that was not exactly the position. The matter had been referred to a Committee to report, and they had not reported.

Mr. LANSBURY. They have reported that they cannot agree.

Mr. DUFFY: Is that final?

Mr. LANSBURY. It was final up to 11 o'clock last night.

The CHAIRMAN said that in the opinion of the Chair as a matter of procedure the report of the Committee was not final. The Committee itself should bring in some definite recommendation and not a Subcommittee of the Committee.

Mr. J. Macdonald (Canada) moved that the matter be referred back to the Committee for the purpose of drafting a motion.

Mr. Queen seconded this Resolution.

*Mr. T. Johnson (Ireland)*

Mr. T. JOHNSON (Ireland) said that the Resolution of Mr Joshi was a general Resolution stating a principle for all races. It seemed to him, even at the beginning, that it was a mistake to pass the Indian Resolution, because they did not come here to vote on matters respecting political principles. If that had been the procedure contemplated he was sure the various elements would have sent in Resolutions, and then they might have been considered. Now, on Thursday, they were proposing to proceed with another Resolution on another matter which was being pressed upon them by their Indian comrades dealing with the position of various races in all parts of the World—not merely the British Empire. Nominally, the Labour Movement of the World was agreed upon it, but the nominal acceptance of the principle, when they came to consider particular applications caused splits and differences in all the Movements. If this Conference simply reaffirmed a general principle no good would be done, but probably a lot of harm. The motion was that they should direct the Committee to bring in a Resolution with the idea of putting someone in a corner, and he thought it would be detrimental to any good result that might come out of the Conference if they were going to submit from the Committee a Resolution affirming a general principle which would then be sent back to the parties that were represented here, and would arouse a good deal of internal conflict. He did not think that was going to be a valuable outcome of this Conference. If they began again to pass Resolutions at the instigation of their Indian comrades, having done so once to meet their earnest desires, it was an invitation to other elements to submit similar resolutions on matters in which they were particularly interested, and which would possibly cause splits in the respective Movements. He felt this was a wrong method to adopt, particularly at this time of the Conference. If they were going to do it, they should also bring forward Resolutions for finding solutions for unemployment, treatment of old age pensioners, and so on. They could bring forward Resolutions of a general character reaffirming general principles on these matters just as usefully, probably very much more usefully, than passing a Resolution on a general principle having the implication of "putting it up to" one particular Labour Party in the Commonwealth.

Mr CHAMAN LALL said he must point out that Mr. Johnson was preaching the doctrines preached by the Conservative Party. He had said that the Indian Delegates wanted this in order to serve their own interests. That was not so. They were serving the interests of the Labour Party.

Mr JOHNSON replied that he was not thinking of individuals, but speaking of national interests—of the interests of India as distinct from the interests of South Africa.

Mr CHAMAN LALL said that the interests of Indians in this question were the interests of humanity. Before Ireland got Home Rule he doubted very much whether Mr. Johnson would have spoken in the way he had done to-day. Here was an item in the Agenda, and the question was, had they the right to discuss that item or not? He claimed they had a right to discuss it. He supported the motion that it be referred back to the Committee.

Mr. W. WANLESS (South Africa) thought the Conference should be satisfied with paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Questionnaire. In South Africa they had a native problem, and the problem of another race coming in. Those were the very things that were contained in the Questionnaire. He could tell them that neither his co-Delegate, nor himself, could accept any Resolution on this question of the status of Indians in South Africa.

The Resolution to refer back was then put to the Conference, and carried by 5 votes to 2.

The CHAIRMAN said as it had now been decided to refer the matter back to the Committee, the Delegates must decide whether they wanted to give any definite instructions to bring in a Resolution.

Voting was taken on this matter, and it was decided by 5 votes to 2 against bringing in a Resolution.

Mr. Chaman Lall moved an amendment to Clause 5 of the Questionnaire, to insert the words "on terms of political equality" after the word "and" in the second line.

Mr SAMPSON hoped that would not be accepted. He said that the difference with the Indians on this question when they came down to it was purely political. The question of political equality was the whole thing, and it was not a question of the condition of the Indians in Natal at all. They wanted the votes equally with the whites in South Africa. He claimed that security, which was mentioned in the Questionnaire, was something more than political equality.

Mr CHAMAN LALL considered that if they were given equal political status they would be secure. Once they were given this right the rest would be with them. They were denying these people political rights, and he was fighting for those political rights. He moved the addition.

Miss HEAGNEY said that when the Chairman of the Committee read over the Report he said it would exclude India. They



had accepted the Resolution, and then there was an amendment adding something to it. She did not care which way they had it, but she thought the correct way was to have "excluding India" left out of the proposition, and they gave Mr Lall all that he wanted.

The CHAIRMAN said the point raised was that India should be excluded from this series of Resolutions, inasmuch as India had been dealt with, and the amendment submitted by Mr. Lall had some reference to the political rights of Indians and others in different parts of the British Empire. It seemed to him that the suggestion made by Mr. Lall did not necessarily conflict with the previous Resolution.

Mr. CHAMAN LALL said the position was this. They were not considering the Nationals of those countries in which they happened to be. In South Africa they were not Nationals. The first Resolution excluding India referred only to the territory known as the Continent of India.

The CHAIRMAN here pointed out that this was only a Questionnaire

Mr. MACDONALD (Canada) said he supported this Resolution, but he wished to make it clear that he thought they ought to strike out the first two sections of the Questionnaire. They had had some discussion on this matter on the previous day—whether these people should be granted self-government immediately. This was a Questionnaire, it was true, but it set forth a doubt as to whether these people were entitled to self-government. He held that they had the right of self-determination of their own destinies. It had been the platform of the Labour Party ever since he could remember—the right of people to say in which way they wished to be governed, and to control their own destinies so far as the right to vote was concerned.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether Mr. Macdonald thought that Canada should be exempt from answering this question, although the Conference might desire to get the information.

Mr. MACDONALD said it was up to Canada to answer or not. The point was, it had always been the other class that had said these people were not capable of governing themselves.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that they were not asking the other class to answer these questions; they were asking the Labour Parties to answer them. Did Mr Macdonald want to delete it?

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes, because it conveys the idea that even in the Labour Party there is a doubt as to whether they are fit for self-government

The CHAIRMAN: I submit that the question of the deletion of those two clauses is not before the Conference. The question is the amendment submitted by Mr. Lall.

Mr. MACDONALD. That is true, but I was discussing the deletion of these two clauses. I am of opinion they ought to be deleted, and that you should have a Questionnaire to which you can expect answers. The people in Manitoba will not waste two minutes in discussing whether these people should have self-government or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is that the words be added.

The Amendment was then put to the Conference and carried, and the Report as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LANSBURY then moved the following Report:—

#### " INTER - COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS.—POLITICAL.

" The Conference, desiring to obtain the views of the various Labour Movements on certain aspects of inter-Commonwealth political relations, including the position of States forming the British Commonwealth in relation to other States, decides to request each organisation to send fully considered statements on the following questions to the Secretary of the Conference for communication to the other organisations and discussion by the next British Commonwealth Conference. (1) How to reconcile the conception of equality of status between self-governing States, being members of the Commonwealth, with the requirements of Great Britain in respect to a unified foreign policy and in respect to naval, military, and aerial armaments? (2) How to reconcile the idea of a unified Commonwealth with the desire of the constituent units to be free from the consequence of automatic belligerency if the Crown on behalf of any one State (e.g., Great Britain) becomes involved in war? (3) Are you in favour of securing the inviolability from occupation by any belligerent of the territory of a self-governing unit within the British Commonwealth, when Great Britain is at war, and the Parliament of that State has declared that they are not involved in the war? "

Mr. CHAMAN LALL said he hoped they were including India.

Mr. LANSBURY replied that it included the nations within the Commonwealth. Until India had got self-government India could not declare neutrality about anything. It would be useless to put that in until India had secured self-government.

The Report was unanimously adopted. The Conference then adjourned.

## FIFTH SESSION.

Friday, July 31, 1925.

Mr. A. A. PURCELL, M.P., presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: As you are aware, important conferences are taking place in connection with the industrial trouble, and therefore I shall have to ask you to excuse me presently and appoint someone in my place. I am sure under the circumstances you will forgive me. I desire to say that I am sure that it is in one sense a pity this Conference is taking place this week in view of the other circumstances, but you will be glad to learn that most of us are very optimistic as to the position which affairs have got into in connection with the industrial trouble. I think most of my colleagues on the General Council view with extreme satisfaction the present developments. We are extremely hopeful, despite what is said in certain places, and I think it is rather good, perhaps, that you should be meeting here at a time, and particularly our Colonial colleagues, should be meeting here at a time when I think we are on the threshold of one of the biggest victories Trade Unionism has achieved in the last 25 years.

Colonel Vernon Willey, President of the Federation of British Industries, speaking at Leeds on July 14, said: "The figures of the Board of Trade for the past half year, which had just been published, showing an increase of only £4,000,000 in our exports while imports have grown by £79,000,000, were nothing short of alarming. . . . It was obvious that unemployment must increase . . . Industry in its precarious state was not satisfied that the Government appreciated its critical condition. We, as the premier manufacturing country, were feeling most acutely the world trade shrinkage."

Why are our exports so low? The reasons are to be found in the stupendous industrial development in India, China, South Africa, and the subject and colonial countries generally; and in the extension and intensification of industrial capitalism in Middle Europe—Germany, Austria, Hungary—and in America.

The Committee appointed under the Labour Government, presided over by Sir Arthur Balfour, to inquire into the reasons for the decline of British industry, in its recently published report gave as the principal cause: *The development of local manufacture in those countries to which we had previously been exporting goods.* In other words, the countries that have been importing countries are importing countries no longer. The markets we once had are markets no more as far as manufactures made in Britain are concerned. In some cases, the countries that used to be importing countries have so developed their industrial fabric that they are now exporting countries, rivals in the world market against Britain.

The British Empire of pre-war days was a far different thing from the British Empire to-day. Before the War Britain was the manufacturing centre imposing its goods on a circle of colonies. Now these centrifugal forces—the radiation of commerce from Britain to the Empire domains—are being stayed, turned back, by other centrifugal forces. The Colonies are radiating their own commerce and destroying the Mother Country in the process.

In India there is a developed industrialism. During the war the industrial fabric of India increased in size and scope more than 100 per cent. That is to say, that during the five years when the people of Europe were cutting each other's throats, Indian capitalism developed as much again as it had done during all the years of British domination previously; new mills, factories, engineering plants, railways, manufacturing concerns, sprang up like wildfire. And this accelerated industrialisation has proceeded at very much the same pace since the war, and the field of possible development is simply tremendous.

Very much the same kind of process, making allowances, of course, for the natural resources available and the labour supply, etc., has been taking place in Australia, Canada, South Africa, Egypt, as well as in the countries outside the Empire, particularly China and Japan; that, in addition to the intensive development of the older capitalist countries, such as the United States.

Capitalism knows no frontiers. An engineering firm on the Clyde or in Stockholm, or Essen, or Pittsburg is perfectly willing to set aside all scruples if by sending up-to-date machinery to Bombay, or Calcutta, Shanghai or Canton, it can make a substantial profit. Capitalism proceeds blindly, urged ever forward with one definite all-absorbing motive, one fixed certitude, the desire for profits. The consequences of establishing a modern industrialism in the undeveloped parts of the world are not given the least consideration, outside the immediate gain. That this modern industrialism will grow, will swell like the genie from the fishermen's bottle in the Arabian Nights, and will become eventually a devouring monster to the people of the very country that gave it birth, is not thought of for a single moment. Yet such is the case.

The President of the Federation of British Industries blandly tells us that unemployment must grow increasingly worse in this country. Now, why must unemployment grow increasingly worse? Are not the reasons manifestly clear? This was the first country to become industrialised. The machinery, the plant, the technique, the industrial fabric of Britain is old. Much of the machinery used in this country is obsolete. While we have been sending new and up-to-date machinery abroad, our capitalist class has tied itself, by all manner of restrictions, to using old machinery at home. It is a more costly business to scrap an old plant and replace it with a new one in this country than to start off with a brand-new plant in a new country where rents are low, legal formulæ are not so entangled, and where, in most cases, labour is cheap and raw materials are immediately available. While we have been building up a modern industrialism in Japan, India, China, Egypt, South Africa and numerous other places, the utilisation of modern methods and modern machinery here in Britain has been prevented by an infinite variety of obstacles, of which over-capitalisation is not the least important. Obviously when machinery is sent to a new country it is the latest machinery that is available. It stands to reason that if in India and Egypt there are up-to-date cotton mills, equipped with all the latest machinery and technique, and at the same time the raw materials, and an enormous number of highly intelligent but very cheap workers are available, close at hand—workers who will receive a penny for every shilling received here—the cotton mills of Lancashire, which are not so up-to-date, which have the raw materials transported from long distances, and which are compelled to employ workers at a much higher rate of pay, cannot possibly hope to compete effectively against them.

We seem, sometimes, to forget the great fact of progress until some acutely dangerous situation is suddenly revealed. One is reminded of that by the grotesque situation that has arisen in connection with the traffic problem, where the revolution in the motor car industry has become a veritable Frankenstein, outgrowing and becoming impossible in the early Victorian roads of the cities. The crush of traffic in our roads is like endeavouring to squeeze a big, fat man into a pair of boy's trousers.

The same is the case with an immeasurably greater significance in regard to the progress made in the means and methods of production over the whole field of industry.

Leonid Krassin, commenting some time ago on the question of buying agricultural machinery for Russia, said that there was one difficulty that was always cropping up, and that was the difficulty of securing the most modern, the latest kinds of machinery. Improvement was so fluid; so swift, so great, was the changeability of machinery and the progress of invention that every three or four years machinery became out of date, obsolete.

As with agriculture, so with engineering itself, and so with every other industry.

The law of accumulative progress has never been clearly stated. But I think it can be said in all truthfulness that as far as the means of production are concerned, as much progress has been made during the past twenty years as during the whole of the previous century, and that the next ten years hold promise of more being accomplished in science and invention than the past twenty.

Progress does not merely appertain to machinery. New motive forces—like oil and electricity—have been and are being brought into operation, effecting revolutions in shipping and transport generally, and speeding up, intensifying and spreading wider the fields of production.

It really is difficult to keep pace with and to attune one's mind to the vast changes that have taken place, and are taking place, and to sense their immediate and future consequences. How many people have yet, for instance, become actually conscious of and accustomed to the aeroplane as a regular means of transport and travel?

The world is a very different place and an infinitely more accessible place to-day than it was when the war broke out. Our poor planet keeps shrinking, shrinking—India is—as near to us to-day as France was a century ago—and we are being huddled closer and closer together. What happens in India, in China, in America, reacts upon us more, affects us more, than ever before. And the whole world is netted in a mesh of conflicting industrialisms.

To a large extent it is the employing capitalist class of Britain which has sent the up-to-date machinery to other parts of the world—which has built up the industrial fabrics of India, China, Australia, South Africa, and so on, and it is the British Capitalist Class which owns mills, mines, railways, and factories in those other parts, and which draws an enormous profit through that ownership.

The Capitalist Class of old England—and the capitalist class of any other country—is not concerned how it gets its profits or where it gets them from, so long as it gets them. It has no morality or scruples in regard to that matter. No pride of race compels it to employ and exploit English men and women only. No patriot ideals are permitted to interfere with the acquisition of £ s. d.

I sometimes reflect upon what the Empire has meant to the working class of Britain; a patient, loyal, hard-working, long-suffering class is the British working class. The British workers have borne the burden of the Empire. The frontiers are marked red with the blood and white with the bones of the sons of British working-class mothers. In Egypt, in South Africa, in India, all along the Indian Frontier, everywhere have the soldiers of the Queen and the soldiers of the King given their lives to cement and to maintain the Empire. And like a dazzling dream the Empire has been flaunted across the minds of the workers. But the spoils of the Empire, the riches of the Empire, the vast possessions of the Empire, the teeming cities and illimitable veldts of the Empire—what part or lot have the workers of Britain had in these? What actually has the Empire meant, and what does it mean to the workers? What does all the wealth of the Indies mean to the slum-dwelling workers of the East End? What does the acquisition of Togoland mean to the toil-worn navy practically starving on a very uncertain few bob a week? What benefit are the diamond mines of Africa to the unemployed in their misery? What, indeed, does this precious Empire mean to the whole working class of this country, whose arduous work and wages of toilsome earnings hardly enables them to drag on from week to week? Ah—and more than that I have mentioned Lancashire. I know Lancashire. I have heard the clogs of men and women, boys and girls, rattling down the streets in the early morning, in the towns of Lancashire, as they go swarming to the mills. I know something of the story of Lancashire and the beginnings, the growth, and development of the cotton industry. For generations the most hideous wage-slavery has existed in Lancashire. Generations of hard work in humid, unhealthy mills has had its effect on the people there, as the stunted, bow-legged men and flat-chested, anæmic women bear witness. Those Lancashire workers have piled up millions for the

*Mr. J. SIMPSON (Canada).*

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. J Simpson) said that the attitude of Canada until recent years was simply that of a child, as it were, accepting the spanking of the mother—just being obedient children. In recent years, however, Canada had been more inclined to analyse very carefully and discuss with greater fullness the decisions of the Imperial Government. With reference to the difference between the Protocol and the Pact, he said that that was a subject to which the workers of Canada had not given very much consideration, and he thought that perhaps about as far as the Canadian Delegation could go would be to say that they would go back to Canada and urge a thorough discussion and consideration of the vital differences between the Protocol as it was now on paper, and the Pact as it would be on paper perhaps later on, because, as Mr MacDonalld had said, the matters relating to the Pact were now in negotiation. Therefore, it did seem to him that a subject of this character, its magnitude, its tremendous influence, and its bearing upon the affairs of the country and the world generally, required a good deal of discussion and consideration in his country before they could be committed to any set of resolutions bearing on the value of the Protocol. He wished to say that personally he had been very much impressed during the discussion with the value of the Protocol as an instrument to bring about international peace, but the most they could do at the moment was to get their impression as to the virtues of the Protocol having regard to their own mentality towards world problems. There was no question but they were interested in the solutions offered for world peace, but this thought arose in his mind. He was tremendously concerned that in any kind of international proposals brought about by agreement between the nations of the world, freedom of action of any nation in its desire to establish socialist conditions should be safeguarded, and that under no Pact or Protocol of any kind should there be any capitalist attempt to impress upon other nations of the world the virtue or non-virtue of their systems of government. He was interested in the establishment of socialism the world over, and it did not matter to him which nation was initiating and carrying out their own proposals. If those proposals were hastening towards the goal of their great ideal, national prejudice was not going to interfere with it. He was not in a position to commit the Canadian Labour Party, but he could assure the Conference that they would go home and discuss the Protocol as a draft which had been submitted to the Governments of the different nations of the world, and convey to their

people what had been said by Mr. MacDonalld and Mr Henderson with the hope that it would bring enlightenment.

Mr. J MACDONALD (Canada) said they might agree to a Questionnaire on the same lines as had previously been arranged.

*Mr J. QUEEN, M L A. (Canada).*

Mr J. QUEEN, M L A (Canada), said he also could agree to the proposal to go back and tell his people of the discussion that morning. Of course, out there these questions had not interested them very greatly. In the first place, they were situated somewhat differently from the Labour Movement in Great Britain. They were not—and he was not speaking of the workers only, but of the whole country—involved in the same international rivalries and disputes as Great Britain, and consequently the Labour Movement in Canada centred its attention more on the conditions under which the people were living in Canada than on these international disputes. Outside the Labour Movement the Protocol had not been a live question in the political life of the country. If a Labour man tried to run for election and put the Protocol as one of the planks of his platform it would not carry him far, but if he put something about Old Age Pensions, or greater protection for widows and orphans, he would get the ear of the workers. As a matter of fact, in the Labour Movement in Canada—he was talking now particularly for the Independent Labour Party of Manitoba—there was a feeling that the Labour Government in England would have put in its time to more purpose in the advancement of their great movement if it had devoted more attention to the social conditions of the people instead of trying to solve the quarrels of their masters. That was the outlook of their Movement in Manitoba, but he was going back to discuss this thing. He had to make a report of the Conference, and he would, as faithfully as he could, convey in that report the sentiments expressed both by Mr. Henderson and Mr MacDonalld.

But, after all, he wished to say this, without speaking for the Labour Movement but as giving an idea of the general feeling. There was a general feeling in Canada that they did not want to be embroiled in any more European disputes. They wanted to remain, as far as possible, clear of them. They looked over to Europe and saw nothing but international rivalries and trouble all the time. The people in his country wanted to make money and to go ahead with the development of the country, and consequently they refused to come in under the Protocol. He had been informed that the Premier of Canada was opposing both the pact and the

*Mr J. Queen, M.L.A. (Canada)*]

Protocol That would give them an impression of the feeling that prevailed in Canada at the present time. They wanted to keep themselves altogether clear of these European troubles that were coming along so frequently; which, as a matter of fact, were existing all the time. There was also a very strong feeling in Canada—he was talking now about the feeling of the people generally and not particularly with those connected with the Labour Movement—there was a growing feeling that Canada was going to determine for herself when she would go to war. As a matter of fact, they would remember that when Mr Lloyd George was looking for another little scrap with the Turks, how he electrified the world by sending inquiries out to the Dominions to know whether they would support him. The people of Canada were very much against supporting Mr. Lloyd George in that scrap. (A Voice: "Not more than the people of England.") That would show Canada's desire not to become involved in European rivalries, and also her determination to decide for herself when she should go to war. Of course, there were so-called patriots out there who rolled the Union Jack round themselves, but this was a growing sentiment amongst Canadians generally.

With regard to the Protocol itself, he said he thought it was an attempt to deal with an effect and not with a cause. It was an attempt—and he wanted to say this in a helpful way because he was not speaking for the purpose of finding fault—it was an attempt, it seemed to him, on the part of the Labour Party to rub off the rough corners of this capitalist system which meant so much misery and degradation to the workers generally; an attempt to show that even capitalist society, with all its exploitation, could still be continued without having resort to war. Where, he asked, did all these antagonisms spring from between classes and between nations? It arose from the competitive system, the capitalist system, and while they went on and discussed these things and smoothed out their masters' difficulties, their own people were suffering and were hungry. He thought as a Labour Movement the way to get down to the question of how to abolish wars—not only how to abolish wars, but how to remove the danger of wars, because even the Protocol did not attempt to do that—was to tackle these social evils, and consequently, if they were anxious to bring about peace, they had to get down to the job of abolishing the system that bred all these rivalries. The danger of these discussions was that they rather

attracted the worker's attention, not to solving his own problems, not to solving the question of a full and free life for himself, but to solving the difficulties of the capitalist system. He believed the most important, the immediate question that faced them as workers representing working class organisations, lay, not in the settlement of these international disputes, but in a greater and healthier interest in the social life of the workers, not only of this country, but of every country of the world. He knew that if he went back to Manitoba and advocated that they endorse the principles of the Protocol, and he made it plain, as Mr. MacDonald had done, that they had not just to take one clause and say they objected to that, but to deal with the principle, some would want to know whether he wished to make peace with Mussolini. (A Voice: "Do they want War?") Well, he would like to have a go, and he believed Mr. MacDonald would go with him. They were interested in the condition of the workers' lives in Italy just as they were interested in the workers' lives of other countries. In conclusion, he said he had the feeling that they should not be spending their time trying to solve their masters' problems, but rather in trying to solve the question of shelter, food, and housing for the working classes of the whole world.

*Mr. A. HENDERSON, M.P. (Great Britain).*

Mr ARTHUR HENDERSON (Great Britain), replying to the discussion, said he did not wish to take up the time of the Conference further than he had already done, except to say he hoped the Delegates would not go away with the impression created by the last speaker. He thought that all of them who had passed through the great War knew that nothing put the brake on so far as development in the direction of their Socialist ideas more than did that war. Moreover, he thought that peace was one of the most vital questions to the workers of the whole world, and if they were going to allow even their masters to plot and plan for war, which would swallow up, perhaps not their children, but their grandchildren, they would be making the most vital mistake possible in the interests of those they were representing. That was all he had to say. He was sorry they should finish on such a note, because after all, there was the suggestion that there were only a few people who cared about the bread-and-butter problems. If they could eliminate war from Society then they could get on with the great problems of Socialism and economic reconstruction.

demand was that a man should not be deprived of the franchise simply because he belonged to a particular race, or his skin was of a particular colour. The same thing applied to the question of segregation. Mr. Sampson, or others, might say that the Indians were not sanitary in their habits. Well, they were entitled to make any sanitary conditions they liked, but they should make them applicable to all, but to segregate a man simply because he was of a particular colour, or belonged to a particular race, was entirely wrong. If a man was insanitary, by all means segregate him, but they must not say that a dirty white man was acceptable while a clean coloured man was unacceptable. In the same way with regard to political franchise, he claimed the restrictions should be applicable to all races. It was not right to deprive Indians of the political franchise simply because they were Indians. If the difficulty was an economic one it could easily be overcome. He would not object to a minimum wage law so long as it applied all round. They should treat all on equal terms. And if a black man got the same wages as a white man he should get the same political rights. He was, therefore, quite prepared to accept any conditions which any white man might lay down so long as they were conditions that applied both to Indians and to whites. He strongly objected to them saying that simply because a man belonged to a particular race, or was of a particular colour, he should not get employment.

The Conference, apparently, was of opinion that they should not express any view on this point. It had been said that they had not any mandates. Did they require a mandate in order to settle the principle that the coloured bar should not be raised? He thought the Labour Movement had stood for this principle at all times. If they wanted time to consider what conditions should be imposed, that was a matter of detail, and he was quite willing to wait, but he submitted on the mere question of principle that colour should not be the ground for exclusion from political franchise, or anything else, they did not require any mandate. But if they thought the Movement would not accept this principle, they could, at any rate, express their own opinions upon it as Delegates to this Conference. He could not understand why the Delegates were unwilling to do so. The reason given by some of the Delegates for not expressing an opinion was not really substantial. The main ground appeared to be that their friend, Mr. Sampson, from South Africa, would not accept it. He could not understand how he could belong to the Labour Party and

not accept this principle. If he really held the principles of Socialism he must accept it. He might say he had not considered the qualifications that should be imposed. If that was so, he (Mr. Joshi) was prepared to wait, but not for two years, to see if the principle was acceptable. The problem was very urgent. Mr. Sampson would not deny that there was an intention on the part of the white people of South Africa to exclude Indians from their country and send them away as early as possible. If that were so, he could not be expected to wait for two years, by which time half these people would have been squeezed out. Possibly then his comrades from Australia and Canada would sympathise with the Indians, but what value would that be after they had been sent away? Therefore, he wanted an expression of opinion to-day, but unfortunately the Conference was unwilling to give it.

The conclusion he was driven to was that it was not an economic question — if it had been an economic question they could have laid down their conditions—but simply that they were unwilling to speak out their minds on this subject. He admitted that there were people even in his own country who would not say that the Indian was economically equal to the white. The politicians said that he was inferior in politics, and he (Mr. Joshi) was willing to admit it. But he believed that the working classes of India were quite equal, if given opportunities, to any man in the rest of the World. He did not say they were equal to-day, but his point was that they had the capacity to be equal. If their friends in South Africa considered that the Indians were not equal to the whites, then let them lay down the test and say that any man who wanted employment in South Africa must pass a certain examination, and, if his countrymen were excluded on that ground, he would not complain. In the same way with regard to a political qualification. Let them lay down the test, and let all people who were to have the franchise abide by that test. That was reasonable and logical, and, so far as he was concerned, he was prepared to take that risk, but to make it simply a colour test was entirely wrong. He wished to make it perfectly clear that if this Conference refused to express an opinion on this matter it would stultify itself. It seemed to be feared that if they did so their South African brethren might not like to join the Conference again. (Mr. Sampson: "That is your apprehension, it is not my apprehension.") He, personally, was quite sure that they would join the Conference again. He thought the Conference should pass his Resolution.

*Mr. N. M. Joshi, M.L.A. (India)*]

The SECRETARY pointed out that a decision had been taken on the previous day that the Conference would not pass a Resolution. The matter had been voted upon.

The CHAIRMAN said it was very difficult, owing to the change of Chairman, to follow the sequence of events, but it seemed to him that a further discussion was, strictly speaking, out of order. There was, however, no limit to speeches, and care ought to be exercised on that point.

Miss HEAGNEY claimed her right to make a statement as Mr. Joshi had been allowed to make one. The whole issue, she said, had been confused owing to it being applied to South Africa instead of being treated on general principles. She was sorry for the position Mr. Joshi had taken up, which she described as a matter of mistaken tactics.

Mr JOSHI here rose to a point of order. He said he had only spoken that morning because he had not done so on the previous day, when he refrained because he did not want to make two speeches. He knew the report was coming on, and he claimed that he was perfectly in order in speaking to it. As a matter of fact, he could have made a speech on the previous day, and another that day.

The CHAIRMAN said he understood the Committee had submitted a Report, and that Report stated clearly what he presumed to be the attitude of the Conference. It seemed to him that the proper thing was to allow a speech in opposition. He thought that would be only fair, and he had only in mind the time limit when he referred to the matter. The Report that had been presented seemed to indicate the Committee had not once, but several times considered this matter, and, if that was so, it seemed to him unnecessary to discuss it further unless there were some special new points that could be produced. He was entirely in the hands of the Delegates, however, seeing that there were no Standing Orders.

Mr. JOSHI said that, under the circumstances, he would take up no more time. The subject was a very unpleasant one, and the opposition was based, not on economic grounds, but on racial grounds. The Conference was not willing to accept his Resolution simply because the white people wanted to stand together side by side. They had no consideration for the feelings of other races and people of other colours. That was the only conclusion he could draw from this decision.

*Mr. G. LANSBURY, M.P. (Great Britain).*

Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY (Great Britain) apologised to the Conference for not being present to present the Report of the Com-

mittee, but he had another very important matter to settle. The Sub-Committee had spent several hours on this matter, and he did not know what he could say to make Mr. Joshi believe that it was not a question—at least with those who sat round the table at the Committee—of the white man coalescing against him and his people. But they were up against a situation in South Africa, which was such that they did not feel they ought to impose a decision on their comrades who happened to be present at this Conference, and so, after hours of talk, they had come to the conclusion that they should endeavour to bring the South African Labour Party into contact with the Indian Labour Party, that they might between them hammer out some policy. He wished Mr. Joshi to understand that if he (Mr. Lansbury) was in a public meeting with him, or anybody else, and was asked to express his opinion about racial relationships he would go for absolute equality. But he had no right at this Conference to say, or to try to make someone else say, something which would pledge people out in South Africa, especially when the Delegates from South Africa had told them that if they passed any Resolution of this kind they would not be helping forward the thing they had in view. He hoped the Conference would adopt that view and try to bring together the people who were most concerned in this matter. If Mr. Joshi thought that this was a way of shelving it, well, he (Mr. Lansbury) and Mr. Gillies, and others, would see that this communication was sent out immediately the Conference was over.

*Mr. J. McMULLEN, M.P. (Ireland).*

Mr. J. McMULLEN, M.P. (Ireland), thought the wrong point of view altogether had been taken up by Mr. Joshi, who had missed the important point. He believed it would be quite easy to pass a Resolution on the lines their Indian colleague had suggested, but how far was that going to carry them? The South African Labour Movement, apparently, felt this question very keenly, and it would not necessarily follow, even if they did pass a Resolution, that the position of Indians in South Africa would be improved thereby. Therefore he thought the right attitude had been taken by the Committee. He hoped it would be possible to bring the South African and the Indian Movement together.

*Mr. H. W. SAMPSON, M.L.A. (South Africa).*

Mr. H. W. SAMPSON, M.L.A. (South Africa), said that personally he agreed with the Report of the Committee, although he had had no hand in framing it. He thought that the only way through which progress could be made would be by discussion between the



two Parties This discussion started with a description of the industrial condition of Indians in South Africa, but out of the discussion it had become clear that it was not so much the industrial condition of the Indians that Mr. Joshi was concerned with as the political franchise of these people. He had said he wanted a conference between the two Parties to discuss the industrial conditions of Indians in South Africa, but if when these Delegates met from each country the attempt was made to turn the discussion from industrial conditions to political franchise, the whole thing would fall to the ground. They were bitterly disappointed as Trade Unionists that men who espoused the cause of the working class in India did not come and organise these people. They had 160,000 of them in South Africa absolutely unorganised, working under the very worst conditions, and yet not one single Indian connected with the Labour Movement had ever shown his nose in the country or come amongst the Indians with a view to improving their conditions. He accepted Mr. Joshi's description of Socialism, which was an attempt to change the economic system, but it was not an attempt on the part of the peoples to mix them all up higgledy-piggledy. He believed that under Socialism they might live quite apart as races. Socialism did not imply that they were going to give all people equal franchise, whatever their state of development might be. The white working class in South Africa was trying to lay down civilised conditions of life, not only for white men, but for black men as well. Mr. Joshi had said that because they were, through legislation, trying to lay down civilised standards of living, the effect was going to be the squeezing out of his compatriots there. What, he asked, would be the effect if the miners in this country went on strike at the end of the week and they found that Indian miners were landing on these shores to take their places? Would the Trade Unionists of Great Britain welcome them with open arms? Certainly not. In South Africa, wherever the Indian came into an industry he did not come in under Trade Union conditions.

Mr. CHAMAN LALL. You should organise them.

Mr. SAMPSON said that it was not their duty but the duty of Indians to organise them. Mr. Lall and his friends should

be in South Africa now organising them. They were trying to turn a purely industrial question into one of extending the franchise to the educated people from India. The Labour Party in South Africa would never agree to grant the franchise to the Parsee. If they did grant the franchise at all it would be to the Indian working class as well as the merchants. If this Delegation went to India, or if the Indians came to this country, to have a consultation, it was going to be a very expensive matter, and their people would first have to be convinced that there was going to be an earnest endeavour to improve the conditions of the Indian worker in South Africa—not the Parsee and merchant, but the Indian worker. If the people in South Africa got the idea from Mr. Joshi's speeches that the discussion was going to be side-tracked on to one of political franchise, he was quite sure all their efforts would prove to be futile. Mr. Joshi knew the position, and knew the difficulties, and they must not confuse the two issues. He suggested that the next time Mr. Joshi came to this Conference he should put down a motion on the lines he had suggested and let the Labour Parties in the Dominions discuss the matter before coming. Delegates would then be able to come with a mandate and let the Conference know the exact position, and not act from a mawkish sentiment, which was, after all, not equal rights for black and white. He asked what would be the impression if they saw a fleet of sixty ships outside British ports to-day with Indian coloured miners waiting to take the place of the white men in the mines. Similar things had been done in this country against the wishes of the white people. The whole world had been disturbed by the exploitation of these low wage earners. They might pass whatever resolutions they liked, but it would not alter the conditions.

The Report of the Committee was then put to the Conference, voting being by Countries. Seven voted for the resolution and none against, India abstaining.

#### CHAIRMAN.

At this point Mr. Purcell left the Chair, and Miss Heagney was voted to the position.

Miss M. HEAGNEY took his place

## LABOUR CONDITIONS IN BRITISH GUIANA.

*Mr. H. CRITCHLOW (British Guiana).*

Mr. H. CRITCHLOW (British Guiana) said he joined with his friends from Palestine in saying that he could not speak English very well, but he would do his best to make the Delegates understand the conditions existing in British Guiana, and he hoped the Conference would do everything in its power to help him, and those working with him, to improve them. British Guiana was not known to many of the Delegates, and probably not even to some of the British Delegates. It was the only British Possession in South America. It had an area of over 90,000 square miles, or 57,000,000 acres. It had a population of 313,999 souls, including 118,612 negroes, 2,810 Chinese, 137,959 East Indians, and 32,816 mixed peoples, which included Portuguese and other Europeans.

They had nothing of the kind of industrial legislation that was found in other countries. When the cost of living went up and they asked for an increase of wages, there were no arbitration courts, or anybody else to consult with. They might ask in season and out of season for what they wanted, but nobody would listen to them. During the War when they were wanted for fighting they asked for an increase of wages, and then they found that the Chamber of Commerce was willing to listen to them, but now they refused. They had to work very long hours. In certain trades, such as dock labourers and stevedores, they had succeeded in getting an eight-hours day, but in other branches of industry the bulk of the workers was still working ten or more hours of the day. The dock labourers were now earning 1 dollar 12 cents, or 4s 8d per day. In 1921 they approached the Chamber of Commerce, who always used to deal with these matters, for an increase of wages, and an agreement was signed between the merchants and labourers, but now the Chamber of Commerce said they had nothing to do with it and could not bind the merchants; the Workers' Union did not know who to approach, so they went to the Government in 1923 by way of a deputation. The Government referred them back to the Chamber of Commerce, and the Chamber of Commerce refused to do anything. They therefore had to go on strike. The Union had a demonstration, and some of the people got out of control and damaged houses, but it had been proved that it was not the Unionists but other workers. Then the Government met the representatives of the merchants and himself and arranged a meeting between the employers and workers. They met but could not agree, so the Government appointed an arbitration board, and he had with him a

report of the sittings which he proposed to hand in to the Secretary so that Members of Parliament could read it and see exactly what the conditions were.

Their greatest grievance was that they had not a Government which properly represented the people. They had really what was called self-government, but the franchise was based entirely on a property qualification. This they desired to see abolished. For a man to be able to sit in the Court of Policy he had to possess property worth 5,000 dollars, and no ordinary labouring man had that. Therefore they could not find a labouring man to represent them, and they always had men who were either capitalists themselves or who represented a capitalist. In their Combined Court they were obliged to have a man who was earning at least 1,440 dollars per annum. Then there was an Executive body on which the Governor represented the King, and he had the right to nominate all the members. In the Court of Policy the Governor had the casting vote. In the Combined Court they have 14 members elected by the people, whilst the Governor had eight, but in the Combined Court they did not make any laws, but only passed resolutions and advised the Court of Policy. His people felt that the qualification was too high, and they asked this Conference, and especially the British Members of Parliament, to take the necessary steps to get the money and property qualification abolished. They wanted manhood and womanhood suffrage.

The women of his country were eagerly watching the Labour Movements in this and other countries. They were reading the literature of the Labour Movement, and particularly the pamphlets of Dr Marion Phillips, but for the last two years they had not had the privilege of seeing any new books dealing with the Labour Movement amongst women. The Labour Movement in British Guiana only started in 1919, and many of the big questions like that of the Protocol they did not know anything about. He could, however, give the Delegates this assurance, that they were not going to fight again unless it was to fight for the working classes. That was the view which was held in his country. Their Union had only a financial membership of 1,100 at present, because on account of unemployment many of the members had dropped out. He knew nothing about the Trades Union Movement until he read about it in the *Daily Herald*. There he found what a Union was like, and he got into communication with Mr. Henderson, who gave him the instructions they needed, and they got it started. But the

Government refused to incorporate the Union. This they also referred to the British Members of Parliament, and a question was asked in the House of Commons, with the result that their Governor was instructed to allow the Union to be registered at once.

They did not pay much attention in his country to the question of colour. It was the capitalists, he found, who raised the colour question when they wanted to create dissension amongst the workers. When they were discussing vital questions they called together people from various parts of the country, and put before them the things they were asking for, whether they were members of the Union or not. They were not asking for unreasonable things, but only those which the workers in other countries had secured long ago. They were asking, for instance, for workmen's compensation. When one of their comrades was injured they had to find the money to go to the Court, and pay a lawyer about £100. This was a big amount of money to find, and generally when they did so they lost their case. They had been constitutional and peaceful in their demands. The Bible said, "Knock and the door shall be opened unto you," but this door had not been opened to them yet, and they were beginning to say it was time to pull the door down and get the things they were asking for.

They not only wanted workmen's compensation but old age pensions, national health insurance, and unemployment insurance as well. After the recent disturbance they asked the Government for an Unemployment Exchange in the Colony, so that they might be able to see how many people were out of employment. In this they had succeeded in a sort of way. The Government had appointed a Committee of Capitalists, and this Committee had drafted a Report on which the Labour Bureau could work. This Report stated how much they should eat, and what they should wear. Even the clothes their womenfolk should wear were stated. (Mr Critchlow here gave the quantity of clothing and food which this document prescribed for the working people.) Continuing, he said they were putting down these small quantities of food and clothing so that they might base the wages upon it. In these Labour Exchanges if an employer wanted someone to work for him at such and such a price, whether the wages suited or not, the worker was obliged to take it. The Unions rejected this proposal, and then the Government asked them to meet the employers and the Government to discuss it, and so he (Mr Critchlow) drafted a Report stating what they wanted. They said they wanted exactly what they were entitled to as British

subjects modified to suit local conditions. Of course they had no knowledge at all about the working of Labour Exchanges.

Years ago they had the right of challenging a jury, but a law had since been passed stating that a prisoner had no right to challenge a juror. That, he claimed was unfair. They felt they should have the right to challenge a jury, and he appealed to the Conference to do everything in its power to help him to obtain these and the other things he had mentioned.

The East Indian labourers were rather a menace to the other workers of the country. They worked at from 1s to 1s 6d a day. Dealing with the conditions on the sugar estates, he said that the owners advertised for labourers at very low wages, and they tried to induce people to come by saying they would live in the estate houses and get their rent and medical treatment free, but a person who was not living in one of these estate houses still had to accept the same wages. Many of the people could only get a few days' work a week, but, whenever an employer wanted them, they had to turn up, and if they failed to do so they were taken before the Court, tried, and fined, and, if they did not pay the fine, they had to go to prison. At present in only a few industries were they able to keep a fixed wage. Whilst the East Indian was willing to work cheaper than the coloured man they were quite unable to do much to help to raise the standard of life. They wished to bring the East Indians and the coloured people up to an equal standard. They wanted equal conditions for all races.

Their Union was too poor to send a delegation to this Conference, but a subscription had been raised, and all the different races contributed to the fund, and even some Capitalists, to send him over here. He did not wish to speak against any other race. In every race they would find a certain amount of prejudice against other races, but he felt the same as the South African Delegates felt when he found that while they were trying to establish a certain rate of wages the East Indians came in and worked cheaper. But they also had to contend with a certain section of white labour. On one occasion they had a general strike, but the white men jumped in and worked the electric cars. They were not blacklegs but whitelegs. (Laughter) The coloured Militia did the same. When there was a strike in their country and they appealed to the English seamen they found that they were always willing to give assistance, but it was different with the men on the Canadian boats. He could not understand what kind of men they had on those Canadian boats

*Mr. H. Critchlow (British Guiana)*

He did not know if the Canadian Delegates knew anything about them, but when they came down to the port, if there was a strike on these men helped the employers by doing the work. He appealed to the Canadian representatives to make inquiries about this matter. They should understand that they were all fellow workers, and when they were having a strike they did not expect other workers to come in and help the employers.

Mr. SIMPSON: Do you know the name of the Company?

Mr. CRITCHLOW: The Royal Mail Steam Packet Company.

Mr SIMPSON: A subsidised Company.

Mr CRITCHLOW. Well, you get on to it.

Mr. SIMPSON: Certainly, we will.

Mr. CRITCHLOW, continuing, said he thought they should make arrangements so that when there was a strike and they cabled over to Canada asking the men on the Canadian boats not to touch the cargoes they should agree not to do so. That was, of course, as long as their claims were reasonable. They were willing to submit their case before calling a strike.

He then referred to the question of child labour, stating that they were not supposed to work a child until it was over nine years of age, but employers on an estate could work them from seven years of age without being prosecuted. The wages were so low that the husband had to work, the wife had to work, and the children had to work, and even then they could hardly get enough to live. Then they were going to do everything they could to prevent immigrants being brought into the country, which would make working conditions even harder than they were at the present. The last time the Government appointed a Committee of enquiry to go into the condition of the workers they had two representatives of the workers, two representatives of the Government appointed by the Court, and three others which the Government appointed from Government offices. The Report was so one-sided that the workers' representatives had to issue a minority Report. Even one of the majority, whose conscience would not allow him to say they should get no increase, agreed that they should at least have one-half of what they were asking for, and another Member of the Government said they were entitled to an increase, but that would not solve the problem, because there were more people in the city than could be found employment for. One of the Commissioners said the Government should buy some land and put people upon it. Why? Because he had an estate close by which he wanted to get rid of.

In conclusion, Mr. Critchlow said they were having the anniversary of their Union on January 11 next year, and he hoped the countries represented at this Conference would find men and women to send over to that gathering, and to help them to organise the workers. They were prepared to arrange for board and lodging so that the Delegates would only have to pay the passage money. They were going to send out invitations, and he hoped some of the Delegates would be liable to come. They need not be afraid of the language, because they would find the people could speak better English than he could. He had described to them the conditions in his country. They were trying to educate all classes of workers on this Labour Movement so that there would be no under-selling amongst them. The things they were asking for were not unreasonable, but they wanted the Trade Unionists of other countries to help them. So long as the working people were unorganised they would be able to do very little to raise the standard of life, and therefore they were doing their best to organise them and to get them to realise their responsibilities to one another (Cheers).

The CHAIRMAN said she was sure they had all been intensely interested with the very able and comprehensive survey which Mr. Critchlow had given of the conditions in British Guiana.

Mr. SIMPSON asked what area of land was owned by the native peoples in British Guiana, as compared with the whites. He also wished to know what was the tendency of the natives in regard to politics; what form of government did they favour?

Mr. CRITCHLOW said they were trying to train representatives who would be able to put forward the views of the working-class. The Europeans had 563 votes, the Portuguese 482, the Chinese 96, the blacks 3,396, and the East Indians 428. Although the East Indians numbered 125,000 out of a population of 313,000, they only had 428 votes. They had really no question of colour. Their complaint was not against either white or black, but in regard to the qualification.

Mr. H. SNELL, M.P. (Great Britain), said that he and other Members of Parliament would be very glad to put questions in the House of Commons with regard to the property qualification in British Guiana if they were supplied with the necessary particulars.

Mr. JAMES STEWART, M.P. (Great Britain), referred to the statement made by Mr. Critchlow to the effect that the country had an area of 90,000 square miles, and a population of 300,000, and yet he wanted them to take some action

to prevent further immigrants going into the country (Mr CRITCHLOW "Because there is scarcity of employment") He thought it would be better that they should consider proposals that would lead to the development of the country and the giving of opportunities for people in over-populated parts getting to these sparsely populated parts They had more territory in British Guiana than we had in Great Britain, where we had a population of 45,000,000, and British Guiana was a very rich country.

Mr CRITCHLOW said he wished to make it plain that they had no objection to other people coming to the country They felt that their country was badly in need of capital If they had the capital, and good wages were paid, they would welcome new people coming in If they had a fixed minimum wage, it would help them, but people coming into the country while it was in its present state only helped the employers to exploit the work-people

Mr. W GILLIES (Secretary) said that in these matters of the Crown Colonies and Dependencies the British Labour Party felt they had a very special responsibility They were delighted that in British Guiana there should be a Labour Union, and a correspondent with whom they could keep in touch Their Indian comrades by their intellectuality

and industry had made an impression on the political Parties in the British House of Commons They had even Members of the Labour Party whom they might call Members for British India They had others who were experts about Kenya About ten years ago Mr. Pointer made himself a specialist on the questions which Mr. Critchlow had referred to in the West Indies, and did great service for the people out there He once made a visit to those parts at their invitation He would suggest to the Parliamentary Party that they should have one, two, or three members for the West Indies, and if Mr Critchlow would keep in contact with him and he with those Members, the propaganda of the British Guiana Labour Union would have reverberations in the British House of Commons There was one thing the Governors of these Dependencies did not like, and that was to have their policy watched by several British Members of Parliament who were putting questions to the Colonial Secretary, who in his turn demanded reports from the Governor.

Mr CRITCHLOW said that if it was proposed to call a West Indian Conference it would be a great opportunity for the Members of the Labour Party to come over at that particular time to hear the views of the West Indian people.

## MIGRATION.

*Mr J. QUEEN, M L A (Canada)*

Mr J. QUEEN (Canada) "Mr Chairman and Comrades, the time is getting on so that I will try to cut down my remarks as much as possible, and especially because this is a question I would like to have fully discussed by this Conference. Before I come to the question, permit me to say that I appreciate very much the fact that I have been able to be present at this Conference It has, I think, given us a greater breadth of vision of the work the Labour Movement has yet to undertake We have always been concerned with our own particular countries, our most immediate problems, feeling somewhat that the whole progress of the World depends upon our activity, but as we have come here and listened to the problems of our comrades from other countries, particularly our comrades who come from India and British Guiana, and who have told us of their conditions, we seem to get a wider outlook of what our activities should be What is the use of a Labour Movement concerning itself with the conditions in one particular country—in England, for example—when capitalists are going out to India and establishing their fac-

ories and getting cheap labour that is competing against the higher-priced labour of the English worker just as effectively as if that factory had been established in England itself? And so our concern becomes a much wider concern, namely, the need of an organisation amongst the workers, no matter which country they are in. There is the need of an organisation amongst the workers of India to raise their standard, because the Trades Union Movement is to-day on its defensive to maintain the standard to which it has already attained This matter of cheap labour in India is one of serious import to us, and we ought to be doing something on behalf of the workers there, if only for the reason that it is going to react to our own benefit.

Now I have to open this question of emigration. It is one that concerns the Party that I am a member of very closely, and it is one that I can speak of with a certain amount of knowledge, and can put before you the attitude of my Party very clearly, because we have just recently been discussing it with the idea of issuing a manifesto. I want you to understand that when discussing this ques-

Mr. J. Queen, M.L.A. (Canada)]

tion I am not discussing it from the narrow view-point that Canada belongs to us, and we want to keep it for ourselves, and to exclude others from coming in. As a matter of fact, we very much oppose the erection of barriers which are intended to prevent people from coming into the country. The thing I am concerned about is the organised efforts that are made to induce large numbers of people to come from their own countries, very often, I fear, under what can only be described as false pretences. We become acquainted with what that means to people in the way of disappointed hopes—the fact that they have sold up their homes, and then possibly they had not sufficient to pay their fares to Canada, and they have had to borrow, or, by some other means, get the balance which was needed, expecting that they were coming to something totally different from what they find when they arrive. Oftentimes when they are stranded they come round and tell us their troubles, and we therefore learn a great deal about it. It is usually the habit of the master class when they get to the point that they cannot find work for the workers to tell them that they have come to the wrong place altogether, and to refer them to one town and another. We have that state of affairs in Canada. When there is unemployment—and we have quite a lot of unemployment, possibly just as much as you have *per capita*—it is quite the usual thing to tell these unemployed people that they should go somewhere else, and to name a town where they may be able to get work. I have heard the Premier of Manitoba during a discussion in the House state that these unemployed deserve no sympathy at all because they did not want work, that he knew a number of farmers who were quite willing to take them, give them their food and their bed, though he could not afford to pay them any wages, if they would work for him for the winter. Those are conditions that we believe the people of this country ought to be acquainted with.

During the last Session of the Legislature we were passing an Estimate for publishing immigration literature. I opposed it, but I told them they would gain my support if they allowed me to write the literature. I promised them there would be nothing in it which was not true to fact. Of course, the appropriation went through despite our little protest, but the point of the matter is that the literature they want contains statements that are not correct. Say I was a large landowner in Western Canada, say I was a coal mine owner—and we have about five times more coal mines opened up than there is need for at all—if I was an individual owner of one of these mines I would be very anxious to get a population built up

in order that my profits would run more steadily. If I was a landowner and saw the opportunity of getting men on to the land for a number of years—if I was these things, I might determine that emigration would be a very good thing for Canada. But when you look at it from the human viewpoint, and if you are concerned with the sufferings that the workers have to endure under this present system, and you saw, as we see in Canada at times, men and women suffering from this emigration policy, you get an entirely different viewpoint. To get down to some of the actual conditions in Canada, it is usually stated, and always implied, that all you have to do is to go to Canada and pick the gold up from the street. The story is told of an Englishman who went to Canada, and, going along the streets of Montreal, he saw in front of him a golden sovereign. He picked it up and said, 'This is fine.' There was a blind man at the street corner, so he put the sovereign in the cap and said: 'You can't see to pick them up; I can, so you have this one.' (Laughter.)

Out there we have all the earmarks of the capitalist system. Amongst the workers we have the same struggle as you have here, the same struggle to get sufficient to maintain themselves and their families in any degree of comfort. As a matter of fact, in some parts of Canada, particularly in the coalfields of Nova Scotia, if I were to relate to you the conditions you would almost fancy it was one of your Indian comrades telling you about India. Amongst the coal miners of Nova Scotia there is the greatest amount of destitution that anyone could imagine. The British Empire Steel Corporation own practically the whole of Nova Scotia. It is capitalised at about 5,000,000 dollars, and yet I have seen people employed there who, at the end of their week's work, were still owing the Company money due to the various deductions that are made. There are deductions of all sorts, and one novel deduction is 50 cents donation to the Church. These conditions have been brought to the attention of the Government time and time again. It has been sought to impress upon the Government the seriousness of the situation as it is affecting the lives of thousands of people of Nova Scotia. As a matter of fact, I have in my hand a memorandum that was placed before every Member of the Dominion House of Commons in 1922, not by Labour men, but by Reeves or Mayors of various municipalities who were sent to Ottawa by their different Councils for the purpose of calling the attention of the Dominion Government to the serious conditions that existed. These Delegates, mind you, were not appointed by Labour bodies, but by good respectable Muni-

pal Councils, and they were good respectable Mayors. But the situation was so acute that they went to Ottawa demanding intervention on the part of the Government in order to protect the lives of the people in that district. There is much in this report that is valuable, but I am not going to read it to you in extenso, because I want to conserve the time as much as possible. This, however, is what the Majors say: 'Indeed, we have in the mining districts abundant proof that they are not (that is the wages of the miners) sufficient to provide them with even the necessities of life for themselves and their families.' While the Delegation was in Ottawa they received a communication from the doctors of that district, and this is what the doctors had to say: 'The doctors here declare that there is more sickness among young children staying away from the school than ever in the history of the mining towns of this district. This sickness among young children has resulted from nothing more nor less than malnutrition.' That is in this glorious Dominion of Canada that they are seeking to induce people to emigrate to. I could go on and quote from this document at length. It tells about the health conditions, the want of sanitary regulations, and so on. As a matter of fact, just before I left Winnipeg I was very active on a Committee that was established there for the purpose of sending relief to these miners in Nova Scotia, who were at that time on strike, and, as far as I know, are on strike now. The effects of that situation were most appalling, even to the extent of some people not having a stitch of clothing for their children. Dr. McIlroy told about going into one home where the children had nothing on them but sacking, and in one case it was cement sacking at that. One can hardly credit that a condition of that kind could exist, but these are facts. And yet they come over here and tell you about the glorious opportunities that Canada presents. They are seeking to attract a large number of workers from this country, and we believe it is only right that you should know the actual dangers that have to be faced by the workers when they reach Canada. I could tell you a whole lot about the situation.

Here is another communication that was sent in March, 1922, to every Member of the House of Commons in Ottawa, telling them of the conditions, and giving some actual cases in order to demonstrate the suffering that existed amongst these miners in Nova Scotia. I think I will take time to read this one: "McNeil's wife gave birth to a child on March 16, McNeil himself met with an accident in the mines on March 17. He has traded

at the Company's store for 20 years and had credit nowhere else. He was the recipient of this 'charity' last fall, and when trying to get a few groceries last week he was absolutely refused anything unless he would agree to sign a contract handing over to the British Empire Steel Corporation all cheques he received from the Compensation Board as a result of his accident. He would not agree to hand over his compensation cheques—and, by the way, it has not even been decided whether he shall receive compensation at all—hence he was refused any more credit with the Company until he got back to work. On March 25 McNeil and his family had nothing at all to eat until after six o'clock in the evening, excepting that his sick wife had a little left over tea warmed up, and a small bit of dry bread." We believe it is only right to tell you of these things that you may appreciate some of the struggles that even in our much boosted Canada have to be endured by the workers.

But you may say that these emigrants are wanted to go on the land in Canada, and that Canada has wonderful opportunities for the people who go out to take up farming. That is all very well, but when you are up against the facts, as I am up against them in the Province of Manitoba, you get a different aspect of the whole situation. When I tell you that despite the fact that we have unemployment in our cities, despite the fact that we are continually contending that our wages are too low, I honestly believe there is as much suffering in the farmhouses of Manitoba as there is amongst the industrial workers, you will have some idea of what these conditions must be. The summer before last 130 schools were closed down in Manitoba because they could not pay the teachers' salaries. The schools were there, the equipment was there, the charges had to be met, but because the farmers in these districts could not pay the teachers' salaries these schools were closed, not for the whole of the year, but for varying periods of time, some for two months, and some for as long as eight or nine months. When I tell you that, it will bring to your mind the privation that exists even on these much-boosted farming lands of Western Canada.

Here is a letter I received while the Provincial Legislature was sitting this spring. I will read only one little portion of it from one of the districts where the Soldiers' Settlement Board put in a number of their settlers. It says: "Most of the farms were up for sale at a recent tax sale, and there were no buyers." After telling of the hardships in that district he goes on to say that most of the farms

were up for sale because the farmers could not pay their taxes, and the reason he wrote me the letter was to see if I could not use my influence with the Government to get them to construct some roads through the district so as to give these farmers work on the roads in lieu of paying the taxes.

Again, I have in my hand a number of petitions. These are all from farmers. The farmer in Manitoba usually regards the men in the Labour Movement as a set of hold-up men. He needs some help in the fall to gather in his crops, and he wants that help as cheaply as possible, while we try to get from the farmer as good wages as possible, and there is consequently a good deal of open antagonism shown by the farmers towards those who are in the Labour Movement. But when they get into trouble, when they are feeling their own hardships so acutely that they can no longer stand it, it is to the Labour men they come. If I read some of these letters you would see what the conditions are. Some of them have not even sufficient money to provide seed for their next year's crops. But they not only want seed; they actually want food and clothing for their children. It used to be said that the farmer was the most independent man there was; that, come what may, at least he always had his food. And yet I have here petitions from men telling us that they are not only wanting seed, but wanting food and clothing for their children. These are the dangers that your new settler is exposed to.

Do not run away with the idea that I am trying to convey the impression that every emigrant who goes out to Canada suffers all these privations. But I do want you to know that these are the dangers to which they are exposed after they have sold up their home in the Old Country and get out there with their assisted passages, and get on to a piece of land, and have the life driven out of them in three or four years. I have not the statistics, but I venture the opinion that the percentage of those who go on the land, and at the end of three or four years, get up and walk off it, is very high.

Here is another letter, because I want to give you a real picture of the conditions. An old lady 69 years of age wrote to me and put a question to me. I got this about last October. She says: "What am I going to do for this coming winter? I have arrived at the point where I cannot go out to work any more." So you see that even in this great and wealthy Dominion of Canada, and it is a wealthy Dominion, and has great natural resources, even in spite of that the capitalist system operating out there as it does in this country denies

to the workers, denies to the useful part of the population of that country, the opportunity of making for themselves a good, healthy and comfortable existence.

One more thing and then I am going to finish. Strongly as I feel against the emigration policy of the Government, I feel a thousand times stronger when it comes to the question of taking children out of this country and transplanting them in Canada and other countries. By arrangement between the British and Canadian Governments they have taken out about 5,000 children per annum under the Juvenile Emigration scheme. We hear out there of some of the outstanding cases of cruelty, but only the outstanding cases. But even if there were no outstanding cases of cruelty, if you just picture these Western prairies, lonely, separated the one farm from the other, oftentimes by great distances, and just imagine what it means to pick up a little child out of this country and place it on one of those lonely farms, you will realise that it is likely to break its little heart. If you realised it I am sure you would say it should not happen. For a man to take his wife and children out, there can be no objection so long as they know the conditions, but in the case of children it is very different. These children are taken out, not in order to provide them with a home, but because it provides an avenue for the farmer to secure cheap labour. I am not going to harrow your feelings by telling you of some of the atrocious cruelties that have been brought to light, neither am I going to suggest that every child that goes out there is subjected to the same kind of brutal treatment. You will find something of the fiend amongst all classes of people, and you will find it amongst the Western farmers. But quite apart from that, I ask you, is it humane in itself to take a child from this country and place it away in the loneliness of these prairies just for the farmer to obtain cheap labour. I should like some definite action taken. I know the views of the Independent Labour Party of Manitoba, but I would like some very definite action taken to bring this child emigration scheme to an end.

Mrs. HARRISON BELL: It is at an end.

Mr. QUEEN: Since when?

Mrs. HARRISON BELL: Since we were there. You still report the carrying on of it, but only under certain conditions.

Mr. R. B. WALKER: I read this morning that it was still continuing.

Mr. QUEEN: I would like to think that Mrs. Bell is correct, but if it has been stopped I have never heard of it. We have discussed this question in Manitoba from the welfare of the child point of view and not from our own. The child coming into Man-



toba was not doing us any harm, but as a Labour Movement we desire to give protection to those who most need it, and particularly to the children. From that aspect we have discussed it, and we feel very strongly that if the scheme has not already been dropped, the British Labour Movement should use its influence to put an end to it. I have tried to place the conditions in Canada before this Conference as faithfully as possible, not with the idea of discouraging anyone from going out to Canada who desires to do so, but in order that through this medium the workers of this country may realise the dangers they will have to face when they reach Canada; that they may know that Canada is not the haven of safety for the workers that is depicted in emigration literature. We very much oppose the erection of barriers tending to stop free entry of people who desire to come into the country. The thing we do oppose, and the thing we want to bring to your attention, are the mis-statements made by those who are endeavouring to induce people to go out. The literature that is sent over here has beautiful pictures showing the farmhouse in Western Canada as a fine big place with beautiful grounds round about it, with the farmer's wife all dressed up, and the children romping and playing, and everything lovely. And yet what I have given you are the true facts (Cheers)

*Mr W McMULLEN, M.P. (Ireland).*

Mr W McMULLEN (Ireland) asked whether it was true that in Canada the miner was compelled to purchase from the company's stores. If that was so, and if it was a fact that the education of the children forming the community depended upon whether the parents could subscribe for the teachers' salaries, Canada must be developing in a very lopsided way, especially in view of the statement made by Mr Simpson on the previous day as to hydro-electric development, and the nationalisation of railways. He did not suggest that the statements made by either were wrong, but it seemed to him they were contradictory to say the least.

Mr. QUEEN replied that there was nothing contradictory about it. What he had stated in regard to the stores was correct. When a man went to work in the mines he had to give the company a charge on his wages, and had to go to the company's stores.

Mr. GILLIES asked whether that applied only to Nova Scotia, or to the whole of Canada, and Mr. Queen replied that it was Nova Scotia only.

Mr SIMPSON asked the Delegates not to forget that there were nine Provinces in Canada, and Nova Scotia was only one of them

Mr. QUEEN said that immediately the strike was called, or just before the strike, the stores were closed down. The employees had no credit anywhere, and had no money to purchase anything, and that was why they organised relief in Manitoba. They not only had to collect money to send to them, but they had to issue an appeal through the schools and Churches, and other bodies, for clothing to send from Winnipeg, which was 2,500 miles away. The situation was so acute that the railway carried the goods free of charge. The development of the hydro-electric system was quite true, but that was in another part of Canada. In answer to another question, Mr. Queen said that it was the Canadian National Railway that carried the goods free of charge. With regard to the school teachers' salaries, that situation had come about through the farmers not being able to pay their taxes. There was no money in the municipality.

*Mr W WANLESS (South Africa)*

Mr W WANLESS (South Africa), referring to the question as it affected his country, said that practically, so far as immigration was concerned, South Africa was a closed door. There was an organisation called the 1820 Memorial Settlers, which guided and helped those going out to commence farming, but it was necessary that they should have a capital of £1,500 or £2,000 to enable them to start farming. This association helped the people in the purchase of land, looked after their interests, and gave them what guidance they needed. There had been a good many land development schemes in South Africa through which settlers had suffered. He wished the Delegates to understand that practically all the work on the farms was done by black or coloured labour. The white man was more or less a supervisor of the black man. Skilled trades were, of course, carried on under Trade Union conditions. In order to get into South Africa a man had to be guaranteed employment on his arrival, or else, so that he might not be a charge on the State, be in possession of at least £100. Those were the conditions laid down for people coming into South Africa to-day. The prospects in the country were very poor. They had a large population of what was termed poor whites, people who had originally come down from the Boer element. A farmer had had a grant of land, but gradually his family had increased until eventually they had to go into the towns. They consequently had a large number of people drifting into the towns, and they came into competition with the black man so far as labour was concerned. There was no immediate prospect for the immigrant. White men were leaving their shores in large numbers owing to the competition

*Mr. W. Wanless (South Africa)]*

of the black men. These were the simple facts, and he did not think there would be any hope for his country for many years in regard to immigration, unless things were put on a much better footing than they were on now.

*Mrs HARRISON BELL (Great Britain)]*

Mrs HARRISON BELL (Great Britain) congratulated Mr Queen on the speech he had made, and said they must back his statements, because when she was over in Canada she found that Mr Queen was one of the men most hated by the capitalist section there. For several years she was the sole Labour representative of the British Government on the Overseas Settlement Committee, and during all that time she had been very anxious about the welfare of the small children to whom Mr. Queen had referred. They were collected by various philanthropic societies, who assumed responsibilities that they were not prepared to shoulder as they should have been. What Mr Queen had said about the farming community and the children was absolutely correct. They quite frankly admitted that they wanted the children for the work they did. When she returned with her colleagues to England they recommended that no child under school age—at present 14, but they were hoping it would be 15 before long—should be given any Government assistance either by the Canadian Government or the British Government to proceed to Canada unless accompanied by its parents. It seemed to them that Canada must have been waiting for that recommendation, because after some discussion here with the Colonial Secretary, who was a Conservative when they returned, although they had been sent out by a Labour Colonial Secretary, it was finally decided to recommend the Government of Canada to agree to their recommendation. Not only did the Canadian Government do that, but they even went further; they even decided that children under school age should not have assisted passages.

The evils to which Mr. Queen had referred were the result of haphazard methods, and as a Labour Movement they should address themselves to methods for preventing that happening again. Labour people had to take far greater interest in this subject than ever before. When she first went on that Committee there was no Labour person who would touch it, but the passing of the Empire Settlement Act not only gave money but power to the Government to make arrangements for emigration, and also to select suitable people to take care of the emigrants when they arrived. There were those in the room who knew the fight they had had this very summer on the question whether a large body of men were needed for the Canadian harvest.

They had had conflicting evidence on that subject, but she thought they had succeeded in preventing any of the private enterprises advertising for harvesters at this juncture. The Government here had, in fact, spent about £60 in advertising, trying to overtake some of the lying advertisements of the estates in South Africa, where commissioned officers were asked to go and take up land in order to grow oranges and lemons in a region where they had found out there had been no water for five years. They had prevented scores of them from going.

The work of a properly-arranged British Commonwealth emigration effort should be directed almost as much to dissuading unsuitable people from going out as to helping suitable people to go. There were suitable people. She had found that boys with the spirit of adventure were the most suitable; they were the people who were doing very well, if one might say so, in Canada. One of them, the son of a Welsh woman of her acquaintance, left a job in the Co-operative Society at Cardiff and went to Canada to farm. When she was over there she met his employer, who said he was a splendid lad and was doing very well. When she saw the boy she asked him if he had saved any money, and he replied that he had. He had been there four years. That was a boy who loved the land, and he had tested it, and had been thrifty. But he said to her. "It will be a long time before I can get a farm." She had put it to the Prime Minister of the Province whether some scheme could not be evolved for helping these younger lads with the capital necessary to settle them on the land, because it was a terrible thing to be unemployed in Canada. Unregulated emigration was the thing that had caused the conditions to which Mr. Queen had referred. They could not organise at this end without the help of the Dominion people. She was hoping, therefore, that there would be much more coming and going in the days to come than there had been in the past.

With regard to Australia, she said that there were one or two very excellent schemes which seemed likely to be successful, but it was impossible to say yet, because they had not been in operation long enough. Another thing that seemed to be hopeful, although it had not been going long enough to judge, was the migration of 3,000 families to Canada to settle on the land. The plan was not that they should be dumped down without care, but they should be placed in the country without, at the start, the man attempting to farm on his own account but to work for wages. That had only been in operation this year, and it was quite impossible to form any idea of the result until they had had a winter.

Mr. QUEEN asked whether it was not the intention to place these people on farms that had already been abandoned by others

Mrs HARRISON BELL replied that this was so. Many of the farms were farms on which other people had not succeeded; whether it was because they were overvalued or not, she could not say. She invited their Dominion comrades to take particular interest in emigration questions, and to see that the Committees out there had not so many land agents upon them. There were vast resources in these new countries which needed to be developed, but she could not see how the capital was to be made available to develop them unless we in this country and in the Dominions adopted a very different kind of taxation from that prevalent to-day, so that those who had most would pay most. Then, if funds were available, they could manage to distribute the population on a scientific basis under real decent conditions, and not in the haphazard way they had done in the past.

Dr L. HADEN GUEST, M.P. (*Great Britain*).

Dr. L HADEN GUEST (*Great Britain*) said he welcomed very much the last speech, because it brought them to the constructive point of view, and he welcomed Comrade Queen's speech, because it gave them the criticism that was required. He said they had got to consider the question from the point of view of the distribution of the population of the whole of the Commonwealth of Nations, of which they formed part. It had got to be from the point of view of the Socialist policy and not from the point of view of the immediate possibilities. What he meant was this: he believed that in this country, and in other countries, they were moving much more rapidly than was imagined towards the creation of a comprehensive Socialist organisation, and he believed they would have to deal with the question of Australia—he was speaking of the Labour Movement of the Commonwealth as a whole—with the question of Canada, with all these countries as a whole rather than from the narrow point of view of each country. They had to deal with them from the point of view of the Commonwealth and the Socialist use of the resources of the Commonwealth as a whole in the redistribution of the population, because they knew if they got the power of the workers in this country applied to the land and the instruments of production which were available at the present time in the great Dominions, they would be able to increase and improve the standard of life. He was in agreement with Mr. Queen that at the present time that was not happening in a considerable number of cases in Australia, South Africa, and Canada, but

their policy should be one framed from the point of view not of a Party in opposition, as he ventured to think Mr Queen's remarks were framed, but from the point of view of a Party which was going to take over control. In this country they had had a Government in a Minority, but they were undoubtedly coming to the time when they would have a big majority. They had had forced upon them the fact that in the past they had been too much in opposition, too much on the destructive side, and not sufficiently on the constructive, but when they did come into power he hoped the whole of Australia would also be under Labour auspices, and that in Canada the Labour Party would be much stronger, in fact, that in every part of the British Commonwealth the Labour Movement would be stronger, and they ought at that time to be able to take a definite step towards the Socialist policy as a whole.

They had got to invent another name than "British Commonwealth". They had got to find a name which was all-inclusive, and they might even have to fall back on the word "Empire," as the Germans had had to fall back on the word "Reich". He therefore suggested that this Conference—be did not know whether they would appoint a Sub-Committee—should endeavour, at any rate, to form the foundation of a general redistribution of population policy which would be applicable to all parts of the Commonwealth of Nations, of which they formed a part. He was quite sure this was urgent and necessary.

In conclusion, he said that when Mr. Queen was speaking of the bad conditions in Canada, and, of course, there were bad conditions in Canada—they had to remember that unfortunately there were worse conditions in this country, but because there were bad conditions in Canada and Australia and here, they ought not to allow themselves to be deluded by their opposition policy, they ought to get down to a constructive policy, and then in their opposition—if they were still in opposition in the future—they ought to be getting a policy which they were going to pursue, not merely in opposition, but something which was to be their endeavour to get at step by step—a constructive policy which they had already framed. His friend, Mr Lunn, who was sitting in front, had already done something towards a constructive policy. Finally, he wished to repeat they should rely, not on destructive criticism, but should endeavour to frame a constructive policy which would be part of the Socialist policy for the Commonwealth of Nations.

At this point it was agreed to continue the discussion on the following day.

The Conference then adjourned.

## SIXTH SESSION.

*Saturday, August 1, 1925.*

Mr. C. T. CRAMP (Great Britain) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure we are all pleased at meeting in an atmosphere such as surrounds us this morning. You have been observant of what has taken place concerning the coal industry, and though personally I cannot claim it as a complete victory, yet I think we have the right to congratulate ourselves upon preventing the miners being pushed down below the absolute poverty line. We have secured a respite which I feel confident is going to lead to something more than a respite, it is going to lead to an acknowledgment of the workers in this and, I hope, every other country being entitled, before any other charge can be made upon industry, to an adequate subsistence.

I have had no time to prepare any set address, but I would like to say how pleased I am to think that it has now become possible to gather together men and women from practically all corners of the earth, though not from each country, to consider the well being and future development of what I hope will be a great society of nations, employing a common language for a common purpose.

It is an extraordinary thing that while we have in Great Britain extended our activities more and more in the direction of internationalism we have chiefly done it with those nations which are not English-speaking nations. It has been easier, so far as distance is concerned, to get into touch with the nations of Europe, though they do not speak our own tongue, and it has been easier to come to decisions with them affecting our common welfare on the political and industrial planes. But I am glad that we have at last, arising from an informal Conference which was held last year, decided that we will not only hold one Conference of this description, but that this shall be the first of very many succeeding Conferences fixed at regular intervals and becoming, I believe, for that reason better attended and more representative.

The problems with which we are confronted in the old country are problems that we need your assistance in solving. I am afraid the general outlook in days past has been that the workers of Great Britain were to give a lead to the workers of the remainder of the world. It may be true in one sense, that inasmuch as we are perhaps better organised by reason of the fact that capitalism is older here than in any other part of the world, we are able to give a lead so far as organised effort is concerned. But it is not simply the old problems with which we are confronted to-day. We are confronted not merely with the problem of the worker obtaining the full fruits of his labour, but we are also confronted with a much more difficult problem, making the fruits of his labour worth having; and in all our deliberations and in all our plans for the betterment of the workers we cannot ignore natural facts, we cannot leave out the equator. Therefore, those of you who come from countries which are not so congested as this, those of you who represent men and women who are applying themselves to taming the wilderness, who are applying themselves to develop lands which have hitherto been undeveloped, you can teach us many things with regard to development in other directions in this country in which we live.

It seems to me we have to reconquer rural England. The time has gone by when we can merely regard ourselves as the workshop of the world, as the place from which will flow the manufactured products which will be exchanged for food. That time, I think, will never come again. We have to apply ourselves, therefore, to such questions as the reconquest of this country in the interests of the people who live in it; I mean the reconquest of this country in a literal sense, not merely the conquest of capital but the reconquest of the

raw material on which we live, in this land in which we were born and in which we live and which we believe is capable of affording us a great deal more in the way of sustenance than it is doing at the present time. I think it is not too much to say that many of you are better skilled in the solution of that problem than we are ourselves, that we have as a nation forgotten many elementary facts, that we have forgotten how to utilise our land in the best possible way, that we have forgotten how to live close to nature in the way that you are doing and in the way that it is necessary for us to do if we are not to become an impoverished and weakly town population. Therefore I am glad that we have the benefit of your experience and your help in the solution of these problems

Their solution will not lend itself perhaps to street corner declamation, and their solution will not lead to action which will show scare headlines in the newspapers, and therefore will not attract the public attention which the events of the last week have done. They are problems to which we shall have to apply ourselves in a scientific spirit, and in which we shall need the assistance of those who possess the requisite knowledge to help us.

I said just now that while we had achieved a certain success in the prevention of our comrades, the miners, being driven down below the poverty line, I for one could not claim it as a complete victory; and I cannot so claim it because of this fact: that the method which is adopted is one which will involve, as it always has involved, payment by the workers. The workers will be the people who will ultimately pay this bill under the system which has now been adopted as a method of respite, and much more will remain to be done. That I am confident will be done by the organised forces of this country both industrially and politically as representing the workers. We may, and we shall, I believe, have to pass through very difficult times before the problems of mining, of transport, of textiles, of all our great industries are solved, and I believe that we will not do it simply by the rough and ready method merely of the strike or the threat of strike, but that we ourselves will have to employ our own brains in solving the problem of the reorganisation and the ownership of all these industries; and the major part of that work will not be done on the platform but in the study.

Now to conclude, I will reiterate what I said in the first place, that as a Britisher I am glad to have the assistance of my fellow workers throughout all parts of the world. United we can be a tremendous force for good, united we can be not an empire in the old understanding of the term, not a conglomeration of people who exist for the purpose of military dominance or military display, but people who can work together for the common good, none of us endeavouring to exalt ourselves above the others, all of us endeavouring to help each other, employing our common tongue, to some extent our common traditions and our common blood, in the best possible way to exalt the workers of the world. It is surprising that we have never done this thing before; I am glad that we have now decided to do it, even though it has taken the spectacle of a ruined Continent to bring us together. We shall meet, I hope—and this will be a point which you will have to decide before the end of this session—at the latest two years hence refreshed by our experiences, animated by greater hope than perhaps we possess at the present time, knowing each other better than we do now, and I hope then we may have a record of work which has been accomplished in the meantime

## ADDITIONAL DELEGATES.

The SECRETARY announced that the Parliamentary Labour Party, owing to the inevitably irregular attendance of their Delegates, had appointed four additional Delegates, namely, Mr. James

Stewart, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Harry Snell, and Dr. Haden Guest.

The CHAIRMAN called on Miss Heagney to continue the debate on Inter-Dominion Migration.

## MIGRATION.

*Miss M HEAGNEY (Australia).*

Miss HEAGNEY (Australia) said that with regard to the question of emigration she had a direct mandate from the people she represented to place before the meeting the resolutions in connection with emigration, which were adopted at the Australian Commonwealth Conference held last October. Their party was constituted on State lines and met triennially to frame a Commonwealth policy. The delegates to the Conference had mandatory powers, and what she was about to put before the meeting represented the emigration policy of the Australian Labour Party as a whole. In order not to waste time she would read the resolution as it had been carried and incorporated in the programme of the Federal Labour Party. Under the heading of "Immigration" the resolution was as follows.—

"(1) We believe that the present immigration policy of the Capitalist Governments is directed to flooding the Australian labour market, reducing Australian working class standards, and the providing of cheap labour to sweating employers. We are emphatic that public money should not be expended for these purposes.

"(2) We declare that Australia is capable, under good government, of supporting in happiness a much larger population; but to protect our fellow-workers from being deluded by false statements into leaving home and kindred merely to become tools of sweaters, we insist that land, housing accommodation and employment be provided for overseas immigrants before they are invited to come to Australia."

Then follow the conditions:—

"(a) That existing land monopoly should be broken up, and provision made for Australian land seekers;

"(b) Work should be made available for Australian unemployed, or unemployment allowances provided;

"(c) Adequate housing accommodation;

"(d) Land should be ready and employment available under Australian conditions for overseas settlers or workers when invited to come to Australia;

"(e) Effective medical examinations abroad of all intending emigrants to Australia."

It would be seen that that resolution covered many of the questions which are exercising the minds of all who are concerned with emigration. Australia was a very large continent with a small popula-

tion, and there had been from time to time considerable propaganda directed to Australia's great empty spaces, and on the face of it it looked a very selfish policy for any Australian Labour Party to desire to restrict or control the migration of people from crowded areas to that country. The speaker, however, wished to put before the meeting some facts that were overlooked when these bald general statements were made. In the first place, Australia, just like Africa, was not all cultivatable, and it was not possible to live in the whole of Australia. There was in Australia a very great desert territory, just as there was in Africa, a very great deal of the land had a rainfall of less than 10in. in the year, so that it was not all productive.

The difficulties in connection with the land which could be cultivated were, first and foremost, that the best of it was privately owned. There were just the same difficulties in getting on the land in Australia as there were in England, and, as their comrade from British Guiana had pointed out yesterday, as there were in Guiana, and as presumably there were in South Africa. The land was owned by private people for exploitation by private enterprise for the good only of the individual. There were areas of Crown lands, but the best of the land had been alienated from the Crown. Miss Heagney said that in speaking of the Crown what was meant was the Government, but she would keep to the term that was used in Australia with regard to Crown land. The Government or Crown lands were fairly good, but differed very much in the different States. Queensland had a considerable amount of Crown lands which were let under lease to large landowners. Some legislation had been introduced to deal with the question of the resumption of these Crown lands and the alteration of the leases, and Queensland Labour was developing an agricultural policy which had for its object the bringing of more good Crown lands within the reach of the settler or the person who wanted to go on the land, and who had no capital. But that policy was only being developed; it had not yet reached the stage when the Government could say they could settle an unlimited number of people on the land. In New South Wales the position was different. There the Crown lands were leased under varying schemes; without going into the whole detail of the tenure of lands in Australia it would be sufficient to say that in New South Wales the Government really had not got at its disposal very much good land suitable for settlement without the expenditure of vast sums of

money. In Victoria, where the speaker came from, there was no Crown land suitable for settlement. All land that had been made available for settlement had been purchased from the rich land owners at exorbitant rates, which had rendered it absolutely impossible for the settlers to secure a comfortable livelihood on the land. When a settlement scheme was proposed, and the Government was seeking fresh land, the price of the lands which were likely to be bought was immediately raised, and the Government bought at an absolutely uneconomic price land for settlement. That land was bought on loan money, and the land itself had to bear the heaviest part of the mortgage; which meant that the settler must pay the interest before he got anything out of the land at all. Consequently all the more recent efforts that had been made in Victoria with regard to closer settlement had meant that the first call on the land had been a tribute to the large landowner. South Australia was perhaps not quite in the same position, but very much the same applied.

In Western Australia the position was slightly different. Western Australia was the last State to be settled, and a great deal of its land was held by the Crown. The population of Western Australia was built up after the gold rush of 1890 and 1891. Gold-production had now fallen, and increased agricultural production was essential. There the Crown had a certain amount of good land, and the last Government had developed what appeared to be a very good scheme of group settlement, and the Labour Party in Western Australia was considering the continuance of this scheme. There were certain features of it to which the Labour Party objected. Mr. Collier, the Premier of West Australia, who was in England a few months ago, explained the position with regard to this when here. The country needed capital to develop the scheme, and at the moment there was some doubt as to what the future policy of the Western Australian Government would be. Miss Heagney said that with regard to this, of course, she had not got the very latest advices, but she thought the matter was now being reconsidered. That gave some idea of the position with regard to land in Australia; there was a monopoly, and until something could be done by the Labour Governments to develop land policies, which would free the land from the clutches of monopolists, they could not, with any degree of security, ask people to come to settle on the land in Australia.

In connection with this matter the speaker said that she had with her some cuttings from the *Times* of this

month which would give some idea of the insecurity and unsatisfactory system of land settlement that had been going on since the war. Since the war, with co-operation between the British Government and the Australian Commonwealth Government, there had been a steady working up of the idea of emigration to Australia. Now she would give just a few facts in connection with land settlement which must arrest their attention. The first cutting, in order of date, was dated from Perth, July 16th. This would give some idea of the present situation in Western Australia in connection with the group settlement scheme.

“The Royal Commission on Immigration has presented a Report condemning group settlement, and recommends its abandonment, but the Government is not likely to accept the recommendation. The Report declares that much of the country is unsuitable for settlers, who are only being asked to try land at the expense of others. The failure of a number of settlers has directed attention to the fact, upon which stress is laid, that nearly half of the original settlers have left their holdings. The Commissioners harshly criticise the agreement of the Imperial and Commonwealth Governments, and suggest that undue haste was shown in making an agreement with Great Britain. A minority suggests confining group membership to settlers who have had a preliminary training.”

So without knowing all the facts there was an indication that all is not well with the group settlement scheme in Western Australia, which appeared to be the most satisfactory and the most hopeful of all the settlement schemes in Australia. The speaker said that she was familiar with the proposal, and was very favourably impressed with the plan, as she understood it.

The next cutting was dated Sydney, July 17th, and read:—

“Sydney, July 17th.—Mr. Bruce, the Prime Minister, has written to the State Premiers offering to write off £5,000,000 of the loans made by the Commonwealth to the States for soldier land settlement, bringing the Commonwealth share of the losses to over £10,000,000. After 1930 the interest on the balances due by the States to the Commonwealth will be reduced to 5 per cent. Throughout Australia nearly 36,000 returned soldiers have been settled on the land at a total cost of £53,000,000, of which it is estimated about £20,000,000 represents loss.”

*Miss M Heagney (Australia)*

Those were significant figures when one was considering the question of present-day emigration policy. They related to the whole of Australia. Then there was this from South Australia:

"Adelaide, July 22. In the House of Assembly to-day Mr. Butler (Liberal) asked whether, as the British House of Commons viewed seriously the scant consideration which Australia had given to the Imperial immigration offer, the Government would, at the earliest moment, announce whether it was prepared to accept the Agreement. Mr. Gunn, the Premier, replied that he doubted whether there was real uneasiness in the House of Commons, but the Agreement necessitated much consideration. South Australia was unable to provide sufficient land for local applicants, and was not participating in the offer, but in consequence of the substantial number of nominated immigrants arriving, the Government were considering their absorption by a large re-forestation scheme. A sensation was created in the Assembly when it was announced that the Government would probably have to write off between £1,000,000 and £2,000,000 of the expenditure on the Murray lands, where there are many soldier-settlers, in consequence of the unsuitable nature of the soil and adverse dried-fruit markets."

Continuing, Miss HEAGNEY said she thought she had said sufficient to show that there was cause for uneasiness with regard to the whole basis of the immigration policy. So far as the Labour Party was concerned it had had no hand so far in these immigration proposals. As everyone knew, they had been in opposition since 1917 in every State except Queensland. Their attitude in regard to the war and conscription cost them the Government in every State, except one, and in the Commonwealth. Queensland alone held on. Queensland was not taking many selected migrants except domestics and boys for a farm-training scheme. They favoured the system of nomination by Queensland residents.

In all other States, the policies had been framed by Anti-Labour Governments. The Labour Party was now in power in every State except Victoria, so within the next year or two the Labour Parties would be called upon to review the whole question of overseas migration. The workers in Australia had achieved a considerable measure of control over industrial conditions, but capitalism was still the dominant economic force. In considering migration policies, it must be remembered that Australian Labour sought to retain the power it had won, and avoid complications from influx of people un-

provided with work. When dealing with their own people who were to some extent assured of a living, there was no difficulty, but with the newly arrived migrant the economic pressure was greater and tended to force his acceptance of lower wages. Standard hours and wages were legally fixed for every man and woman engaged in industry, and labour regulations were properly administered as a result of the vigilance of the Trade Unions. They could influence the people who had been educated to the acceptance of their industrial standard, and they could absorb and control a certain number coming in; but if there was a great influx of immigrants, wherever they came from, they could not control the conditions under which they work and live.

This question, said Miss Heagney, had attracted attention this year in connection with the influx of South Europeans. There had been an agitation in connection with it, and an inquiry had been held in Queensland. Queensland had a greater mixture of races than any other part of Australia, which gave rise to special economic problems. She had mentioned at a previous sitting that the sugar plantation owners were responsible for the exploitation of Kanakas in Queensland. Somehow or other those same plantations attracted a greater variety of people than any other industry in Australia, and lately there had been in those areas an influx of Italians, Greeks and all southern Europeans. They had come in large numbers grouped together, and had been employed by people of their own nationality. The Queensland Government appointed Mr. T. A. Ferry as a Royal Commissioner to inquire into the conditions, and, among other things, he pointed out the danger to Australian standards from this quarter. He said in one part of his report:

"The arrival of large numbers of aliens, unable to speak the English language, and unacquainted with our laws and industrial conditions, in districts where there is already a surplus of labour, can only lead to industrial trouble, and to a number of individuals being thrown on the State for support. It is desirable that aliens be not permitted to arrive in any one district in such numbers as to become a majority of the workers in such district."

And again,

"Foreign immigrants are exploited by farmers, and agreements contrary to the provisions of the Sugar Workers' Award are drawn up. It is, however, difficult to succeed in a prosecution where the employer and employees are foreigners and connive at the evasion of



the law Cases were found where the immigrants were working more than the eight hours daily and for the seven days in the week. Thus the hours of labour should be better regulated "

Those were some of the problems which unrestricted immigration meant to Australia. The other questions touched on by the Australian Commonwealth Labour Conference were the questions of housing and a general provision for the people. There had been an acute housing shortage in Australia; they had not caught up yet to pre-war housing conditions, and unless State activity was quickened the constant arrival of people would only increase the difficulties of those who were already there and would place at a greater disadvantage the people who were coming. Because, after all, those who were resident in Australia had the support of their relatives and families and friends; they had a reserve that the newly arrived immigrant had not, and if they were in difficulties there was someone to help them.

Further, there was not the same economic pressure on the Australian citizen that would tend to break down industrial standards as there was on the newly arrived immigrant, who under the existing regulations was only expected to have £2 landing money and a guaranteed job, which might or might not suit him when he got there; and those who came as domestic servants were supposed to guarantee to give at least twelve months' domestic service. Experience had shown that in many cases that condition was not fulfilled. Miss Heagney said that she had been given an opportunity of seeing behind the scenes in the Migration Department in Australia House, and she had found that in many cases women who went out as domestics had not in this country followed domestic service exclusively; almost invariably they had worked in factories. These girls went out to Australia not to work as domestics, but to enter into the ordinary city life of the community. She was not going to say that they should be restricted to domestic work, but when they acted in that way they did not fulfil the conditions which they subscribed to and which, according to even the promoters of these immigration schemes, were the only terms upon which assisted women migrants were acceptable. The Australian people did not want more people in competition for jobs in the factories while there was said to be a shortage of domestic labour. She knew nothing about the shortage herself, and of course these statements were very often exaggerated.

With regard to the men who went out as land workers she was afraid the same thing applied. They did not

really desire to go on the land as farm workers; and the conditions of ordinary farm work were not, as a rule, sufficiently attractive to keep a man who had worked in the city on the land in Australia. They, too, drifted back to the cities, and they came to the Trade Union centres and asked for assistance to be placed in industry. Such things were constantly operating against the success of these migration policies. Miss Heagney said she did not think that there was anything else to be said.

Mr JAMES STEWART asked if Miss Heagney could say anything about Tasmania

Miss HEAGNEY replied that Tasmania had developed quite differently. It was a small country with a limited amount of agricultural land, but with magnificent waterways which would lend themselves to a scheme of electrification. She understood from information supplied to her that recently the Premier had expressed the idea that industrial development would best absorb immigrants and that the land development should be left to local people who had a better knowledge of the conditions. It was mostly fruit growing and some sheep raising in Tasmania. There was a big hydro-electric scheme there which was going to distribute cheap power over the whole of the island, and already two or three big concerns had been developed; Cadbury's had taken their works out and would absorb a great number of industrialists. Of course the numbers who had gone out to Tasmania were so far not very great. They were accepting nominated immigrants, domestics and boys, and lately, in order to use these people, they had developed a forestry scheme, and were sending the boys particularly into the working of this forestry scheme. It was something in the nature of a nursery for the reforestation of certain areas, and the scheme seemed to be, so far as it went, quite good. But the numbers that had gone out to Tasmania and the numbers that could be absorbed at the moment were not very great. When they were taken they were absorbed in industry.

Miss HEAGNEY remarked that in general she supposed that what she had said sounded a very limited contribution to the discussion that was being held. They knew that Australia was going to continue developing. Their population was increasing at present at the rate of 2 per cent. per annum, 1½ per cent. of which was natural increase, and half per cent. represented the excess of arrivals over departures. There had been no thorough examination, but it was felt that after the expenditure of vast sums of money on immigration, people went back again;

*Miss M. Heagney (Australia)]*

the economic life of the country did not lend itself under the present system to the absorption of vast numbers quickly, it must be a gradual process, and until they could socialise some of the industries and deal effectively with the land problem they could not take great numbers of immigrants quickly. She did not think that they could really be accused of being selfish in this respect, they were facing the whole problem of social reorganisation, and when that was done the opportunities for migration from other countries would increase.

But again and again she had had to say through this Conference that their domestic problems and their responsibilities in these matters were infinitely greater than any contribution they could make to world affairs. They could not from the Socialist standpoint influence any of the big foreign policies in Europe. They could serve best in the interest of workers in the Commonwealth that they were discussing to day and in the international sphere by developing as quickly as possible their home policy and by eliminating and restricting the other causes that tended to make their home problem more difficult. She hoped she had made the position clear. They were not opposed to people from other countries coming to them if they were sure that it was to their advantage and to the advantage of the people in Australia, but they knew that under the present system, except for individuals here and there, the whole position was unsatisfactory, and it worked to the disadvantage of both the people in Australia and the migrants who came under the conditions and facilities that had been offered under any immigration scheme up to the present.

*Mr. H. W. SAMPSON, M L A  
(South Africa).*

Mr H W SAMPSON (South Africa) said that he had a suggestion for what it was worth to offer to the Conference. He had listened to the horrors that had been brought about through indiscriminate immigration; they had heard where immigration had been partially successful, but where other things had worked in the direction of undoing the good that had been done, and it seemed to him, while listening to this debate, that that was mainly owing to lack of proper control. He desired to offer the suggestion to the Conference that they should set themselves to a policy of setting up some co-ordinating authority, first of all in respect to the British Commonwealth of Nations, and then to extend that policy when successful as far as they could internationally. Why he said internationally was this. He might just say in passing that they had only to look at a map of Africa and see

what a number of countries were interested in the development of that Continent and see what chaos would ensue in, say, a hundred years' time if each country interested in that big Continent pursued a different policy in regard to emigration. Therefore it must ultimately become international. He had sufficient faith in the peoples of the world to believe that they could get a body of people who were divorced from partisanship, who would make it their life's work to visit and study in an impartial manner the problems of all the countries, and who would then, gradually being vested with powers through the confidence of the country, drive this tide of emigration not only from the older countries to the newer countries, but sometimes he thought it would work in the other direction, that some from the newer countries who were misfits, and did not quite fit in with the scheme of things in those countries, would find a better and freer life and a higher standard of living in some of the older countries than they did in the newer countries.

This was a first class political question in the country that he came from. To this question he subordinated all other questions, and most other people did so also. The only cause of enmity they had with the rest of the world was wrapped up in this question, and, generally speaking, it assumed a racial aspect instead of a true aspect; that was, the desire to utilise the country in which he lived for the benefit of all the peoples of the world—which he considered should be the proper outlook of anybody in South Africa. He had found from people who had taken any very great interest in regard to those countries which were British possessions, that they seemed to imagine that all those countries were barren of population, just wanting people to pour in and develop them; and further that each country was practically identical, that there was no difference in what immigrants had to face, whether they went to Australia or to South Africa. It was more a matter of chance to which country they went, and they never seemed to make any proper inquiry beforehand. But there was a vast difference, as everybody present knew, between, say, the Continent of Africa and the Continent of Australia. The aborigines of Australia were a decreasing quantity; in Australia the white race predominated; but he wanted to point out that the exact opposite was the case in regard to Africa. Africa was a country that was peopled all over by people who had lived there for many centuries before a white man trod in Africa. Those peoples were of

different races, with as much difference as the races of the peoples of Europe, speaking different languages, living different lives altogether to each other, with different philosophies, different religions, and with a different outlook in life from each other. True, Africa was not intensively populated. But parts were; and that was mainly due to the natural resources of the country when people lived in a primitive fashion. As far as the white people of South Africa were concerned they were all down in one corner of the country practically, except a few plantation owners in other parts of the country. Those were the people who were in the Union of South Africa and in Rhodesia. There one had to remember that the proportions of population were roughly five natives to one white man. In the rest of the country the white man was a rarity. He had got a large slice of the land, of which he had dispossessed the native, but he was a rarity; and he did not carry on production on his own account, he exploited the natives in specialised forms of production. Mainly he was using up the fauna of the country; he was hunting animals for skins, elephants for ivory; he was depriving the country of a good deal of its wealth in a wholesale fashion for exportation to Europe, exploiting the natives *en route*.

He wished to bring to the notice of those present the climax which had been reached in just that corner of that huge Continent, which might have very great consequences in the next century over the Continent itself. When he went to South Africa 34 years ago the whole of that southern portion was wide open to the immigrant. It did not matter who he was or what he was. If he was a white man he could enter without let or hindrance and without a penny in his pocket or a prospect of work; he would be admitted into that country. Now 34 years afterwards he found this was what was said in regard to immigration: "We want immigrants of the right kind. We want the man who has had a first-class agricultural training and who possesses at least £2,000." That change in South Africa had taken place in 34 years, and there must be some particular reason for it. Entrance through the ports of the country was now so restricted under the Immigration Act that he did not think, speaking without wishing to give offence, that half the people in that room could get admittance to the country or could satisfy the immigration authorities; whereas thirty-four years ago they could have come through without a sou in their pockets, without a medical examination, suffering from any disease under the sun, and without any prospect of work whatever. The position thirty-four years ago was that the people who had gone there

before and who had collared or bought land were wanting people to work the land, and they mainly utilised native labour, which was primitive and very inefficient, at least at the beginning. Generally speaking the land in South Africa was exploited somewhat after that fashion. But the change that came over the country was mainly due to the finding of gold and diamonds. Certain industries sprang up which required the technical knowledge and the greater efficiency and experience of white men from European countries. White men went there in crowds at that time. The greatest increases of the white population could be shown by the censuses taken from time to time thirty or forty years back. But those men, at least in the minds of the people who had set out to exploit the wealth of the country, were merely there in the missionary sense; they were there as the teachers of the blacks and with the knowledge that a few years of contact between them and the black people in the country would suffice to allow black people in South Africa to get a knowledge of their trades and industries and the way in which they practised them, and then the black would continue with the original scheme of things with that fuller knowledge and perform the work for the rest of time at a much lower rate of wage than a white man. But after a few years of working of this plan there grew up a problem in the country which startled the white people. It was what to do with the dull members and some of the bight members of the white families. They could not all become employers of natives. There seemed to be no place in the scheme of things by which they could find a living in the country they were born in, and most white people in South Africa began to look to other countries as countries to which they could send their white children when they grew up, not only to learn trades but to practise them.

Likewise there grew up the problem of the *arme blanke*—the poor white. They amounted to something like 150,000, which was a considerable number in a white population of a little over a million and a quarter. They were agriculturists and mainly the descendants of the Dutch and French early settlers in South Africa; they were the descendants of men who had ample lands at the beginning, who had enslaved the natives and who had set up a system of exploitation of native labour. They, too, had no place in their scheme of life for their sons and daughters except as supervisors of the natives. Crowded out, these sons and daughters drifted away from the high and habitable lands for whites, and went to the forests and the low lands of the country; and their position today (and

*Mr. H. W. Sampson, M.L.A. (South Africa)*]

it) it was that the condition of many of Africa although they felt disgraced by it) was that the condition of many of these people was poorer than the condition of very many Kaffirs, that their outlook on life was worse than that of a Kaffir. In fact in that country many called them White Kaffirs; that is what they had descended to. Any set of people or any race of people who depended on another race to do their work would suffer the same disaster; and unless they were going out to the Colonies with an idea of doing their own work they would not succeed as true Colonists and they would do that country an injury; but if they went to that country prepared to work and to help to develop it, then there was a different outlook. Mr. Sampson said that during the period when the ports were open he went out with thousands of other men like him, with no outlook in life in Great Britain, competing in the streets of London for employment, having to be content with a day or two per week with a very low standard of living, with nothing in front of him in life at all, in a country overcrowded through capitalism; and when he and others went out there they started to work and they thought they saw a great future. But as time went on they saw the encroachments that were being made upon their field of labour by the natives, not so much in his own trade, which he attributed to the establishment of a minimum wage and entire absence of any colour bar in the constitution of his own Trade Union, but they saw those encroachments of unorganised and uncivilised natives used merely as chattels directed into industry, gradually improving their knowledge, gradually fitting more and more into the white employer's scheme of industrial advancement of the country, and one by one deposing the white workman until now the position was reached in South Africa that they did not know what to do with their children, and there was no further immigration into the country; more white men left that southern portion of South Africa every year than came into it.

Then take the native position. Whatever might be their opinions of the state of civilisation in which the natives lived prior to the whites going there, nobody would gainsay that in his own tribal life, communally owning his own land, with his own laws, with his own responsibility to his own people, generally speaking they were very much more happy in those days than they were to-day as the wage slave of the white. White men could only now come into Africa as farmers, as settlers, by purchasing land at high values from other whites or at the expense of further encroachment on the land in native reserves, by taking further land away from the natives; nor for that

matter could Indians come into South Africa as settlers and agriculturists, as suggested at the Conference, except at the expense of the native and by taking away his lands. Many whites until recently saw no purpose in life except that they had penetrated that country, and endeavoured to start organisations amongst the people, and by their efforts had shown to the natives what they could do by combination in the way of improving their standard of living; they could see no future for the whites at present there, and if the past policy were pursued it would be only a matter of time before the bulk of the white population would have to drift from that portion of the country. Personally, as one who had made very great efforts in his lifetime to improve the condition of the natives, he was scared to think of what the lot of the native was going to be when left to the tender mercies of the people who would remain to exploit him when the white working class had gone. Therefore it was not a preference of one colour or another which would determine who were the people who would in future populate that vast country, but a question of the wage paid. If it was to be a wage which would not allow a white man to maintain anything like a white man's standard of civilisation, then the work would drift into the hands of the natives without the protection of a white working-class. On the other hand, if a wage was fixed which industry could well afford to pay in a very rich and highly mineralised land such as South Africa was, with its very vast resources of raw material—if it was fixed on a civilised wage, then the white man would continue to prosper in that country, and bring up his children with a future in life, and furthermore they would as a body do something to increase the standard of living of the native population of the country, and by organising them get them better conditions. So they, as a white Labour Party out there, who were just a small section of a big community and without those immense powers which some people imagined they had got when they came here, had adopted that policy of determining wages on civilised standards. He would not say that incidentally in the working out of a policy of that kind, certain men who stood in the position of blacklegs to the whites, who had never striven to maintain a civilised wage, and who had never become wholly efficient in industry, might not suffer some temporary set back. When an employer was faced with the option of giving a civilised man a wage to meet his necessities, irrespective of the colour of his skin, he need hardly say that the natural tendency would be in the beginning to employ the white man owing to his greater efficiency. He did not think that that meant a very great hardship. At any rate it

was a necessary one. When the minimum wages in the printing trade in the Cape were fixed 30 years ago, there were fully 75 per cent. of coloured people in it. It was a very low minimum wage at first. Many worked in Capetown for £2 a week of 60 hours before their Union was formed; and that was a very low wage for a country such as that. He thought he could safely say, without hearing in his whole history of a single coloured person being actually sacked to make room for a white, that a process had gone on by which the workers now employed there were considerably whiter than before.

Many years ago they had thought that the contact between the natives of the Union and the white men and the white Trade Unionists especially would have the effect of increasing the wants of the native, and cause him to get higher wages. It was thought that contact with whites would raise the standard of living of the natives, and that their low standard of civilisation would gradually disappear and likewise their competition against whites. But the employers found a way of getting over that. A great number of the natives performed work on the goldfields, there were about a quarter of a million of them there. From their contact with white men, whose standard of living was an object lesson to the natives, there came a time when they demanded higher wages, when the cost of living went up during the war period. That was met by pouring over the Portuguese border hordes of barbarians from Portuguese East Africa and natives from north of latitude 22, bringing sleeping sickness and all sorts of diseases from the centre of the Continent in amongst the other natives. The wage standard of the natives in the mines, which remained the same within sixpence a day over the last forty years, had been kept on that low basis solely by bringing in other natives from outside, from Central Africa and Portuguese East Africa, to show the natives already there that they were not indispensable, and that if they attempted to raise their standard or to demand more wages the inevitable end would be that other men would get the work. Those who thought everything would come right if left alone had to face the problem that some twenty-five million natives south of the Equator had to be absorbed into industry on a very low wage basis before there was any hope of raising their wage standard to anything approaching our own. All the whites would be eliminated before this happened. That was the problem which white South Africa had to face. They, therefore, favoured the policy of the territorial separation of the races, of trying to give all the land they could to the natives, of allowing the native to develop on his own lines in his own terri-

tory. This would allow them to build up a white civilisation with white standards of life, with white people performing their own work side by side with the natives in their own territory. Not only that, but in time they would require the help of many millions of white people from elsewhere, who would assist in the development of the white portion of the country. That was the policy that had been adopted by the South African Labour Party, and the speaker did not think that any Labour men in South Africa could now be shaken from that policy, which all were convinced was the right one, not from race prejudice or a feeling of antagonism towards the coloured races, but because they believed that the exploitation of the coloured races would be to the detriment of black and white alike, and because they believed the native would work out his own redemption better in his own way upon his own land, than by any other method that had been pursued hitherto in that Continent.

The CHAIRMAN said there was a very interesting subject next to be considered which was to be introduced by Mr. Lansbury on "Inter-Dominion Trade Relations." He thought they might now go on to that subject.

Mr. J. STEWART (Great Britain) pointed out that in that case the opinions on emigration of some of those present, representing the Old Country, who perhaps held conflicting views, would not be expressed at all.

Mr. GEORGE LANSBURY (Great Britain) did not think that there could be to-day a very effective discussion of Inter-Dominion trade relations, in view of the short time at their disposal, and he thought that probably it would be best simply to inform their friends who were not at the Conference that the Agenda was so long that there had been no opportunity to discuss that question.

The CHAIRMAN said that he himself had not the slightest objection to whatever course was considered best.

Dr HADEN GUEST (Great Britain) asked if there was a possibility of sitting during the afternoon—The CHAIRMAN said there was a possibility.

Mr. J. SIMPSON (Canada) did not want anybody to be deprived of the opportunity of expressing their opinions, but he hoped that, if possible, they would get through the Conference during the morning.

After a discussion on procedure, it was agreed to continue the debate on emigration, and afterwards hear Mr. Lansbury's introduction of the subject, "Inter-Dominion Trade Relations," without debate.

It was also agreed that the Chairman should impose a time limit of ten minutes on all further speeches.

Mr. P. Heenan, M.P.P. (Ontario).

Mr P. HEENAN (Ontario) said that he thought the Conference had done well to decide to go on with the discussion on emigration, because he knew of no subject that had been before the Conference which was of more importance. Going round the country, he had heard a great many English Conservatives, as they were called here, or, as they were called in Canada, English Tories, describing the position here. He had listened to one gentleman at Trafalgar Square, a few Saturdays ago, telling miners and other workers that this was no place for them, that there were too many of them, and that they would have to get into other work. One man asked: "Where will we go?" The answer was: "Go to Canada, to Australia, to anywhere in the great Dominions where the British people are. We are giving assisted passages." Mr. Heenan said that he sat in the House recently, and heard Mr. Amery speaking on colonization, and, speaking of the great things that happened in the Dominions, and principally about Canada, he said that he had scores of letters here that he would like to read, but he was tempted to quote from just one. That one was from an Englishman who had gone out to Canada, and eventually got sufficient money to buy one pig, and was soon going to have a litter, and who had so many hens and some chickens, and who was happy and contented. That was the standard of living that Mr. Amery had evidently chosen for an Englishman in Canada. It was a very serious question in Canada, because they were face to face there with perpetual unemployment, which was a really serious thing. But it was the fact that the emigration policy was very gigantic. There were so many agents working all over the world, that if a million men were put there to work to-morrow there would be another half-million coming on afterwards.

He would like to say to Dr. Haden Guest that Mr. Queen's statement yesterday was not in opposition to emigration, as he thought Dr. Haden Guest had understood. They in Canada wanted to welcome everybody, but they wanted them to know the conditions under which they were going to that country. They wanted people to bear in mind that in Canada there were eight months winter in the year, and in some parts of the country they got from 25 to 50, or even 60 degrees below zero; and he wished to point out that being out of work in a country with no "dole" system, and in a country having winter for eight months in the year, at 50 degrees below zero, was not simply like being out of work in England. He said

it was a hardship, and it was criminal to invite men to a country such as that, without some provision being made for them and their families. A man emigrating to that country would be a beggar if he did not secure employment. In Canada there was no Unemployment Insurance; there was nothing except knocking at someone's door and asking for help. In the Trans-Continental train on the Canadian Pacific Railway there were dozens of Englishmen stealing rides and hanging on to buffers, even in the dead of winter, trying to get from one place to another and trying to get work, and he himself knew something of their experiences. He would say that the whole propaganda for emigrants to that country was misleading. They had their Governments—he said Governments because there were many Governments in Canada—making statements to the effect that Canada was not asking for industrial workers to come; they were telling the British Government not to send them out; they wanted only agricultural employees. And yet, when he stood on the Floor of the House last week, at a time when there were 30,000 unemployed people in the City of Toronto, he was able to read a clipping from an English paper saying that 5,000 men were required in the City of Toronto to help build a new viaduct. He said he would not go into details, because everybody present knew the reason of that. At the same time that a Minister of the Government of Canada was making the statement that emigration to the United States was their opportunity, Mr. Amery was standing on the Floor of the House here, making the statement that this country ought to try to get the Overseas Dominions to adopt a system of reciprocal unemployment insurance, so that the workers here could be got out there.

Now, this was the question: what was going to be done with them when they arrived out there? Somebody said: Farm the land. All he wanted to say was that Mr. Latta, himself an agriculturist, made the statement on the Floor of the House last year in Saskatchewan that, with a population of a quarter of a million, they grew enough wheat to feed thirty million people, and yet the quarter of a million people did not make a living out of the wheat they grew to feed the thirty million people. That was the position out in Canada, and in face of that, when there was a big surplus of labour, there were Governments in Canada, who were large employers, sending men out into the bush to cut wood at a dollar a day. Such were the conditions in Canada. The Labour Party in Ontario thought that some kind of a Commission should be formed, independent and unpartisan, which would work this emigration policy

in the interests of humanity, instead of in the interests of farmers or agriculturists or industrialists. He said there was no question about it: they were using the present situation to cut down the wages of the men who were employed. One of those capitalistic Ministers had jeered at him on the Floor of the House last session and had said, "What have you done to raise wages; why can't you try to use your influence to raise wages in the industries? Why don't you do something, if you are a Labour man?"—and yet, at the same time, he was bringing in thousands and thousands from all over the world in order to have unorganised men in the position to take the places of organised men. That was the position in Canada, and he thought the Conference ought to know it. One of the reasons he was speaking about this was the fact that in Canada the workers were used as a political football. If they could not get the religious question in Canada, they could get the drink question, and if they could not get the drink question, they could get the racial question.

*Mr D. BEN-GURION (Palestine).*

Mr. D. BEN-GURION (Palestine) said that he was under the impression that the question of emigration had not been as fully appreciated at this Conference as it should be. It was not a question for this or the other country. It was one of the biggest problems in the whole of history. If one took Eastern Canada, for instance, one would see that the whole trouble there now was the product of immigration, and the same thing in Australia. At all times people have been migrating from one country to another. He thought it would be a great mistake if they did not concern themselves very seriously with the problem of migration, and that the Labour Party, not only in this country but in the various countries, would have to face the problem of migration. He was sure that they would never be able to organise society on a new basis unless they found a solution to this problem. The problem was that in many countries there was over-population and they must find an outlet; and on the other hand there were many countries which were very sparsely populated; and not only in one country, but in the world at large, there were big areas of land which were not cultivated because there was not only the question of emigration, but there was also the question of food and there was the very big question of raw material. In a country like England they would be in difficulty if they could not find a solution of the problem of getting enough raw materials and getting enough food for the people. Therefore the question of emigration and the question of colonisation were interwoven and a solution must

be found for both these problems. The result on the Labour movement of the prevailing system of emigration up to now was this. On one side the Governments used the immigrants who were not organised as cheap labourers in order to undermine the standard of employment of the organised Labour movement in various countries. He fully understood the attitude of the Canadian representatives; they were afraid of Englishmen because the Canadian Labour movement had succeeded in getting a very high standard applied, compared with other countries.

Mr J. QUEEN said that was not so.

Mr. BEN-GURION said he knew that Canada was not a paradise, but when Canada was compared with many other countries, it was much higher than in other countries. Certainly that was the case with regard to Australia. He believed that the comrades in Canada were afraid that immigrants would come and do harm and that they would work for cheaper rates.

There was another objection to colonisation, because until now, colonisation in many countries had been conducted in this way: they were going to other countries, not to work them, but to own them. But you could not live on owning land unless somebody else was working on it, and it was the native races who were exploited. Therefore there were two objections from the organised Labour movement: on the one side to emigration as undermining the standard of life of the workers, and on the other side there was the capitalistic Imperial exploitation, subjecting the coloured races and other subject people to the most inhuman Imperialistic exploitation. But we were nearing the moment, as Dr. Haden Guest had very rightly pointed out, when the Labour Movement would be responsible, not only for this country, but possibly over all the world. The time is not far off when, not only in Great Britain, but also in France and Germany, and certainly in Australia, there would be a Labour Government, and they would have to solve big problems; and one of the biggest problems was the problem of making a redistribution on the one side and of developing the sparsely populated countries, not for exploitation or for subjection of the coloured people, but for increasing the food and raw material.

He hoped the Conference would allow him to make some remarks regarding the problem as seen by the people in his country. In his country, Palestine, this question of emigration was naturally an economic problem which they had to solve, not only as far as their country was concerned, but as far as their own people were concerned. When he said his people, he meant the Jewish people.

*Mr. D. Ben-Curion (Palestine)]*

The vital question of the Jewish people at this moment was the question of emigration. They were a people of nomads, not because they liked to wander from one place to another, but because they had been forced to do so, not only in those countries where they had been allotted, but even in those countries where they had got full and equal civil rights. Taking Russia as one instance, they had now a Labour Government which was very friendly to all nations. It was really anxious to help the Jewish masses to better their conditions, but it was unable to do so because of objective conditions. Objective conditions in Russia were such that they were trying to organise their industries and they were centralising their enterprises; they were abolishing the small industries; they were being centred in several big industries; and the Jewish masses had no opportunity under the Soviet régime, and there was no possibility of improvement under the existing system, which was a social system—at least, it was an experiment in Socialism in Russia. But there was a very friendly Government, and there were 106,000 Jews who, if they were not able to go out of Russia to some other place, would have to starve, and the Russian Government could not help them, although they were trying to help them to settle on the land. They had not got the means, and there was not land enough, because they needed the land for their own peasant population. There was a still worse condition in Poland. Besides the objective condition, there was also the deliberate policy of the Polish Government to turn out the Jews by their economic and political policy. So this was really a vital question.

The Labour problem in effect was a problem of emigration. He would tell the Conference very shortly what was their emigration policy. They had the same question as was to be found in Canada, that there was the danger that the immigrants would undermine the standard of wage of the organised workers. Immigrants represent the highest standard of life which they had in Palestine, and it was their task to aid the Palestine workers. They were trying not only to organise the immigrants when they came, but were organising them in the land of their emigration. They were organising them in Russia and in Poland, and were training them there to enable them to occupy themselves in such trades as they could. The main trade in Palestine was agriculture, and it was just that trade with which the Jewish masses had not had an opportunity in other countries of occupying themselves; they had been deprived of that opportunity in all countries. They

had in Palestine, on a small scale, the same problem that there was in Canada, the problem of cultivating waste lands. There were many waste lands in Palestine. They were training the prospective emigrants in various countries for agricultural work, and organising them so that when they came to Palestine they automatically became members of the Labour Movement, and also fitted in with the method of colonisation. It was not a question of exploiting unemployment; they wanted only proper labour conditions; they wanted only to live by working; and the one obstacle in Palestine was the question of private ownership of the land. They fought against private ownership of land in their system of colonisation, and they fought for national organisation of the land, and they had to a very great extent succeeded in that. Their system of colonisation in Palestine was based principally on national land; there was no private property in the land, which was given to the immigrant workers who came into Palestine, so that there could not be any speculation in land and nobody could be exploited. People could get land only by working on it themselves.

*Mr. J. STEWART, M.P. (Great Britain).*

Mr. J. STEWART (Great Britain) said that he, like other Comrades who had spoken, was deeply interested in this question of emigration, but from a quite different point of view. As the Chairman had pointed out, this country had been highly industrialised, but it had now ceased to occupy the position it had occupied for nearly a hundred years as the foremost industrial country of the world. There was a population in Great Britain of 45 million people on a little piece of land that would easily go into a very small State in Canada, and would easily go into a corner of Australia. There was an immense unemployment problem, which was now generally recognised as being permanent in this land, and nothing we could do under the present conditions could possibly prevent that from developing. Some of them were satisfied that this country could not on agricultural lines maintain its present population. That position had to be dealt with, but the difficulty which had arisen this morning was that while there had been a great deal of sympathy expressed by all who had spoken, there was no room in their particular countries for emigrants from this country. Canada had a territory larger than the United States, with nine millions population, as against 110 millions in the United States. Its resources were at least as great as those of the United States. Australia had a population of something less than six millions, with a



continent larger than the United States. They had no room there at all for us! Circumstances prevented them from accepting our people. He thought the problem was here, and that we had to find a way out of that difficulty. They had got to pool their forces together. They must not adopt the position which seemed to have been adopted this morning. "While sympathetic, we do not want you." They had to find a way of getting over the difficulty.

In Great Britain the stage was now reached when it was recognised that there was no difference between going to Toronto, to Alberta, to Saskatchewan, to Melbourne, to Adelaide, to Victoria, or to Western Australia and going from Inverness to London. One hundred years ago Inverness was as far away from London as Vancouver is to-day, and the people have got to be got there. There were those illimitable territories which could easily support the population which was necessary for development and with the development there could be the increasing standard of living that all desired. But it could only be brought about, as was suggested a few moments ago, by appointing a Commission to inquire into all the difficulties and as far as possible getting over those difficulties. One of the Canadian delegates yesterday referred to the poverty which was common in Winnipeg and other industrial parts of Canada. But poverty of which Canadians could have no idea could be seen in London here, in Poplar or Bermondsey, or in any great industrial city such as Glasgow. What was uncommon in Canada, what was there an isolated instance more or less, was a common incident here in London—poverty of such a degree, in this great, wealthy country, that people who had a higher standard of living, as they had in Canada or in Australia, could not understand it at all. There were forty thousand families in Glasgow living in one-room houses, in which neither light nor air penetrated—and they were to be precluded, by the policy that had been advocated in the meantime of giving those people an opportunity of looking for a fuller and freer and better life than they had had in the past.

Mr Stewart said that he knew that the comrades from the Colonies did not mean it in the sense in which he was putting it, but when one got down to the fact, that was where one got to: there was no room for them. Australia had said so this morning, and Canada said so yesterday and to-day. South Africa had just declared that they could accommodate a white population of many more millions than existed in that country to-day. They had to find the answer to that problem

They could find it as a Labour Party; they could find it as a Joint Party, for, as has been said, the day was rapidly coming when Labour would be dominant throughout the Dominions and possibly throughout the world, and by sitting down together and getting over these difficulties they would find an outlet for our surplus population. He believed that if that was not done, they would be going from bad to worse. The people could not exist in this country. The position was recognised yesterday—300,000 unemployed miners, probably going to increase another 100,000 at least; that could not be prevented. In the Colonies there was the natural opportunity, here there was nothing but this tremendous concentration of human beings, and the desire here was to get what ought to be done as the result of this discussion, namely, that some kind of Commission should be forthcoming to represent all parties, to try to find a solution to this problem.

Miss M HEAGNEY (Australia) said that there were 12,000 unemployed in Melbourne, and if immigrants were to arrive, those people would have to transfer to the one-room conditions that had been referred to.

The CHAIRMAN requested that the discussion should not be conducted by dialogue.

*Mr J SIMPSON (Canada)*

Mr J SIMPSON (Canada) desired to say that the charge was too often made that English people and Scotch people who had emigrated to Canada and were now prospering over there, were inclined to close the doors of Canada to others who were just as anxious to go out there and to have as good a chance as those who had already gone there. He wished to give one case of that from this point of view. Those present would remember that there were thousands of emigrants who had gone out from Great Britain to Canada at a time when labour was an actual scarcity in Canada. The industrial and commercial development of Canada in those particular periods was such that labour was scarce, and when those people went to Canada there was no walking the streets, there was no appeal to charitable organisations for their sustenance when they were there, but they were immediately put to work in a sustained employment, and during that period of tremendous development, particularly the railway development of Canada, there was no complaint on the part of the Canadian worker. He might tell the Conference that whereas one of the great features of Canadian development in the last fifty years had been the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars in railway development in that

*Mr. J. Simpson (Canada)*]

country, now, instead of building railroads, in many sections of the country they had pulled up hundreds of miles of railroads in order to send the rails over to England during the Great War, and since that time there had been no great railroad development in Canada.

There had been some talk about slums in Glasgow and slums in London. It was true that he had been through slums in Glasgow in 1911, with Keir Hardie's brother, where rat-traps were put at the foot of the beds at night to catch the rats. He had been down to Whitechapel on this trip, and had seen the poverty there, and their desire was to prevent the establishment of the same conditions in Toronto. He might tell the Conference, as a Canadian, that that part of the British Empire had its own problem of capitalism which to-day, so far as Great Britain was concerned, was in his judgment responsible for the condition of the mining industry, and other industries in this country. Capitalism was so heartless and ruthless that it had no patriotism, it had no love for its working class, it took its profits and invested them in other countries where it could get cheaper labour, and it gathered its own profits into its own treasury, to the absolute social and mental destruction of its own citizens. If it could invest money in India, and employ Indian labour at a cheap rate, and thus get greater profits, it did not care for the welfare of Englishmen or Scotchmen or Welshmen at all.

He wished to say that capitalism was just as ruthless in Canada as it was in Great Britain. As far as the emigration problem was concerned, he wanted to point to one cause of unnecessary and premature emigration. Canada had taken over a great railroad system. There was a nationalised system. The Canadian Pacific remained in Canada as comparatively a national railway system. The Canadian Pacific Railroad had not only its great transportation system, but it had also its great steamship line. Recently in Canada, when the Government were proposing to subsidise a great steamship company to break up a steamship combination, it was stated that one of the great reasons of the vast emigration schemes that were carried on was that our great steamship companies were building palatial steamers to ply between Canada, the United States and Great Britain, and the investment of capital, so far as it was represented in railroads and in great steamship companies, was tremendous, and the fact that these great companies were obliged to declare a dividend on their investments every year, and to show their shareholders a substantial return, led them to have no consideration whatever as to how the immigrants fared, once they landed them on the shores of Canada, or

any other country. They said it was a business with them, and they did not care how the immigrants got on.

There was in the United States, on the borders of Canada, one of the greatest industrial countries in the world. It is almost impossible, with a tariff war, to prevent commodities from the United States going into Canada, and so they had their own industrial problem there. The industrial development in Canada within the past few years had simply been a kind of stagnation. For the last five or six years in Canada they had been suffering the severest depression that Canada had ever gone through. If one conversed with the merchants and industrialists, and asked them what was the matter, what was the cause of this, they seemed to be simply in a maze, they did not understand why they were continuing at such a commercial and industrial low ebb. It might be difficult to believe, but despite all the energy of the great steamship companies to get emigrants to Canada, despite all the agencies that there were, just as fast as they had been pouring into Canada they had been going over to the United States; in fact last year there was in Canada no increase of population at all due to immigration. Had not the United States given Canada an outlet for thousands of its citizens to go over there, where commerce and industry were better, that population would have stayed in Canada, and there would have been the most depressing condition in Canada that was ever known in the history of that country.

Mr. SIMPSON said he wished to speak quite frankly on what Mr. Queen and Mr. Heenan had said about agriculture. They talked about putting people on the land; they said, "Bring them and put them on the land." He had been told that in this country to-day there were 150,000 less agriculturists than in 1919. There were one million less acres of land under cultivation, and yet this was a great food-importing country. That was an anomaly which was quite apparent to anybody who had studied the economic life of Great Britain. There was a great demand here for food, and yet the amount of land under cultivation was being reduced, and people were being sent out to Canada in spite of the fact that the farmers there to-day were saying that they could not live, and, as Mr. Queen said, the condition of the farmers in Manitoba was such that they could not get a living. There were ranges of abandoned farms of farmers who had gone out to the great Western Canada areas, and to-day the Western farmer was on the point of collapse. Very often, out of five crops that the farmer put in he only got profit on one.

Drought, frost and other causes in Western Canada interfered with successful farming. There were instances of men who had gone out West, and who had taken quarter sections. He had asked one of them, just before he came away, how many crops were a success, and he was told one out of five. For four of them they put in their seed and their labour, and then frost or drought would come along and the crop would go.

They had to face the fact that the actual condition of industrial development in Canada at the present time was at a standstill, and that there were 30,000 or 40,000 men out of work in Toronto last February. The City of Toronto had issued a report, just before he left, that unemployment was at its worst in February, and that there were between 30,000 and 40,000 out of work at that time. Men were sent out from England, but what were they going to do in Canada? In England there was the "dole"; there was no "dole" in Canada; there was only charity, and that charity simply means having to go and ask for a bucket of coal and some food to keep them from starving. He went on to say that this question had to be discussed from a larger standpoint than its standpoint of merely local situation, but he did not wish those present to think that Canadians were properly open to the charge of trying to keep any Britisher out of Canada. In that great country there was a tremendous amount of room for people, but if they were brought in now to put them on the land, it must be remembered that, as regards agriculture, the farmer could not get a living out of the land at the present time. In Canada the great combinations and trusts and packing companies got a lien on the food they bought in large quantities, but the farmer got very little out of it. The retailer had to pay big prices, and the great trusts got the benefit of it all. That was the problem in Canada; they did not want to be under the charge that they wanted to keep anybody out, unless it was desired to introduce into the City of Toronto the same conditions as there were in Glasgow and Whitechapel.

The CHAIRMAN said he regretted that he was not able to remain any longer, as other duties called him; and he invited Mr. Joshi to take the chair.

Mr JOSHI intimated that he would prefer to make a speech and he was afraid it would not be permissible for him to make a speech if he took the chair.

The CHAIRMAN said that he thought it would be quite in order for Mr. Joshi to take the chair and also to speak.

(At this point the chair was taken by Mr. N. M. Joshi (India).)

The CHAIRMAN thanked the Conference very much for the honour, and called upon Mr Snell to speak.

Mr. H. SNELL, M.P. (Great Britain)

Mr SNELL (Great Britain) said that he thought this discussion on emigration was ending on an altogether wrong note and that they had rather got on the borderline of recrimination of one part of the Commonwealth and another, and that was not the right note on which to end this discussion. Every member of the Labour Party in Great Britain would agree with what their friend from Canada had just said, that there were many acres of land in this country that could be used for the production of food. The Labour Party had always been quite as conscious of that, as anybody from Canada or Australia could be. In this country they were trying to get greater access to the land, but that did not alter the fact that they held certain general principles which he would put in an old-fashioned way, that "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, and He gave it to His people." Those in the Labour Party in this country had been trying to expand beyond the tribal conception of humanity and beyond the civic conception and the national conception, to an international conception, and they believed in a certain brotherhood of interests throughout the world. Therefore the lands of Canada and the lands of Australia were as much the heritage of humanity as were the lands in other places; and so it was said here that, in the Labour movement, at any rate, there should be a joint view as to the necessity of the work. Now Great Britain had fulfilled and perhaps overrun her industrial destiny and she had got this great number of people. What was to happen to her? He was impressed, of course, with the fact that in Adelaide and Victoria and Toronto there were these numbers of unemployed. He was in America a couple of years ago and he saw queues of unemployed standing out there, but the Dominion friends must realise that so long as the capitalist system lasted here or elsewhere, there would always be a residuum of unemployment, the time would never come when Canada would be able to say: "We have no unemployment and therefore we can accept your emigrants." The fact was that when the Pilgrim Fathers went to America, there was a proportion of them who were unemployed, who were not fit for the job on hand; and there would always be that. He said our criticism about the immigration policy of the Colonies amounted to this, that what they wanted from this country was the pick of the basket; they would not take an average bunch of the population.

Mr. J SIMPSON (Canada). "That is right; you are perfectly correct."

*Mr. H. Snell, M.P. (Great Britain)]*

Mr SNELL, continuing, asked what was to happen when this country had drained off the very best of its blood for the service of the Colonies and they left us with the troubles we had on hand. He thought that there ought to be further and very serious consideration of this problem when the Conference met again, and that meanwhile there should be a sort of Labour Commission, if necessary, to investigate the whole problem. He hoped that in their own countries each one present would try to become an expert by gathering information. Before he left South Africa last year he suggested to Colonel Creswell that he might serve the Labour Party in that country by being a sort of link between it and the Labour Party here, in the way of correspondence and getting information from them and rendering information to them. He felt that something of that kind might profitably be done with other sections. He only said that because he felt there was just a little danger of getting into the region of criticism, which was not appropriate to the subject under discussion.

*Mr. W. McMULLEN, M.P. (Ireland)*

Mr McMULLEN (Ireland) desired to add a word to the discussion, which he had found extremely interesting. He was very shocked at the speech delivered by Mr. Stewart, more particularly when he referred to Inverness. He had had the privilege of travelling in most of the north of Scotland. He had always been struck by the number of Scotch people who emigrated to Canada and other parts of the world, and having been privileged to travel over a considerable portion of that country, he was inclined to ask himself why exactly those people went to different colonies when there were large tracts of land in the north of Scotland, the home of the people, which were absolutely undeveloped. He had had the pleasure of taking part in an Election in 1918, and he had a distinct recollection that a Commission was set up for the purpose of inquiring into afforestation, and he believed it would be very good if afforestation were developed in the north of Scotland, and if the land which was arable could be cultivated a large number of people could be settled in the north of Scotland.

In addition to this, he had further an idea with reference to the position of Ireland. People had gone from Ireland to Australia and Canada and other places. Probably those present knew that for nearly half a century following the Act of Union, up to 1845, Ireland had a population of eight millions. The population of Ireland to-day was four and a quarter millions, and there was plenty of arable land in Ireland absolutely undeveloped and uncultivated. For that reason he had been

somewhat shocked by the speech delivered by Mr. Stewart, and he had been oppressed by a good many things he had heard. He had listened to the position in Canada, and the great fact that had struck him, from what had been expressed by Comrade Simpson, was the amount of capital that had been taken to India, China, and other places, and it would seem that what a British Labour Government would have to do would be to say to the capitalist in this country: "If you have capital to invest, that capital must be invested for the purpose of developing portions of the British Empire." If that were done, he believed our difficulties would be solved to a very considerable extent.

He just desired to place those ideas before the Conference because he thought it was probable that, even in the case of Ireland, that question had not been thought of at all. To him, it was a remarkable state of affairs that Ireland, with its obsolete methods, half a century ago could maintain a population of eight millions, while to-day there was a population of only four and a quarter millions. He thought that with the potentialities for the production of work at their disposal, Ireland should be able to support as many again as she supported in 1850. Although he did not claim to be an authority on the question, he believed that if proper attention were given to appropriate cultivation of land in Great Britain, that would absorb a great proportion of the unemployed at this moment. He believed it would be a very useful thing if a Labour Commission could be set up for the purpose of inquiring fully into the position in this country before we started to suggest that Canada and Australia and other parts of the British Empire should take what we described as the surplus population. He was not able, at the moment, with his indefinite and perhaps insufficient knowledge, to accept the position that we have a surplus population in these islands. He said he might be wrong, and he was open to correction in regard to that question; but, for that reason, in his opinion, a Commission would perform a very useful function, and there were other avenues to explore before it was decided to ask Canada and Australia and other parts of the British Dominions to accept what we described at the moment as our surplus population.

*Mr. R. B. WALKER (Great Britain),*

Mr R B WALKER (Great Britain) said that he wished to support the idea of a Commission or a Committee of Inquiry. But he wanted to go further than that. He had had some experience, not only so far as the agricultural population of this country was concerned, but he had also

witnessed, in Canada, in 1923, certain happenings which he hoped he would never witness again, when thousands of our own folk were found stranded in the night in Winnipeg and in other districts. He supported very strongly the idea of a *Committee of Inquiry*. He would like to see some kind of Institution or Standing Committee set up whereby our people, whether they be agriculturists or whether they come from other industries, when they wanted to go to the Colonies or Dominions, might know exactly the position, so that everything should be fair and square before they went from one country to another. He was quite satisfied that there were people living in this country to-day who were venturing on the absolutely unknown, and he thought it was only right at this moment that they should know exactly what they were faced with. He agreed with Mr Snell that the discussion was rather drifting. A great deal could be said in reply to Mr Stewart. He was quite sure that so far as Labour people in the Colonies were concerned they were not against our people going to their countries, provided there were no economic pressure behind these people. At present they were being driven there very largely through economic pressure. He was quite certain that while certain people were seeking to populate our Colonies there was a great deal that could be done in repopulating our own country. Unfortunately, Friend Simpson, from Canada, had underestimated the acreage that had gone out of cultivation since 1918, he could have gone on and told the Conference of the hundreds of thousands who had left the countryside since 1918. However, he was not going into that. He simply rose to emphasise the absolute necessity, the imperativeness, of something being done now by way of setting up not only a Committee, but of setting up some link or connection between this country and the various Dominions and Colonies with a view to informing the intending emigrants of the actual position in the country to which they proposed to go.

*Mr. H. CRITCHLOW (British Guiana)*

Mr H. CRITCHLOW (British Guiana) said that in his country the population was agricultural, but he would like to say that the only agricultural labourers required were East Indian or coloured labourers. They had sent a deputation to the Secretary of State for the Colonies here a few years ago for the purpose of getting these Indian labourers. They tried to make out to the Secretary of State here and to the Government in India that what they required was a land settlement scheme. But what they had in view was to get cheap labour, and they wanted to drive our people into the Committee—they gave an invitation to attend to some of those who were against immigration,

so that they should be able to say that there were several workers and several organisations who agreed with them to have this immigration. That was not true. They had sent to the workers' organisations a copy of all the correspondence with different countries, which showed that they only wanted cheap labour. The speaker said he would hand these copies in to the Chairman, and there would be found among them copies of telegrams, letters, and so on, of the different Governments and the Secretary of State, which were too numerous to read now, but those Members of Parliament who were present might go through them, and they would be able to see that it was only cheap labour that was really required. The speaker said that he always liked to be very brief, and he wished simply to assure them that they were not against people coming to their country, but they wanted to protect themselves. There were not sufficient houses to live in, which sends house rent up, and it meant that the more immigrants there were, the greater would be the scarcity of houses; and he would like this Conference to know that they must provide houses, they must irrigate and drain the land, before they bring in new people. That was all he had to say on that point, but he would like the Members of Parliament to go into those official documents.

*Mr N M JOSHI, M.L.A. (India).*

The CHAIRMAN (Mr N. M. Joshi, India) Ladies and Gentlemen,—Before I request Mr Queen to give his reply to the remarks made by the delegates, I would myself like to make a few remarks on this question. I think the difficulties that we have to face on account of capitalism are at the root of this problem. As long as the present system of capitalism lasts, I do not think you are going to solve this question at all. It has been my lot to study this question in my country, and even now there are some parts of the world which want Indian labour, and we have got in our country a great community. Take British Guiana. Their Government sent a deputation to India asking for more labour. We went into the question, and we found what Mr Critchlow has told us, that they do not want their wages to be reduced on account of immigration. But that is bound to be the result. Personally, I always hold the view that a man should be allowed to go wherever he wants to go; but, after studying the question, I myself came to the conclusion that we could not send any more people from India to British Guiana under those circumstances. I do not wish to go into the question of English people going to Canada.

*Mr. N. M. Joshi, M.L.A. (India).*

If a Commission be set up by the British Labour Party or by this Conference, I want that Commission to consider the question of the two races, the white and the coloured races, coming together, and the effects of them coming together. The problem is not so very easy. As our friend from Palestine said, if there are lands available, anybody should be able to go, and, as he said, if his standard of life was higher than the standard of life of the people to whose country he goes, it is not a danger to them to have him. Jewish emigration to Palestine may not be a very great danger, because the Jews who migrate are not the governing race. The difficulty is not the same. The Jews and the Arabs are practically on the same level. You may enable the Arab to better his condition, but the position is not the same in the other case. Look at the effect of the contact of the two races in the United States and in Africa. On account of this contact with white people, of people whose civilisation has not yet come up to their standard, the fact is that it is practically lowering the condition of some of the races, and you are now faced with a very difficult problem. The result of the contact of white people with the coloured people or the natives of South Africa is, perhaps, to raise the standard of life of the natives. But you must remember that the natives, and many other people along with the natives, have lost their political freedom, and in losing their political freedom they have lost their economic freedom. In Kenya the labourer has been deprived not only of his political freedom but of his economic freedom. Capitalism and the white worker have made common cause. I have had some experience in my own country.

Many of your Trade Unionists have gone to India in the textile industry and in the steel industry. Every one of them, when he gets to India, forgets that he is a Trade Unionist. I simply say, for the sake of argument, that there is a white-leg as well as there is a blackleg. In the steel industry, where there is a yard with four hundred people working on one plank along with fifty Indians, the white workers who are members of Trade Unions here have always made common cause with the capitalist. I do not wish to blame anybody; if I had been in that position, perhaps I might have done the same thing. The difficulty is due to these different standards, and we must, therefore, study the effects of the meeting together of these two races, and if the effect of the white races emigrating into other people's countries is to deprive those people of their full economic freedom, whether it will be according to Labour principles for any white man to go to

that country and bring about this result is a matter to be considered. In your country to-day you do not get employment on account of the difficulties of the capitalist system; but you do not wish to alter that capitalistic system because you find it difficult. You want to do the easier thing, of going into another man's country because he has not the physical power to resist your going there, and then, in order to retain your standard, you deprive him of political liberty, you deprive him of his economic liberty, and bring all sorts of troubles upon him. This is a matter which I think should be considered very carefully by any Commission that may be set up, and by the whole Labour Party, before it comes to any definite conclusion as regards its emigration policy.

*Mr. J. QUEEN, M.L.A. (Manitoba).*

Mr. J. QUEEN (Manitoba) desired to emphasise that the questions of unemployment and emigration were questions due to the capitalist system. Unemployed might be removed from this country to another country without relieving the suffering that exists among the working classes. He was sorry that a previous speaker had taken up the attitude that he had; he had charged the speaker with trying to protect Canada for the Canadians and leave the people in England alone in their misery. But he liked to think of himself not as an internationalist, because an internationalist still retains something of the different nations, but he would like to think of himself as being one who was endeavouring to solve the problems of the whole of the working classes. The problems of the working classes in this country were the same as the problems of the working classes in the country he happened to come from. As a matter of fact, he had been himself an emigrant to Canada, and he could look at all those who take a leading part in the Labour Movement in Canada and assert that 99 per cent of them had been at one time emigrants. They were trying to deal with this question not from the point of view of keeping English people out of any one particular country, but from the working-class point of view, and how best they could relieve the suffering that is so prevalent to-day. His friend had mentioned the time when harvesters had been taken out to Canada, and he had heard it said that they were sending more out. He had spoken to some of these English harvesters who had been absolutely stranded with not a cent. One man in particular to whom he had spoken was nearly crazy, because he had come out to Canada on promises that were held out to him, and he had left his wife and three children at home,

and he did not have a dollar in his pocket, and far less was he able to send anything to his children who he knew needed it badly, and with the thought in his mind that if he had been in England at least he would have had the unemployed dole, but having gone to Canada even his wife and children were denied that.

Mr. Queen asked that he should not be charged with wanting to protect Canada against the influx of more workers. He desired particularly to bring that to the attention of this Conference. Though he was serving the working class movement of the world, he thought he had shown that merely taking the unemployed or surplus population from one country to another did not relieve the great suffering that existed. Further, after the close of the war a great many Jewish people were anxious to bring their old people into Winnipeg away from the suffering caused by the war, and he had to put up a motion in the House on behalf of those people that they should be allowed to bring them in. He had no intention of keeping them out at all. He merely mentioned that in order that those present might understand that he was not speaking in favour of a policy of exclusion. He had already tried at that Conference to make it as plain as possible that he was quite willing that workers should come to Canada; but after they had come there they would realise that there was no more hope out there, and he hoped that they would find their place in a movement for helping to remove the capitalist system. He had a great objection to the emigration literature that was distributed which held out false hopes to the workers of the country. He had seen the gradual disappointment that had been the lot of very many of those who had come out as the result of that kind of emigration literature. He pointed out that their troubles to-day were not in regard to the question of production. He said that the question of unemployment should not be discussed from the point of view that there was not sufficient production. There is; there is sufficient being produced in England to take care of the people of this country. The real question was to obtain such a distribution of that wealth that the needs of the people might be satisfied.

One of the Delegates had said that after the Labour Government comes in there will have to be a proper distribution of the population. He could well understand that, but that was a question when that time came. The question that faces us to-day is a totally different question. If the remarks that he was making got out to the Canadian people he would be condemned by all the interests in Canada, but he was already, so that did not matter. Those

people out there who had made their investments, even the stores in Main Street in Winnipeg, are all complaining of hard times, and they are not selling anything; they all say that what Canada wants is immigration. But what is their view? They are just round the corner from the station, and when a train load of immigrants comes in they stand at the door and they tell them they need a certain kind of cart and they need a pair of shoes, and they get the opportunity to sell to these immigrants as they are passing through. Then of course they say that Canada needs immigrants. The same occurs with regard to the landowners who own vast stretches of land in Western Canada. They want the opportunity to get someone on to that land so that they may get rent from them for a time, it may be only for three or four years until the people get off, tired with the struggle and unable to make a living at it. Then when they have done, those landowners say that what the country requires is new immigrants, in order that they might get others to rent the land. The same thing applies all over. All the different centres are crying for immigrants to come in. The Conference has been told of 3,000 families that were going to be settled in Canada under the paternal care of the Government. Those settlers will be met at the station by agents of the Government; they will be told where they can buy their ticket at the railway station, and where they have got to go, but the important thing is that those 3,000 families who are going to be settled in Canada are going to be settled on lands where people have already tried to make a living, but could not, and have gone away again.

He hoped that the Canadians would not be charged with not wanting to relieve the suffering in England, but those false hopes are held out to the people, and he thought they ought to be told the truth with regard to the conditions that they have to face when they go out to Canada. He referred to a letter which said: "We are forced to ask for relief. Everything was frozen last year. We have no seed for the coming spring. We are unable to pay our taxes. The only thing that is left for us to leave our farms, otherwise we will be sold out for the taxes by the municipality. Below we sign our names, and what seed we need badly for the coming spring." That was dated January 21, 1925. He had received that while the Legislature was in session. It went on to give in bushels the amount of seed that they required for their spring sowing. These are the conditions that exist in Canada. If emigrants from England were going to a county such as 't was painted, it would be a different thing; but in coming out to Canada they would be placing themselves out there in

*Mr. J. Queen, M.L.A. (Manitoba)]*

the hands of interests that are just as ruthless in their exploitation, and possibly a little more so, as would be found anywhere else in the world

He was reminded of a piece of legislation of the Manitoba Legislature two years ago, which would give a further indication of the condition of the people. The farmers came to the Legislature, and wanted a Bill put through which would give them the right to place a mortgage on their crops as soon as they sowed the seed in the ground. That would enable the little country merchants to extend them credit in the shape of food. This was limited to food. The little grocer would have a lien over their crops just as soon as the seed was sown. The people have to be fed during summer, and the lien was to be a lien on the crops after they were harvested. Surely that was some indication of the conditions that existed in Canada.

Mr. QUEEN proceeded to say that there were large numbers of unemployed in Canada. He had in his hand the schedules of relief that are distributed to the unemployed in Winnipeg; it was a regular thing with them. They had different schedules for first week, second week, third week and so on. They had not got the dole, but the investigator finds out if they are genuine cases, he wants to know whether they have not got a father or mother in the old country who might send them money if they were written to, and if it is found that there is no other place that they can get anything from, they are allowed certain supplies: lentil soup, rolled oats, rice, beans, macaroni, sugar, golden syrup, prunes, potatoes, onions, butter, lard. These are indications of the capitalist system in operation in Canada, and an indication of the suffering in that country of the working class, which is the same in Canada as in England; perhaps not as great in quantity because there was not the population in Canada, but they were getting more and more on the way.

The speaker wished to emphasise again that the serious question in Canada to-day is the fact that capitalism is constantly making inroads on the standard of living of the workers, that they were unable to buy back the goods that they produced and that they were denied the use of the goods that they produced, and because of that they suffered. A company will open up a factory in India and employ cheap Indian labour, and then there are workers in this country who come on the unemployed list. That means further restriction of the markets of the world because the workers have not the money to buy things. If you open up industries in Canada he ventured to think that that was not going to be a relief

to unemployment in England. Even although some of the English unemployed were taken to Canada and they started new industries there, as soon as those industries started there the effect would be felt in England and there would be more unemployed workers here, because the ability of the worker to buy is limited, and is all the time being further limited. Therefore a solution of this question is not to be found merely in transporting the workers from one country to another, but in so organising our forces as to get rid of the capitalist system and establish a system where everybody will be able to live in peace, in joy, and in harmony.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the discussion of this subject of Emigration was now closed. Everyone hoped that the discussion would lead to some good by the setting up of a Committee, either by this Conference or by the Labour Party in England, to discover a real solution. Everyone felt that so long as the capitalist system lasted a solution of this problem could not be found, but unfortunately they could not tell when the capitalist system would break down. Any Committee that was set up would have to consider very carefully all the different aspects of the subject.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Mr. Lansbury to speak on the subject of "Inter-Dominion Trade Relations."

Mr. R. B. WALKER (Great Britain) asked whether something more definite could not be done, and that the matter be not left here, but that it be an instruction of this Conference to the British Labour movement to set up a Committee or Committees as may be necessary. He asked whether it would not be better to do that instead of leaving it for somebody by chance to take up the matter.

The SECRETARY (Mr. W. Gillies) said that Mr. Brown, of the International Federation of Trade Unions, had asked him to mention to the Conference that the International Federation of Trade Unions is making a special study of the subject of emigration now, and proposed next year to call a special world Conference on emigration.

Miss M. HEAGNEY (Australia) suggested that it was to include affiliated and unaffiliated.

The SECRETARY agreed, and said that that was one thing to be kept in mind. Another thing to be kept in mind was that this subject must appear on the Agenda of the next Conference, and when that subject was discussed he would suggest that they should ask for memoranda on the emigration policy of the various organisations in the same manner as they were asking for memoranda on other subjects.



Mr R. B WALKER (Great Britain) supposed that was as far as they could go today, but he wanted something done now whereby touts could be stopped going about advertising the golden sovereigns that are lying in the streets in Canada and other Colonies. He wanted the position made clear to those people as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN said that he did not think they could have any resolution now

on this subject, but it was quite open to the Labour Parties of the different countries to start the Committee at any time they thought best, by correspondence. Any party could take the initiative in that manner.

Miss M HEAGNEY (Australia) assured the Conference that she would take the matter up very seriously with her Party when she went back.

## STATE TRADING WITHIN THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH.

At this point Mr W McMULLEN, M P, took the Chair.

Mr G LANSBURY, M.P. (*Great Britain*).

Mr GEORGE LANSBURY (Great Britain) said Mr. Chairman and Comrades, there is about twenty-five minutes left, and before we part we want to settle the Agenda for the next Conference, and when the next Conference is to meet. If it were not that I very much want, and the British Delegation very much want, that there should be at least some sort of statement on this subject in the Report of the Conference, I certainly should not have introduced it at this stage of the Conference. It was the only subject on which the British Labour Party had definitely put down its propositions, and had sent them round to all the constituent bodies represented here,\* and I think that the British Organisations will rather regret that the Delegates who came had not taken the trouble, or apparently had not taken the trouble, to make themselves acquainted, or their organisation had not made them acquainted with the memoranda that we had circulated on this, what to us is a very important subject.

We do not deny at all, at least I do not, that land in Britain is uncultivated. I am continually, and many of us are continually, urging that land in Britain should be cultivated, but it is not being cultivated. This country has been organised as one of the chief workshops of the world, and because of that there is at any particular moment on the average not more than 'six weeks' supply of food in this country. That is a matter which we, who happen to live here, have to take very carefully into our consideration, because to get a renewal of our food supplies we are obliged to find somebody who will take, not money, but goods in exchange for the foodstuffs that we need, and however much as a Socialist, or, if you like, as a Communist, however much I may stand up and denounce the Capitalist system,

\* Appendix, p. 133.

the fact remains that unless I can see my way clear, and the workers of this country can see their way clear, to get a renewal of their supplies, pending, if you like, an absolute revolution in our agricultural methods and procedure, all our talk of the future is absolutely in vain. The history of humanity is not thoroughly well known to any of us, and we who are here, the bulk of us here, have no real knowledge of the tremendous past history of humanity down through the ages. And when I hear people talk quite glibly either about the break up of this Empire or the perpetuation of it I am often inclined to think that they leave out of account that in these days economic forces move much more rapidly than they did in the days preceding, not the destruction, but the evacuation of Mesopotamia and the closing down of all that rich region of Asia Minor which used to be the places where the bulk of the food supplies of the then known world was produced. It is because of this that the question before the Labour and Socialist movements of the world is quite a simple one, which I think I can express in this way. Are we going to have the political sense, the social consciousness, and the absence of racial antagonisms that will enable us to transform, without a terrific upheaval, this international competitive chaotic system under which, or within which, the great mass of the workers, coloured workers and white workers, produce a tremendous quantity of the things they need, and are then unable to use them. It is not a national problem by any manner of means. It is an international problem, and it is one that the Labour Movement everywhere has got to face up to. But for us in this country it is rather more imperative than in most other countries, because of the initial fact that I started with, that is, that we are dependent upon other people for supplying us with food. Even if we cultivate our land to the very fullest extent it is not quite certain that we can feed the whole of the forty million people who are living at present on this island.

*Mr. G. Lansbury, M.P. (Great Britain)]*

In that connection I want to say another thing. The man who first hollered out a tree and started sailing about a river or backwater is the man who is responsible for our being here this morning, and for all these discussions about whether one race shall come here and another race shall go there. Under Socialism or under any kind of "ism" you will never be able to prevent the movement of adventurous people who want to go out and see the world. India will not be able to keep us out of India even under Socialism, neither shall we be able to prevent comrades like Joshi coming to London and elsewhere. Therefore we who are internationalists must, I think, also take account of another thing—and I am saying this in the presence of people who are not British. Whatever crimes Britain has done—and she has done a great many, consciously and unconsciously—we have ruthlessly, brutally, callously carried the flag and dominion and our commerce into all the corners of the world—but one thing we have done, which Trotsky pointed out in either a speech or a pamphlet, which has been a service to the human race. We have taken, if not the chief, one of the chief parts in opening up the waterways of the world, and the question that has to be settled now is whether the British race is going to be able to give such a contribution to the solution of international problems as will enable the whole world physically, and in every other way, to be opened up, not for the service of one race, but for the service of the whole of the human race.

Within our own land we talk of production for the service of the whole of the people within that area. We have got to have, especially in a Conference like this, a much broader conception. We have got in some way to adjust, and to relate the fact that our comrades in India, our comrades in British Guiana, the men and the women who inhabit that continent, at present, and probably for years to come, can produce and can put on to the market goods at a very much lower standard of life than we can ourselves; and we have got in some way to get over the antagonisms which arise from their enormous productivity, with the aid of the same machines as ourselves. It may very well be that even within the social commonwealth you would have great difficulty in adjusting those relationships. It is no use thinking that we can jump over them; you cannot jump over these things. They have to be argued out, they have to be thought out before they are argued out, and in some way we have to find a means by which this enormous productivity of the human race can be used for the service of one another. If the Conference will allow me to say so, I do not believe there is one of us, myself included, in

the Socialist movement, national or international, who has ever given 24 hours of their life's thought to that subject. We talk glibly of international exchange, we talk glibly of the brotherhood of man. Why, if you think of it, even within nations where you are all of one nationality, I am doubtful if there is one man in a million who believes that the unskilled man should get the same reward as the skilled man. It is not only when you come to the relationship of the black man with the white, that we discriminate between one another as to the standard of life we reckon each ought to enjoy. I am standing here, and I am claiming for all workers, for all people, skilled or unskilled, black or yellow or white, the equal standard of life that they need for their whole development. It is because I felt that so very strongly that I joined the Commonwealth Group in the House of Commons on the invitation of Dr Haden Guest. There is nothing of Imperialism about it at all. It is not the idea either of building up the British Empire as a unit in conflict with the rest of humanity, but it is just this. Here we all are meeting at the centre of the British Dominions, and God, or nature, or cupidity, or force, has flung us together in some way, and people like our comrades here have gone and poked their noses into Australia and into Canada, and so on, and white Englishmen have gone into India and other parts, and either by accident or by design we have become part of one another, and whether we like it or not we are related to one another.

Now I hold this theory: that if the people within the United Kingdom cannot manage to organise Socialism up to the very limit that they can organise it apart from internationalism—in present-day society you can never have true Socialism in one country without you have it in all, any more than one individual man can be a true Socialist in his own country without the rest being Socialists. But within that limit if we are not able to develop certainly the spirit of Socialism within us then we cannot expect it to be developed in other countries. And in exactly the same way if we people who are united together politically, even although some are thought of as subject and dependent, if we who are Labour people and Socialists cannot join with them who are associated with us, whatever cause has brought that about—I am not arguing about that; I am arguing only about the fact that we are all together in a political connection—if it is impossible for us to hammer out such a problem as we have been discussing this morning, and if it is impossible for us to hammer out our trade and our labour relationships with one another, how in

[*State Trading within the British Commonwealth*]

God's name or the devil's name can you hope to settle the problem with the people of Russia, of Germany, of Japan, of China, and all the rest of the world?

It is because we feel that we come to you this morning and ask you to go back home and consider whether the time has not arrived when the Labour Governments in the British Dominions and any Governments that we can influence should not set up trading relationships, or if you do not like the word "trading," exchange of goods between ourselves and the Dominions on the sort of basis, leaving out of account whatever corruption there was, leaving out of account any waste there was, that we organised supplies during the war. We maintain that in the bringing of goods to this country we take up our stand on this principle—very difficult to apply, and probably impossible of full application at the present time—but as a general principle we lay down that if within our own country we insist on the Government of the day and the municipalities that we can control not buying goods made under sweated conditions, we should as far as possible in our relations with nations outside apply the same kind of principle. We say that if our people fight and struggle to get a standard of life for the workers here by increasing wages or in any way we can by organisation, we maintain that we have no right to allow that standard of life to be pulled down by anything that we can prevent from the outside. As the maintenance of life is the first law of nature, obviously our principle would be vitiated under some conditions, but so far as it is humanly possible the Labour Movement in this country, I am certain, is now determined that it will not allow mere commercial cupidity to pull down the wages and conditions which our people have sought to establish in this country. In the Labour Movement none of us believe in tariffs as a means for attaining this end, but we do believe that we ought to have the right—and if we had a Labour or Socialist Government here we would insist on that right—of keeping out such goods as would lower the standard of life of our people. We think that the jiggery-pokery of tariffs is not a matter that we would care under any circumstances to adopt, because with tariffs you do not keep the goods out, and in any case the real thing is to be quite sure that you do; there is a doubt always whether with mere tariffs you would do so. Speaking in the presence of Northern Ireland and any other Delegate from Ireland, I would like to say this. Last Sunday I heard quite an interesting little discussion in Dublin. This question was dealt with and illuminated in an extraordinary manner by a workman who

I do not suppose has any theories about anything except earning his daily bread. I was rather complaining that the Free State Government charges a duty on old clothes that I was helping to send in for some people who I thought needed clothes. This man who chipped in was a tailor, and he said: "Oh, you must not interfere with that because they tumble a lot of clothes into this country, and they throw me out of work, and undercut and undersell." I said to him: "But you ought to stop them coming in altogether." He said: "Yes, that is what we would like to do if they are coming in at costs that prevent us who have got a standard of life maintaining that standard of life."

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the first thing that the Labour Movement wants to put before the people in the Dominions as a reason why we think we ought all to be considering this question of our trading relations. We want that the trading relations shall be so organised that, instead of the cheapest and the most sweated produced goods being brought here for our benefit, we should keep them out because we believe that the user of sweated goods in that way not only does harm to those who produce them, but also does harm, in the end, to the working classes in the same industry in the country where such goods are received. We think that it can be done fairly simply by organisation. It may not in the long run be possible for the British Dominions to do more than set this sort of principle going. I believe ultimately if the Labour Office at Geneva is going to develop along the right line, it must be the organisation that eventually will keep records and keep the whole of the nations of the world in touch with one another on this question of production, and exchange of goods between the various nations. But in the meantime we want to see the British Dominions, the Labour Governments of Australia, the Labour Governments (when they are established) in South Africa and in Canada, and the Governments that are under our Colonial Office, such as that which manages British Guiana and Kenya, and other colonies of that kind—we want to establish such a system as will enable us to buy up all the food—the mutton and the lamb, and so on from Australia, the beef from Canada, and the butter and eggs and other things that come from the Dominions—in bulk, and transport it in ships owned or controlled—we would rather they be owned—by the nations, and put them here in our ports, and from these ports the Government department which is responsible should distribute the goods without any of the middlemen's profits that are creamed off before the consumer is able to touch the goods at

*Mr G. Lansbury, M.P (Great Britain)]*

all. If any of you care to read the Report of the evidence given at the Food Commission, or at Lord Linthgow's Commission, you will find that the price we pay for the goods we get from the Colonies is out of all relation to the price that the producer gets in the Colonies, or in the Dominions. Now, we think that even without Socialism, this thing could be at least very largely dealt with, if only the Labour movements would make up their minds to try to tackle it at the earliest possible moment. You may say to me that there will be all kinds of difficulty. But all the difficulties were got over by a stroke of the pen during War time; and if capitalist Governments, or Governments more or less controlled by capitalist patriots, in time of War could do it, in Australia or in South Africa, or in Canada, there is no reason why Governments dominated by Labour, could not do it in Peace time. It is all a question of the will of the Parliaments, and the will of the Governments, and the will of the people concerned.

I will give you one case in point, only that it may go on the record, which proves absolutely what I mean. I was Chairman of, and I am still connected with, Poor Law Institutions in the East End of London. We spend tens of thousands of pounds each year. During the War our costs of maintenance of our people went up enormously; mutton and beef went to 1s 6d., 1s 9d., and 1s. 10d. a lb. My School, of which I was Chairman, had to take in an Army School. The Army School was fed from Army Stores. Talking to the Commandant of those boys, one day, I discovered that the cost per head in his School was about a quarter of the cost per head of my School. So I said to him "Well, how does this happen?" He said: "Bring your prices; come and let us talk about it." I took our prices down to him, and I found that we were paying, for mutton and lamb and beef, nearly three times what he was being charged for it. He was getting his supplies through the Army, and the Army was only paying the actual cost in Australia, or in Argentine or Canada, or wherever it came from, the net cost of transport across the sea, and the net cost of transport to the School. He could get mutton and lamb at about 5d. a lb., and we were paying 1s 9d. a lb. I went to the Food Controller of London, within three minutes of this place, and after about three weeks' arguing and threatening and cursing, we were able to buy for 2d. a lb. profit to the Army, and feed our children at infinitely less cost than any other institution in the whole of the country, barring those under the Army. Ever since that experience, I keep asking myself why in order to feed the civilian population you cannot do what

is done to feed the army. To me it is an amazing thing that there should be the least question about our ability to do it. It is the will to do it which is all that is necessary.

The only other thing I will trouble you to listen to, is this. Do not go away and say that you have to wait for Socialism, or International Socialism, before anything can be done. Nearly all of us here are people who believe in going on to municipal bodies, who believe in going into Parliament; and what do we do that for? We must be doing it because we think that we can palliate the conditions of to-day on lines that will lead on to the bigger thing we want to do. Now I put it to every man who is a Socialist here, I put it to every man who is a Communist here. How do you propose to organise the exchange of goods throughout the world? You must believe that to be possible, if you are Internationalists; you must believe that that is something you have to aim at, if you are Internationalists. If so, why should we not try to begin here and now, within our own circle of nations that are politically associated with one another? And if you agree that it should be done, I ask you to do it for two reasons. One reason is because we people in Britain are being continually brought into conflict with other nations, mainly about this question of food and raw material. I believe that within the British Dominions just now, if this were properly organised by Labour Governments, Socialist Governments, we could commence to organise an international exchange which would show the rest of the world how eventually we could have that fuller and, I think much more complete, international exchange that we all hope to attain. But the great thing to remember, so far as Britain is concerned, is that we are forced, by the exigencies of the position in which we find ourselves—not that we have created, but that Capitalism has created for us—we are obliged either to tumble our population into the sea, or to tumble them somewhere out of the place, or to arrange some means by which we can get food brought in in exchange for our goods. I believe that eventually we will develop those Dependencies and Colonial Possessions that we have got; if we have a Labour Government in power we will be able to do it, and we shall be able at the same time to help the men and women in those communities along true Socialist lines.

I am not one of those who believe that the whole of the human race must of necessity go through the hell of capitalism that the white races have gone through. I believe that if the Socialist and Labour Movement cared to put its thought into this question of how to distribute the abundance that the world has to give us,

we could organise people like our comrade who was in the Chair just now, people like our comrades who inhabit those parts of the world in Africa—we could organise them on true Socialist lines. I believe that that is the function of the white races that call themselves Socialists. I believe, further, that if we do not do so, this thing that you call civilisation, instead of developing into something better, will just go down into oblivion, as every other Empire has done. It may seem a paltry miserable thing to talk about trading; it may sound something which is very common, very mundane; but, remember, feeding ourselves is the first thing any of us have to consider; and it is because I feel that, that I will not stay to say any more now except to

*[State Trading within the British Commonwealth.*

commend it to the very serious and, I hope, sympathetic consideration of every one of you present

The CHAIRMAN regretted that the time at the disposal of the Conference did not permit any discussion of the very interesting matter that had been opened by Mr Lansbury. He asked Mr Gillies now to make a statement as to the Report of the Conference.

*REPORT OF CONFERENCE*

After a statement by the Secretary, Mr. J. QUEEN (Manitoba) moved a resolution that the Report be printed

The Resolution was seconded by Mr H. W. Sampson (South Africa).

The Resolution "That the Report of this Conference be printed," was put to the meeting and carried unanimously

**THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH CONFERENCE, 1927.**

*PLACE.*

The SECRETARY said that with regard to the next Conference, there arose three questions—the place, the time, and the Agenda. He supposed, with regard to the place, everyone would agree that London was inevitable. (Agreed.)

*DATE.*

With regard to the time, last year the Consultative Conference which was held in London recommended that a Conference should be held this year, and that thereafter Conferences should be held biennially. Canada had officially expressed agreement with this decision, and so had South Africa and New Zealand. New Zealand especially had mentioned that they were in favour of these Conferences being held every two years. The British Committee also adopted that recommendation, therefore Great Britain, Canada, South Africa, and New Zealand were already officially committed to the holding of these Conferences every two years.

Mr. H. CRITCHLOW (British Guiana) said that that applied also to British Guiana.

The Secretary asked whether the Conference would agree that the next Conference should be held in 1927.—(Agreed.)

The SECRETARY said that with regard to the date, there was a suggestion that this Conference should be held about the time of the Conference of the International Labour Office, which is usually in May or June. The argument against that proposition was that May or June is usually the most inconvenient date for Parliamentarians; Parliaments throughout the whole of the Dominions are always sitting then. But in 1927 there was a special circumstance which ought to be taken into consideration. The British

Empire Parliamentary Association will hold then, in London, a Conference of the Representatives of the Parliaments of the Dominions and India, and his suggestion was that it should be left to the British Committee to convoke the Conference either on or about the date of the International Labour Office Conference in 1927, or on or about a date that would permit the Conference to be held in connection with the Conference of the Empire Parliamentary Association. When the dates were known, the question could be discussed with the various parties interested, to discover which was the most convenient date. If Australia found that their Parliamentary Labour leaders were coming here, and the New Zealand Parliamentary Labour leaders were coming, and so on, then it might be that the conclusion would be that it should be in July. If it were in July, it might suit both. He thought that point should be settled first.

Mr. H. W. SAMPSON (South Africa) said he quite agreed with allowing the British Labour Party full discretion with regard to calling the next Conference. Personally he thought that so far as the I. L. O. was concerned, it would be a very small sacrifice on the part of anybody who went to their Annual Conference, to remain over for the other Conference, and in any case everyone would be likely to do so. He could not conceive of any man coming from Africa merely to go to Geneva and get back again in a fortnight; he thought he would want to see something of Great Britain and other countries, and, in any case, the Conference would be available to him. By the end of July they try to terminate the Parliamentary Session, and it approximates to the time when most of the people in Great Britain are free, if they do not have similar occurrences to those of this

*Mr. H. W. Sampson (South Africa)]*

year. As far as South Africa is concerned, the end of July would always be the most convenient time, both for the Empire Parliamentary Association Conference and the International Geneva Conference or any other Conference of that kind.

Mr J SIMPSON said he would move in that direction.

The Chairman asked if all were agreed to the course suggested by the Secretary. (Agreed.)

#### AGENDA.

The SECRETARY said that with regard to the Agenda, the Conference had already taken three decisions. They had agreed that the subjects of World Peace, "Inter-Commonwealth Political Relations" and "Subject Peoples." should appear on the Agenda, and they had agreed that, in certain circumstances, the conditions of Indian Labour in British Colonies should appear on the Agenda. With regard to other subjects, he wished to make three suggestions, remembering, however, that this Conference could not definitely frame the Agenda of the next Conference; nothing that they could do to-day could prohibit other organisations proposing additions to the Agenda for the 1927 Conference. He suggested that World Peace should appear on the Agenda, not simply in the form of the Protocol, but that the following question should be put to each organisation in the form that other questions were being put. What is the Policy of your organisation on the Maintenance of World Peace?

Then, again, he considered that Inter-Dominion State Trading would naturally appear on the Agenda, and perhaps they would agree to add to their questionnaire to all Parties, asking them to send considered statements as to what was the attitude of their organisations towards the proposals of the British Labour Movement on Inter-Dominion State Trading.

He thought it inevitable that Migration would appear on the Agenda. That would always appear on the Agenda of these Conferences, just as World Peace would always appear on the Agenda; so they should ask each organisation to send considered statements in reply to the question. "What is the policy of your organisation on Migration?" Perhaps those various statements might appear so valuable that they would be printed for discussion by the Conference when it met. Finally, he thought Miss Heagney had a suggestion that the Policy of the Commonwealth Labour Movements on Socialisation should also appear on the Agenda. He thought that was a very interesting proposal to make.

Miss M. HEAGNEY (Australia) thought that the Questionnaire would be somewhat on these lines:—

(1) Has the Labour Movement of your country definitely adopted the socialisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange, as its objective?

(2) If so, what relation has its immediate political and industrial policy to the objective?

(3) What results have been achieved up to date?

Miss Heagney thought that at this Conference they had rather missed the central idea of the Labour Movement, and that they had been dealing with mild alternatives to existing policies on Inter-Commonwealth relations, rather than developing something new. She thought that the discussion at the next Conference might take a different turn to that which it had taken at this Conference if the replies to such a Questionnaire, on the objectives and achievements of various Parties, were incorporated in the preparatory memoranda.

The Chairman asked whether it was agreed that the three points raised by Mr. Gillies, in addition to the point raised by Miss Heagney, should appear on the Agenda.

Dr. HADEN GUEST (Great Britain) said he agreed. He said there was a phrase used, "Inter-Dominion State Trading." That was not accurate; it was not State trading, for instance, between the Dominion of Canada and the Dominion of Australia; it is really *State trading within the Commonwealth*. (Agreed.)

Mr J. SIMPSON (Canada) said that he thought the position was quite clear now from this point of view, that this Conference seemed to be in agreement that these specific questions on specific subjects should be included, and the matter was still to be left open, allowing for what might arise within the next two years, so that suggestions could be received from London or Australia or elsewhere by the British Committee, saying that such and such a matter was thought to be of such importance that it ought to go into the Agenda; and then leave it entirely to the Committee to select the subjects, and send them forth as they had done at this Conference. He said he would like to move along that line. (Agreed.)

Dr HADEN GUEST wished to state that he had already suggested in the House of Commons, in the course of a speech on Dominion affairs, that there should be summoned a Special Imperial Conference to consider the whole question of the land resources of the Empire. He was intending to go on with that suggestion, because he thought it ought to be done, if pos-

able, by the Governments. At present information as to the land resources of the Empire could not be obtained; and if the matter was further discussed, he would take steps to suggest to the National Executive that this subject be added to the agenda of the next Conference.

#### VOTES OF THANKS.

The CHAIRMAN said that there was no other point to be dealt with, but before the Conference adjourned he wished to take the opportunity of thanking the Empire Parliamentary Association for placing this room at the disposal of the Conference, which he was sure they had all found to be very convenient. He thought the best thanks of the Conference were due to the members of the Empire Parliamentary Association in respect of that, and he moved a vote accordingly.

(The Resolution was put to the meeting and carried by acclamation.)

SIR HOWARD D'EGVILLE (Great Britain) said that the Executive Committee would be very grateful to the Conference for passing that vote of thanks. He could only say that he thought this had been one of the most valuable interchanges of views which he had ever known to take place in that room. He remarked that it was in pursuance of the general policy of the Committee that they should get all representatives of the different interests to exchange ideas, as being the only road to progress.

MR. H. W. SAMPSON (South Africa) said that he thought the Conference owed something more than a mere vote of thanks to their British comrades. He had already said that they owed them a debt of gratitude for what they had done to bring the Conference together to-day and for formulating the Agenda, which had led to very useful discussions. The representatives from distant parts were now leaving the British comrades with a load of trouble and with a load of work to continue, and he was sure that Mr. Gillies would have his hands full. Mr. Gillies, he continued, was not shirking the issue a little bit; he was going to do all he could to further the cause of Labourism in the Dominions, and he had a lot of work to do; but he wanted him and those comrades who were helping him, to go away from this meeting with the thought that they would not merely take what he does as a mere duty, but though they felt that it was necessary for him and those surrounding him to do the work, they still felt it was their duty to assist him in every possible way. If they were merely to go back to their respective countries and forget all about this, and leave this load of trouble behind them with Mr. Gillies, they would not be

fulfilling their duty of delegates to this Conference. They were going to interest the people in their countries in the work that Mr. Gillies and his comrades were doing; and he wanted them to accept from this Conference what he knew every delegate felt, and that was hearty gratitude for the arrangements which he had made, and against which they had no complaint whatever.

MR. N. M. JOSHI (India) said that he had great pleasure in supporting Mr. Sampson in offering thanks to the Labour Movement in England for calling this Conference. The Conference had given a very useful opportunity for exchange of views, frankly, and sometimes perhaps more frankly than they deserved. On the whole, after having watched this Conference, he felt that this exchange of views had been very valuable, and he would be glad if these Conferences were continued as was proposed to-day. Before they dispersed he would like to offer his thanks to Mr. Gillies, the Secretary of this Conference, especially. He had been the guide, philosopher, and friend in the Conference, and he had given them all the help that was necessary. Mr. Joshi concluded by hoping that the work of the Conference would be continued in the future.

The SECRETARY (Mr. W. Gillies) expressed his thanks for what had been said. He was sure the British Committee would be delighted to know that the project of a Commonwealth Labour Conference found a ready acceptance throughout overseas. As far as the British Committee was concerned, the British Commonwealth Labour Conference may not be the most appropriate title for their activities, but although all the States represented to-day were not sovereign States, the delegates, at least, were sovereign delegates within the Commonwealth Labour Conference. He said that their Conferences did not exclude Crown Colonies, and did not consider whether a State was self-governed or not; it was a Commonwealth Labour movement, whether the British Empire is a Commonwealth or not.

Then, from the point of view of Secretary, Mr. Gillies said that he had only one thing to mention. He appreciated the difficulties of the Parties overseas. Miss Heagney had mentioned that the Australian Labour Party holds a Conference once every three years.

MISS HEAGNEY said that was Federal—the State every year, and the Federal every three years; it varied, but was something like that.

The SECRETARY said that certainly Mr. Simpson must have a very great difficulty

in getting his Executive together; perhaps they did not meet more than once a year.

Mr. SIMPSON said they met once a year.

The SECRETARY remarked that therefore the delegates would realise the difficulty of getting decisions from all these Parties. Nevertheless he hoped that all Parties would co-operate in having these several memoranda prepared as soon as possible. The British Committee would act quickly, because what they were really aiming at was a single policy for all the Labour Movements within the British Commonwealth, in order, to say the least of it, that they might minimise the difficulties of a British Labour Government when they found themselves meeting Labour Premiers from Overseas. When that time came, there would at least have been some preliminary discussions by the Labour Movements of the questions which would have to be discussed by the Premiers.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr W. McMullen) said that this brought the Conference to a termination. He said that he could very well understand the spirit that probably animated most of those present. They had come to the stage when they would probably be inclined to leave their hard-heartedness behind, and become somewhat sentimental towards the end of their Con-

ference. Most people might be inclined to make a number of speeches expressing their gratitude and so on; but he wanted to say that the Conference, in his view, had been extremely interesting; it had opened a very great international vista which had only been partially visualised up to the present moment. He was very much impressed with the views of the comrades from various parts of the British Empire, and he was sure that they had all been impressed by the importance of the discussions that had taken place here during the week, and that they would all go back to their respective countries feeling that the questions that had come before the Conference had been dealt with in as fair and impartial a way as possible, having regard to all the circumstances and the conflicting interests of the different countries. He hoped, in particular, that his Indian comrades were thoroughly satisfied with the result of the discussions here, having regard to the circumstances that exist, and that everyone would go back in that international spirit, meeting our difficulties and keeping our eyes fixed on the International situation, with the hope that when they reassembled in two years' time, their difficulties would be less than they were at the present time, and that they would be much nearer the ideal that they were all aiming at, namely, the International Brotherhood of Man (Cheers)



# APPENDICES.

## I.

### MIGRATION.

*Communication from Mr. W. NASH, Secretary, New Zealand Labour Party, dated May 26, 1925.*

I regret that I was compelled to cable you on May 21 to the effect that owing to the political situation which has developed in New Zealand it will not be possible for a representative of the New Zealand Labour Party to attend the Commonwealth Labour Party Conference which is to open in London on July 27; and also that the Industrial Labour Organisations of the Dominions could not be represented either.

As you have no doubt noted in the Press, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, the Hon W F Massey, died a fortnight ago. His death has brought about something of the nature of a crisis in political matters. The immediate political outlook is, therefore, very uncertain, and a General Election is possible at almost any time, although it may not take place until towards the end of the year.

Owing to this uncertainty, the Party cannot see its way clear to send a delegate to the Conference, as we will require all our strength and resources to fight the Election.

In regard to the matters on the proposed Agenda Paper for the Conference, I hope to be able to write you at greater length by next mail.

In the meantime, I can say that the Labour Party's attitude on the question of immigration into New Zealand is, briefly, that it is not opposed to immigration from Great Britain provided that the New Zealand Government makes proper provision for housing and employment. At the present time, the housing conditions in many of our large cities are disgraceful. According to the figures of the Government Statistician at the last Census in 1921, there were 23,055 overcrowded dwellings in the Dominion affecting 164,898 persons, which is a very large portion of New Zealand's population. The Report states that "one person in every seven is living in conditions which at the worst are distinctly dangerous, and at the best are unfavourable to the maintenance of a proper standard of living and decency."

Periodically, unemployment is acute in New Zealand, particularly in our large cities and towns. During the winter of 1921 and 1922 matters were so bad in Wellington that there were distributions of free bread, meat and vegetables at the Town Hall here, and men, women and children were lined up in queues awaiting same to be doled out to them. There is no provision for unemployment or insurance, although the Labour Party has been demanding legislation on the lines of that in operation in Queensland for years.

The Government, the Immigration Department, and, no doubt, the High Commissioner in London, also, contend that every immigrant coming into the Dominion is guaranteed employment and a dwelling. This is not correct. Very often people out here nominate their friends, who may be in a condition of need and distress in Great Britain, stating that they can guarantee a dwelling and employment, when they have not the slightest chance of doing so.

In regard to the conditions in the mining camps of the Dominion, the article written as a warning to British miners in the *Daily Herald* by Mr. David Kirkwood, M.P., is quite correct, in spite of the official attempts at denial.

The Labour Party's oft-stated attitude is that first of all the Housing Problem in the Dominion should be solved by a properly organised scheme, and there should be a guarantee of work or maintenance for all those already in the Dominion, and similar housing and employment provisions made for immigrants, before the present Immigration Scheme is further proceeded with, or new schemes embarked on. We have instances of immigrants suffering from great hardship and some of them actually returning to bad conditions in Britain rather than continue their experience here. There can be no doubt that the general standard of the workers in New Zealand is higher than that in Great Britain, and the workers here do not want to selfishly debar their fellow workers from overseas, but they will certainly fight any attempt to flood New Zealand with such an amount of surplus labour as will menace their conditions. In addition to unemployment and housing as a preliminary to further immigration the Labour Party stands for a properly organised scheme of Land Settlement,

## II.

### MIGRATION.

*Communication from Mr. W. NASH, Secretary, New Zealand Labour Party, dated June 23, 1925.*

I am enclosing herewith a statement of the attitude of the New Zealand Labour Movement, Industrial and Political, on the subject of Immigration, which was submitted to the Overseas Settlement Committee through the late Mr. J. Wignall, M.P., during the visit of that Committee to New Zealand in 1923.

You will notice that the document was signed by Messrs. John Read, President, Wellington Trades and Labour Council; L. Glover, Vice-President, New Zealand Alliance of Labour, P. Fraser, Secretary, Parliamentary Labour Party, and W. Nash, National Secretary, New Zealand Labour Party. It can therefore be taken as the authoritative statement of the New Zealand Labour Movement on the subject.

I would be pleased if you would lay it before the Delegates to the British Commonwealth Conference.

*October 10, 1923.*

### THE NEW ZEALAND LABOUR MOVEMENT AND IMMIGRATION.

The signatories to the following document compiled its contents for the guidance of the British Overseas Settlement Delegation which has recently toured New Zealand.

The following is a considered statement of the opinion of the Labour Movement (Industrial and Political) in New Zealand on Immigration:—

The main portion of the evidence was placed before the Delegation from the British Overseas Settlement Committee at the Trades Hall, Wellington, on Tuesday, September 11, 1923. Mr. P. Fraser, M.P. for Wellington Central, at this conference said:

"The Labour Movement in New Zealand was not opposed to immigration. On the contrary, the whole movement would gladly welcome their brothers and sisters from the old lands. It was necessary, however, to proceed with care. At the present time there was much unemployment throughout the Dominion. He had that day obtained a Report from the Labour Department, which showed that in Wellington an average of 1997 applications for employment had been received every week for the previous 19 weeks. This figure did not touch the actual unemployed, as the majority did not apply to the Department. He was every day placing men in touch with Government Officials in charge of relief works for the unemployed. The fact of these relief works being in existence was, in itself, the strongest of proof that unemployment was rife. In addition to this, many trades were working short time, and he would say that the past three years had been the worst in his experience of the Dominion." The Labour Party will welcome their brothers and sisters from Great Britain, but they would insist that before they are brought here the Government shall legislate to provide that all who are willing to work should have the right to work or adequate maintenance if work was not available.

### HOUSING SCANDAL.

But there was another serious factor which was not peculiar to New Zealand. During the past five years conditions had arisen in the cities of the Dominion that were a disgrace to the Southern Hemisphere. He showed photographs of a stable in which a returned soldier and his four children were living. The rent was 7s. 6d. per week. The husband's average earnings were £3 per week. The father and boy slept in the stalls.

He quoted another case of a family of nine living in a workshop of one room at a rental of 22s. 6d. per week, and cited the following statement by Sister Esther at Auckland on April 11, 1923:—

"Sister Esther backed up a strong indictment of existing conditions by a recital of actual cases. In one instance, no fewer than 27 people were living in one house, the rent of which was £3 per week; two basement rooms were occupied by two separate families, who each paid one guinea a week for their room. In one of these dens lived a man and his wife and three children. There was no room for chairs, the only furniture being two beds and a dressing table, in the drawers of which were stored all their food and provisions. There was no gas or cooking conveniences of any kind. A baby was born in one of these rooms under these conditions."

The evidence is so voluminous that it is unnecessary to quote further, except to say that every steamer from the homeland is accentuating the evil.

## NO LAND SETTLEMENT SCHEME.

With reference to land settlement, he knew many competent farmers on the waterfront of the Dominion who would take up with enthusiasm any scheme which would give them access to the land. If the Government would work out a scheme of land settlement, the conditions of which were such that the people at present in the Dominion could get on the land if desired, and would also make sound provision for adequately housing the people, then he could assure the Delegation that not only would the Labour Party welcome the people from overseas, but would do all in their power to make New Zealand "a home from home."

## THE STATE OF EMPLOYMENT.

Mr J. Read, President of the Wellington Trades and Labour Council, stated that "he supported all that Mr. Fraser had said with regard to welcoming immigrants, but felt that it was due to them that the actual facts should be available when the matter was being considered in Great Britain." The report with regard to employment in the various trades was as follows —

Engineering, poor; building trades, good; clothing, fair; leather, fair, boots and shoes, poor.

The seasonal nature of the industries of the Dominions should be carefully considered. From November to April, shearing, slaughtering and grass-seeding absorbed the majority of the workers offering, but immediately the off-season set in a large number were unemployed, and they flocked to the cities and towns

Whilst employment in the manufacturing industries is spread throughout the year, yet it is doubtful whether this field can be exploited to the benefit of the Dominion. The cry from all manufacturers is "protection" and "more protection". The building trades only are occupied full time, and the shortage of labour in this field is just as acute in Great Britain as in New Zealand

Mr. Read emphasised the remarks made by Mr. Fraser on housing and rents

## RELIEF WORKS AT STARVATION RATES.

During the last three winters unemployment had been rife throughout the Dominion, and the Government had instituted relief works at wages *below the ruling award rates*. Arrivals from overseas may find employment on arrival, but it will not be new employment; it will be *either at the cost of someone else unemployed or on relief works*.

A closer settlement policy for the land might do much to enhance the prosperity of the Dominion, stimulate the secondary industries, and thereby create openings for newcomers; but the present price of land was *prohibitive, from the wage-workers' point of view*. Many returned soldiers who had been financed by the Government, having been unable to make ends meet, had been granted relief from payments of rates, taxes and interest.

A land policy which would make the land accessible to wage-workers would be welcomed, but such a policy should make the land available to the people *already in the Dominion* before bringing people overseas.

## AFFORESTATION.

Mr. Read suggested that forestry work was worthy of the close consideration of the Delegation. He quoted from the 1923 Annual Report of the N.Z. Forestry Department, page 14. —

"Measurements taken early in 1923 on a plot of *pinus radiata*, at Tapanui, now 17 years old, show the average annual volume increment (inside bark) since 1915 to be 398.62 cubic feet per acre. This remarkable rate of growth is exceeded in the North Island, and shows soft-wood growing in New Zealand to be a much more profitable investment than in Europe, where the average annual increment of Scots pine for the same period is in the neighbourhood of 140 cubic feet per acre for soil of the best quality."

This report opened up the possibilities of development and exploitation of forest growth which could absorb many thousands at present unemployed. He suggested to the Delegation that this was a field in which the amount set aside by the British Government for emigration purposes could be usefully and profitably employed. Not only are there large areas of forest lands open for cultivation on silvicultural lines, but there are 300,000 acres of land wasted which will pay for afforestation as in France.

The Department report states that there are also *2,500,000 acres of deforested wilderness which should be gradually reclaimed for human use by timber farms*.

Sir David Hutchens, I F S, in 1919 reported to the N.Z. Government "that the average N.Z. forest will permanently employ one man per 75 acres," whereas the purely sheep country provides labour for one man to every 3,000 acres. In addition to this the primary cultivation of timber growth leads to the establishment of many secondary industries, one in particular being the paper industry.

### ALLIANCE OF LABOUR'S VIEWS.

Mr. Roberts, Secretary, N.Z. Alliance of Labour, stated that he represented the opinions of over 50,000 workers employed in the transport and other industries in New Zealand, and at the outset he desired to say that he agreed in toto with the statements made by Messrs. Fraser and Read regarding housing conditions in New Zealand. He desired to inform the Delegation also that the Labour Movement in New Zealand had no objection to immigration provided that it was carried out in an organised manner, which would enable all the workers in New Zealand to be in continuous employment, and that the immigrants coming here would be assured of employment and proper housing conditions on their arrival. The workers would have no objection to immigration provided that the influx of immigrants into the Dominion did not have the effect of lowering the standard of living of the workers of this country.

### RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

The Railway Service of New Zealand did not at present offer many opportunities of employment. The Government, which controls all the railway services, some time ago decided on a policy of retrenchment, and many men, who were known as "permanent casuals," were dismissed from the service, and at the present time the staff of the New Zealand Railways was sufficient to meet all the requirements of this important industry. The Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants informed him that the only opportunity offered to obtain employment on the railways was that men over 65 years of age were being superannuated, and as vacancies occurred in this manner new men were being engaged. There was no difficulty, however, in filling these vacancies, as there has been plenty of labour offering at all times.

### WATERSIDE WORK.

The waterside industry was at the present time very slack. The men working on the waterfronts throughout New Zealand to-day were not earning £2 10s. per week on an average. This, too, despite the fact that the New Zealand Court of Arbitration laid down a basic wage of £3 16s. 1d. per week. The waterfront industry was to a great extent a seasonal occupation. The busy time was when the agricultural products, such as wool, butter, cheese and meat, were being shipped home to Great Britain; the busy season on the waterfront was from the month of December to the beginning of May. He had heard figures quoted by Mr. Fraser which were taken from the Labour Department's Unemployment Bureau; but in any of the months quoted there was more than that number unemployed on the Wellington waterfront alone. The other large waterfronts were in just the same position. The work was casual, and the men from the country drifted on to the wharves, and this resulted in unemployment being more or less continuous on all the large waterfronts of the Dominion.

### SEAMEN UNEMPLOYED.

Reports received from the Secretary of the Federated Seamen's Union indicate that the number of men unemployed during the past twelve months is higher than at any period in the history of New Zealand. This is due to the amount of tonnage which is laid up both in New Zealand and Australia. The volume of inter-colonial and coastwise trade is not so large as formerly. Added to this, there is the fact that some of the large vessels are oil burners, and this, of course, has reduced the number of men required in the stokehold department.

The introduction of machinery has also reduced the number of men necessary to carry on the work on the waterfront, for until recently the work on the waterfront was carried on principally by hand-labour. Now, however, up-to-date coal-heaving appliances have been introduced, and also motor tractors for trucking; this, of course, has displaced hand labour considerably. The waterside workers and seamen in New Zealand interchange occupation to a great extent, and it has been found that these two departments of the transport industry are affected by the depression or improvement in trade simultaneously.

### SAW-MILLING INDUSTRY.

Reports from the saw-milling industry indicate that at the present time the industry is working at normal, but there are plenty of men available for the work.

## COAL-MINING.

He desired, he said, to draw the attention of the Delegation to this industry, for the Labour organisations had been informed that the Emigration Department of Great Britain had stated that there was a great shortage of coal miners in this Dominion. As a matter of fact, he said, this was not so. He had recently visited the West Coast coal-mining fields, which had the largest output of coal by a long way in New Zealand, and he found that there was no shortage of labour whatever.

The real trouble in the coal-mining districts in New Zealand was the housing question. Many expert miners had left the industry owing to the bad housing conditions and the lack of opportunity offered for the education and employment of the children of coal-miners. On the waterfronts of New Zealand alone there were at least 600 capable coal-miners, who had left the industry due to these causes. The housing conditions in some of the places were extremely bad.

Mr. Thomson, of the Immigration Department, said that the Delegation was going to visit the West Coast.

Mr. Roberts stated that he hoped they would visit Rewanui, Blackball, Dennistown Hill, Ros, and other coal-mining towns. He was sure that if the Delegation did so they would bear out this statement regarding the housing conditions in this country.

## DRIVERS.

Reports from the Secretary of the Drivers' Federation were to the effect that there were more men offering than there were jobs available. This was due to the fact that motor transport had taken the place of horse transport in this country successfully. Indeed, it was competing to a great extent against railway transport as far as short distances were concerned. The introduction of motor transport displaced men, with the result that many drivers had taken up other occupations, and an improvement in this industry could not be expected, as the indications were that motor transport in New Zealand would take the place of horse transport altogether. There were no opportunities offered in this particular industry in New Zealand at the present time.

## FREEZING INDUSTRY.

This, he said, was a seasonal occupation. The season commenced in the North Island about December and ended about May; in the South Island the season commenced about the middle of January and ended about June or July. Last season was the shortest on record, and many men who had followed this seasonal occupation for years were unable to find employment at all. In the Wellington district alone there was a falling off of 800 in the 1922-23 season as compared with the number employed in the 1921-22 season. Information from other parts of New Zealand indicates that there was a similar falling-off in the number of men employed. The men who were displaced have taken on work in other industries, principally in public works, which, of course, restricts the avenue of employments to men who usually follow this class of work.

## REDUCED EMPLOYMENT.

To a great extent, the same applies to the water-side and other maritime industries. In 1920-21 there were 7,675 men employed on the waterfronts of New Zealand. In 1922-23 this had fallen to 4,892—a reduction of 2,783. The membership of the Marine Cooks and Stewards' Union—men employed in the provender department in ships—was in 1919-20, 1,335; in 1923 this had fallen to 578—a reduction of 757, or more than one-half. At the present time there are 189 men out of employment in this industry. In connection with this particular class of employment, he said that overseas vessels engaged men to work their passages out to New Zealand, and then, of course, these men remained in this country. The result was that they drifted into other avenues of employment, for which they were totally unsuited.

## STANDARD OF LIVING.

He knew the Delegation would be told that it did not matter how many immigrants came to New Zealand, they could not materially affect the standard of living of the workers of this country, as the New Zealand Arbitration Court had laid down a standard of living which could not be reduced. This, of course, was not true, for the Arbitration Court could not flout the economic law. It was a well-known fact that if the supply of labour was greater than the demand, the result was a lowering of the standard of living and a worsening of the conditions of employment. The reverse would happen, of course, if the supply of labour was not equal to the demand. The workers could then maintain their standard of living without difficulty. However, he wanted to tell the Delegation that the standard of living laid down by the Arbitration

Court was not what it should be. The rental of houses had increased considerably, and at the present time the Arbitration Court allowed 15s. 3d. per week for a four roomed house when, as a matter of fact, *it was nearly double that amount*. The Government itself built some workers' houses at Miramar, Wellington, and the rental of these houses to-day was from 29s. to 36s. per week. Therefore, it could easily be seen that the rental scale allowed by the Arbitration Court was not nearly sufficient.

### WORKERS BELOW PRISON STANDARDS.

He desired to point out also, that the living wage was based on a *man, his wife, and two children*. The amount laid down for the food of these four people was 25s. 10d. per week, or 6s. 5½d. per member of the family. At present prices it was impossible to provide the amount of food necessary for these people on this amount. This could be clearly proved by the fact that the Prison Department of New Zealand allowed 7s. per head for the food of prisoners, and the food supply for the prisons was bought wholesale, while the worker bought his retail. His desire was to impress the Delegation that the standard of living in New Zealand was in danger of being lowered considerably if there was an influx of immigrants without sufficient avenues of employment being created for these workers. He had been in New Zealand 20 years, and prior to that time had had experience in most of the large seaports of Great Britain. He realised fully the conditions under which many of the workers in these large cities lived, and the Labour Movement in New Zealand was determined that these conditions should not be introduced into New Zealand.

For a number of years he had worked in the country and had found that there was a certain drift towards the cities, and he would point out to the Delegation that if people in the large cities in Great Britain were brought into this country without proper housing conditions being provided for them they would be inclined to adopt the mode of life and environment to which they were formerly accustomed. This would not be good either for the people of New Zealand or for the immigrants.

### PRECAUTIONS TO BE TAKEN.

He concluded by stating that the Labour Movement had no desire to bar and bolt New Zealand against immigration; they would welcome their fellow workers from the Old Country to this Dominion, provided that immigration was organised, and that it did not tend to lower the standard of living of the workers of this country. He considered that it would be absurd to bring men and women 14,000 miles and then place them in the same conditions of living as they were in before they left home. If the people of the Old Country were to come to New Zealand they should be assured that their standard of comfort and social status generally would be improved on their arrival. This could only be done by organisation and co-ordination, and he had no doubt that if the immigration policy of the Imperial Government was gone into thoroughly New Zealand could support a much bigger population than it was supporting at the present time. He thought that, comparing the productivity of New Zealand with that of the older countries, this Dominion could support a population of five millions in 30 years from now, but it would require that extensive cultivation should be carried on and many secondary industries established. At the present time we had a population of one and a quarter million, and that population seemed to be as much as the present industrial requirements needed.

If all the ideas of profit and gain were cut out he considered that New Zealand could be made a home for many immigrants both to the benefit of the Dominion and to the men and women coming from Great Britain and Ireland. If such a policy were adopted the Delegation could rely on the support and co-ordination of the Labour Movement in New Zealand in assisting to solve the great human problem of immigration to this Dominion.

### REPORTS FROM DISTRICTS.

In addition to the statements made to the Delegation, the following reports have been received from some of the smaller centres:—

#### FOXTON.—FLAXMILLING INDUSTRY.

Trade is seasonal. The mills usually close for two months during winter. Wages, 13s. per day.

House rents: Four rooms, 15s. per week; five rooms, 20s. to 25s. per week.

#### LEVIN.—DAIRYING.

No unemployment. Rents are high: 22s. 6d. per week for houses of four to five rooms.

Land prices average £80 per acre. Many farmers have gone under since the war owing to slump in produce prices and high price of land.

#### SHANNON.—FLAX.

Rents high. Houses of five rooms, 20s. to 25s. per week.

## KAITANGATA — MINING AREA

Between September and March (the slack period) the companies reduce the staff by 50 per cent. The single men are paid off, and the married men work through the summer on the cavilling system. Dismissals and short time mean that actually there are only one-third of the winter staff employed during the slack season. Five families left here early this year.

Owing to no building operations in the township, houses are always in short supply.

## HASTINGS — PASTORAL

This is one of the wealthiest towns in the Dominion, being situated in the celebrated Hawke's Bay district. The report is that houses are unprocurable. Rents: Houses of four rooms, 25s. per week; five rooms, 30s. per week.

## FROM CAPITALIST PAPERS.

The following reports are from the *Hawke's Bay Tribune*, of August 23 and September 9.—

### DISTRESS IN HASTINGS.

#### SIXTY FAMILIES RELIEVED.

The Committee set up at the meeting of citizens held on August 6 in the Council Chambers to investigate cases of poverty and influenza, met last night in the Mayor's Office.

There were present: His Worship the Mayor (chair), Messrs H. C. Baird, J. W. Shaw, L. F. Pegler, H. Davies, F. Barley, J. Jeffries, Ensign Watkins (S.A.), and Mr J. Ed. Colochin (Y.M.C.A.).

The Mayor explained that 60 families had received assistance, and further calls were being received daily. Every case was inquired into. Undoubtedly distress was prevalent in our town, and this was due to unemployment, bad weather and sickness, and particularly the high rents which were charged, and which were out of all reason.

The Mayor, Mr. Colochin and Ensign Watkins spoke of the necessity of setting up an organisation to provide relief for those who were in need. That was the result of their observations and experience. Such an organisation would endeavour to eliminate distress by placing them in employment and functioning in other ways.

The meeting expressed itself in entire sympathy with the movement, and the necessity for such an organisation; and it was regrettable that the appeal for monetary aid had only realised £85. Clothing, food, jams, etc., are urgently required, and might be left at the Council Chambers. The committee desired to impress upon the public the necessity for their wholehearted support.

Mr Pegler moved that an organisation, to be called the Hastings Relief Committee, be formed. Mr. Baird seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously. It was decided to ask one representative from each of the religious denominations, friendly societies, Y.M.C.A., Orphans' Club, Chamber of Commerce, and Progressive League to seats on the Committee.

The Mayor moved, and Mr. Baird seconded, that Mr. Colochin, Secretary of the Y.M.C.A., be asked to act as Secretary and treasurer of the committee. Mr. Colochin expressed his willingness to act.

An Executive, consisting of the Mayor, Messrs Baird, Davies, Bailey, Shaw, Ensign Watkins, and the Secretary, was set up.

It was decided to ask the Secretary to interview the representatives of the above organisations with a view to calling a full committee meeting at an early date.

"The Hastings Citizens' Relief Committee is urgently in need of funds, and also clothing, jams, etc. The need is great. There are many families in Hastings who, through no fault of their own, cannot procure the bare necessities of life, and it is such families that the committee desires to help. All donations should be sent to the Mayor at the Borough Council Office, Hastings."

### BOOT OPERATIVES.

The following statement has also been received from the Secretary of the Boot Operatives' Union:—

A. B. and C. D., in response to applications for positions as boot operatives, received the letters and conditions as per sheets. Appendix C, D, E and F. (*The Worker* will publish this next issue.)

It will be noticed from the letter of March 17 that employment and *residential accommodation were guaranteed*. The residential accommodation arranged for consisted of a boarding-house. *The cost of accommodation exceeded the guaranteed wages by 10s weekly*. The position to day is that these two families are in a worse position than they were in England. They are living in one house, whereas in England each had a home.

Whilst the letter states that the employer will arrange residential accommodation, the operatives were under the impression that this implied that houses would be available.

The boot operatives in New Zealand have been fighting for better conditions of living than that prevailing in the Old Country, yet these people sacrificed their home in the Old Country to come out here, where they have no home; so that their condition now is worse than when they were living in the Old Country.

Here are two cases of skilled operatives who, on a guarantee of continuous employment, were induced to come out to the Dominion. On arrival the employer alleged that they were not sufficiently skilled, and instantly dismissed them. This in spite of the fact that they had been brought 13,000 miles to a strange country.

In several cases members of our Union have been dismissed to make room for newcomers, and this has entailed a charge on the Union funds for the unemployed benefit.

### AN IMPERIAL SOLDIER'S CASE.

The following statement is by an ex-Imperial Service man :—

I am an ex-Service man. Was discharged on pension on November 1, 1918, after four years and five days' service. After working in England for some time I decided, as a result of the glowing accounts I had heard of the possibilities there, to emigrate to New Zealand.

Previous to coming to this decision, I made inquiry at the Overseas Settlement Office, Victoria Street, London, and also at New Zealand House, Strand, London. From one of these places I received a booklet, in which I read that houses could be procured in Auckland and other New Zealand cities at a rental of 18s. per week. It further stated that children were welcome, as the Dominion needed population. My wife went to a New Zealand Labour Bureau in Windsor Hotel, London, to see if a job could be guaranteed in the event of our going to New Zealand. When she told the Manager that I was used to horses and cattle, and had acted as a horse-breaker in the army, she was advised not to worry about securing a job in advance, as when we reached New Zealand the employers would be waiting on the wharf ready to grab us as soon as the ship got alongside.

Primed up in this manner, I gave up a job which averaged me about five pounds a week, besides my pension of 30s. a week, and sailed for New Zealand. My rent in London was 10s. 2d. per week for a flat of three rooms and kitchenette; and the cost of commodities, although high, was certainly no more than it is here. I might say that when I told my employer what I was going to do he tried to dissuade me, and said I was a fool to give up a good job to go to a strange country. I ignored his advice—a thing I have since had reason to regret.

We landed in Wellington on March 5, 1921. There were no employers on the wharf waiting to "grab us." We were met by some Salvation Army people, and a prohibitionist agent, who lectured us on the evils of indulgence in liquor. The Salvation Army people sent us to Hotel Bristol, where we were charged £3 17s for accommodation over the week-end. We then moved to the People's Palace, where the tariff was £2 2s per week for adults; children half price. I secured employment at £4 5s a week wages, and got an empty room for a pound a week. Having two children it was necessary to get some better accommodation than this, and after considerable trouble I succeeded in obtaining a house at a rental of two pounds a week.

After being here for over two years, this is the position we are in. My wages as a carter are £3 17s. per week. We pay £1 5s. rent for two rooms. My children have to play on the street, as we have no backyard. In London we did have a yard for the children to play in. I have applied for a number of jobs in the country, but find that I am prejudiced in this direction by having children. My wife and I interviewed a farmer's wife who had come to town to engage a married couple for farm work. She said we were suitable, and that the wages were £3 per week and all found. We accepted, but when she was informed that we had two children, she said that one pound a week would have to be deducted from the wages for the children's keep. We refused to go on these terms.



If we could manage to get a position in the country we might be able to save enough to pay our passages back to England, where I am sure that we could make a better living than we are doing here. My wages are not sufficient to keep myself and family in the bare necessities of life. In order to eke out an existence I have to work on Sunday mornings, scrubbing out a picture theatre. Luckily we brought a good supply of clothing with us from England, and my wife's sister has sent out a few things since we have been here. Were it not for this I don't know what we would have done for clothes.

I think it is time the practice of inducing people to come here under false pretences was stopped, and before men are brought here, houses and jobs should be provided for them.

I might add that I have met quite a number who are in the same position or worse than myself. Quite recently I met one who had arrived by the Rotorua. He had a wife and family of four. *It was costing him £2 2s. a day for board at a private hotel in the city.* He had no work, and little prospect of getting any.

(Signed) *Claude Thos. West* October 2, 1923.

Witness: (Signed) *A. PARLANE,*  
Sec., Drivers' Union October 27, 1923

### THE NOMINATION SYSTEM.

The effect of the present nomination system is shown in the latest Government report on immigration.

Number of new arrivals for permanent residence . . . . .	13,845
After deducting the children under 15 years . . . . .	3,110
And dependants . . . . .	2,878

An analysis of occupations gives the following results—

Mining .. . . .	602
Agricultural, Pastoral and Fishing . . . . .	1,190
Food Trades . . . . .	91

Hardware Trades .. . . .	760
Textiles and Boots . . . . .	456
Building Trades . . . . .	333
Woodware Trades . . . . .	169
Transport . . . . .	367

Commerce and Finance .. . . .	568
Professional and Clerical . . . . .	1,009

Personal and Domestic . . . . .	1,140
Labourers .. . . .	474
General .. . . .	598

So that we have—

Primary Producers . . . . .	1,190
*Mining . . . . .	602
Secondary Industries (including Transport) . . . . .	2,176
Professional and Commercial . . . . .	1,677
Personal and Domestic (chiefly Domestic Servants) . . . . .	1,140
Labourers . . . . .	474
Others . . . . .	598

\* Mr. J. Roberts's statement with regard to miners on the waterfront should be noted here.

## EFFECTS SO FAR.

The immigration policy as at present conducted has had three effects It has

*Lowered wages;  
Increased unemployment; and  
Accentuated the housing shortage.*

Finally, we wish to emphasise :—

- (1) That New Zealand is a fertile land of great possibilities;
- (2) That the people here do not wish to reserve the land to themselves;
- (3) That a certain standard of living has been attained after many years of hard fighting; and
- (4) That there is room in New Zealand for many more people provided that we have a *scientifically organised immigration policy.*

Signed on behalf of the New Zealand Labour Movement :—

JOHN READ,  
*President, Trades and Labour Council.*

L. GLOVER,  
*Vice-President, Alliance of Labour.*

P. FRASER,  
*Secretary, Parliamentary Labour Party*

W. NASH,  
*National Secretary, New Zealand Labour Party.*

October 3, 1923

## III.

### MIGRATION.

*Communication received from Mr. J. ROBERTS, Secretary, New Zealand Alliance of Labour, dated May 13, 1925.*

"With reference to the question of emigration, I have to point out to you that the Tory Government of New Zealand has during past years brought a number of immigrants to New Zealand without making any provision whatever for these people, and at a time when there was quite a number of unemployed workers in the Dominion. The Labour Movement of New Zealand has no objection to immigrants provided that the workers at present in the Dominion are in employment, and that the Government provides for the immigrants sufficient housing accommodation. This important provision has been completely neglected by the Government, and at the present time there are thousands of workers in New Zealand who, though in employment, cannot find homes."

## IV.

### STATUS OF INDIANS IN NEW ZEALAND.

*Communication from Mr. W. NASH, Secretary, New Zealand Labour Party, dated June 23, 1925.*

\* I am enclosing, herewith, a letter which has been forwarded from the Internal Affairs Department, briefly summing up the position of our Indian fellow-subjects in this Dominion.

The attitude of the Labour Movement in New Zealand is, briefly, that we are opposed to any large number of Asiatic people coming into the country. Our opposition is not based upon any colour, race, or religious prejudices. The matter is viewed entirely from the social and economic standpoint. The Indian workers have a much lower standard of living than the New Zealand workers, and consequently any considerable number of them coming into the Dominion would flood the Labour market with cheap labour, and lower the standard of living of the workers already in the country.

At the Labour Party Conference which met in Auckland in 1922, a statement of the position of Labour on this question was drafted and sent to representatives of the Indian race in the Dominion by whom it was received with approval.

The statement briefly set forth that the New Zealand Labour Movement objected to any large influx of white or Asiatic Labour as being a menace to their wages and conditions, and particularly pointed out the danger of cheap Asiatic Labour. It, therefore, could not agree to any unrestricted immigration, claiming for the people of New Zealand the right to determine the question of immigration into the country.

The Labour Party also recognised the right of Self-Government for the people of India, including the question of settlement in that country.

In regard to the Indians already in New Zealand, the Party urged them to conform to the standards and conditions of the workers here, and that would mean that they would observe Trade Union rules and conditions, and adopt the same standard of living as the New Zealanders, as far as their religious and dietetic principles permitted, and that in the question of housing they would also conform to New Zealand standards of comfort and hygiene.

The Party stands for full civil rights for the Indians already in the Dominion.

Mr. J. Roberts, Secretary of the New Zealand Alliance of Labour, authorised me to state that his organisation associates itself with this statement of Labour's attitude on the Indian question as set forth above."

*Copy of letter from Mr. W. NOSWORTHY, Ministry of Internal Affairs, to Mr. P. FRASER, M.P.*

Office of the Minister of Internal Affairs,  
Wellington.

June 22, 1925.

DEAR SIR,—In response to the request made by you to Mr. Hislop, Under-Secretary of Internal Affairs, to be supplied with an official letter showing the standing of British Indians in New Zealand, I have to advise you that the British Indians resident in the Dominion number approximately 600.

The New Zealand Electoral Act gives the franchise to all British subjects, and Indians enjoy the privileges just the same as other classes of His Majesty's subjects. The only disability that British Indians are under in New Zealand, is their exclusion from the benefits of the Old Age Pension Act.

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) W. NOSWORTHY,

for Minister of Internal Affairs

P. Fraser, Esq., M.P., Wellington.

V.  
STATE TRADING WITHIN THE BRITISH COMMON-  
WEALTH.

FOOD.

*Communication from British Trades Union Congress and British  
Labour Party.*

The following memorandum was submitted by Mr. Fred Bramley, Secretary of the British Trades Union Congress, and Mr. Arthur Greenwood M.P., Secretary of the Joint Research and Information Department of the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party, to the British Royal Commission on Food Prices, on February 18, 1925.

SUMMARY OF MEMORANDUM.

1. The memorandum deals in the first place with the various factors affecting food prices, with the object of showing:
  - (a) That home produce will not meet the national needs;
  - (b) That the Dominions, whilst supplying a considerable proportion of our imports, do not "fill the bill";
  - (c) That foreign supplies (and also Dominion supplies) are open to influences which this country cannot control, and
  - (d) That international action is essential.
2. The proposals are —
  - (a) Support for I L P evidence in favour of centralised purchase of wheat and meat (Pars. 17 and 18);
  - (b) Co-operation with the Dominions (Pars 19—20);
  - (c) International Economic Commission to deal with food and freights (Pars. 20—27);
  - (d) Legislation concerning Trusts and Combines (Par. 28);
  - (e) Food Consumers' Council (Par. 29);
  - (f) British Agriculture (in a sense this goes too far afield, but the question of agriculture can hardly be ignored) (Par. 30);
- 3 The memorandum closes with an indication that evidence can be submitted on other questions touching the Commission's investigations

## MEMORANDUM OF EVIDENCE.

### A.—STATEMENT OF THE POSITION.

1 The working classes are more affected by high food prices than is any other section of the community. According to the calculations used in the Ministry of Labour's index of the cost of living, 60 per cent. of the expenditure of a typical working-class family is devoted to the purchase of food. Further, as is well known, the percentage of total expenditure required for the purchase of food increases as total income decreases. The poorest classes in the community may spend as much as nearly 70 per cent. of their income upon food, and are thus most vitally concerned in the problem of food prices.

2. In this country we import roughly half our beef, mutton and pigmeat, over 80 per cent of our wheat and wheat flour, the greater part of our butter and cheese, a substantial proportion of our eggs, practically all our sugar, and, of course, all our coffee, cocoa, tea and rice. In consequence, the cost of living of the working classes depends in a very large degree upon conditions affecting the prices of imported foodstuffs—i. e., upon factors originating outside this country altogether. Indeed, in so far as imported produce commands a lower price than the home-produced article, it is probably consumed by the working classes in greater proportion than by other sections of the community; and the workers are, therefore, specially interested in the prices of imported foods.

3. Increased world consumption may well tend to increase the prices of some of the more important foodstuffs imported into this country.

Thus the world consumption of tea is increasing very materially. In America there is a definite campaign to encourage tea-drinking, while Russia is likely to be an increasingly important consumer in the future.

As regards the price of meat, evidence has already been laid before the Commission of the striking increase in the consumption of imported meat upon the continent of Europe during the last few years. Europe now draws upon sources of supply which were formerly almost reserved for us, and unless there is a rapid increase in production the price paid by the British consumer for his meat must tend to rise.

4. Wheat consumption again might be increased by any rise in the standard of living or change in the tastes of the large populations which do not now habitually consume wheaten bread. For example, there is some reason to suppose that the Japanese are substituting wheat for rice in their diet, and that this may open up a fresh market for Australian wheat, which now normally comes here. In Europe also the possibility that populations now consuming rye will tend increasingly to substitute wheat consumption must be reckoned with.

5. In the case of agricultural products supply is notoriously slow to adjust itself to demand. Such factors as we indicate may eventually lead to increased supplies of those articles of which the consumption is increasing. But in the interim period an increase in prices such as may be of most serious consequence to the British consumer can only be avoided by organised action of a drastic character.

6. Such influences as we have outlined are facts which any serious attempt to grapple with the problem of food prices must take into primary consideration. Nor can it be argued that because prices are affected by the habits and tastes of millions of people in different parts of the globe, therefore they are uncontrollable. On the contrary, organised international action, by eliminating speculative operations, controlling the activities of trusts and combines, and encouraging increased production, can obviate the consequences now associated with increasing world consumption of foodstuffs that are essential to this country.

7. A feature of our food supplies from overseas sources is the substantial proportion that is imported from the Dominions. We understand that something like 13 per cent. of our imports of beef, 48 per cent. of our imports of mutton, 40 per cent of our imports of wheat, 43 per cent. of our imports of butter, and 85 per cent of our imports of cheese come from the Dominions. This position, in which so large a part of imported food supplies comes from countries with which the importing country is so intimately connected, is, of course, peculiar to Great Britain and Ireland. The connection is particularly fortunate in that it enables Great Britain to negotiate inter-imperial arrangements, free from all the difficulties attending upon international action, for securing adequate supplies of foodstuffs at reasonable prices.

8. Our dependence upon overseas food supplies makes it of paramount importance to this country that freight rates should be reasonable. Summaries which have just reached this country of the Report made by Mr. W. T. R. Preston on behalf of the Canadian Government upon the North Atlantic services and freights suggest that the position, at least as regards Atlantic transport, is far from satisfactory. The

Report alleges that combination among the shipping companies has resulted in "undue limitation of the facilities for ocean transport, and in a rise of 700 per cent. in Canadian ocean freights above the pre-war level." The injury to agricultural, cattle, dairy and fruit interests is specifically alleged.

9. In consequence of our dependence on imported foods, the prices of home supplies are largely governed by the world prices prevailing for the various articles of food, subject to certain special conditions, which may temporarily affect the British market alone. In the long run the prices of those British articles of food which compete with imported supplies *must* follow world price movements

10. In our view the production of certain classes of British agricultural produce might be materially increased by a more enlightened agricultural policy. We refer to wheat and, to some extent, to meat and dairy products also. We think, however, that the figures already given of the relative proportions of home produced and imported foods consumed in this country show that no increase in home production is possible, on a scale which would materially affect the prices of those articles which are in serious competition with supplies from abroad.

11. This point may be illustrated by a few figures relating to the wheat position. Thus in 1923 we produced in this country a crop of 7,149,000 quarters of wheat from an area of 1,799,000 acres, the yield being 31.8 bushels to the acre. This crop sufficed to provide less than one-fifth of our total needs for wheat, or sufficient supplies for less than 8,661,000 souls out of a population of 43,304,000. Even if the area under wheat could be increased by a million acres, and the same yield per acre be maintained (an extreme supposition), this would only mean an increase of 55.6 per cent. on the present crop, or supplies for an additional 4,815,000 of the population. The population of Great Britain is, however, increasing roughly at the rate of about a quarter of a million per annum. In less than 20 years, therefore, the whole of the increased production from a million acres would be absorbed by the increase of population, and four-fifths of the total population would still be dependent on imported supplies.

12. The prices of foodstuffs, like all prices, are liable to be influenced by monetary disturbances. The prices of agricultural produce within this country move in very close correspondence with the general level of prices, as has been conspicuously illustrated during the boom period of 1918-20, and the subsequent depression. Indeed, in this instance, at any rate, special factors affecting agricultural prices, though important in certain cases, were outweighed in their effect on the final result by factors influencing the level of prices generally.

13. The level of prices generally is again a matter which international action alone can adequately control. At present much depends on the policy pursued in this country and in America in regard to the gold standard. A change in American monetary policy, in view of the very large amounts of gold accumulated there, might easily lead to a rise in American prices, and so long as this country is not also on a gold standard, to a fall in the dollar exchange, which would cheapen our imports from the North American continent.

On the other hand, should a gold standard be in operation in this country also, a fall in the values of gold in America would be accompanied by a rise in prices here also, and this would affect the prices of foodstuffs as well as of all other articles.

14. In the case of certain staple articles of food, we are impressed by the dominant position occupied by one or very few firms. As regards meat, the Commission has already had full evidence of the extent of the power and interests of the Vestey group. As regards milk, the extensive operations of United Dairies, Limited, in the wholesale and, to some extent, also in the retail trade were carefully examined by the Lighthgow Committee on Agricultural Prices. As regards wheat, we understand that the bulk of the world's exportable surplus of wheat is handled by a very small number of firms, and wheat pools.

15. In our view a situation of the greatest public danger exists where the importation of essential foodstuffs is concentrated in the hands of very few firms, or where a large part of the total supplies is controlled by a single interest which thus enjoys virtually monopolistic powers. These dangers are increased by the facts, first, that combines handling the food supplies of this country may be international rather than national organisations, and second that even those combines whose activities are confined to this country, keep their operations and profits secret, and cannot under the present law be compelled to do otherwise.

16. The evidence that we have given above indicates the very large part played by international factors in determining the level of food prices. We wish particularly to emphasise this. World economic conditions govern the demand for and supplies of many of the more important foodstuffs consumed in this country, and therewith both the price paid by the British consumer, and, in the long run, the price received by the home producer. Monetary factors affecting the price level generally are largely international in character; while trusts and combines are international in their operations.

## B.—PROPOSALS.

17. To secure supplies of wheat and meat for this country, we wish to urge in the first instance the establishment of the system of centralised public purchase of wheat and meat put forward in the evidence given before the Commission on behalf of the Independent Labour Party. As the advantages of this scheme have been fully explained in that evidence, it is not necessary for us to repeat here the detailed arguments in support of it.

18. The supposed objections to public action have not prevented the French Government from proposing bold measures by which it is hoped to reduce the price of wheat in France. The French plan of purchasing a limited quantity of wheat for sale at a loss in order to lower wheat prices on the market is open to very serious objections which cannot be urged against our proposals. Such temporary sales below cost may well make the position of the private importers intolerable by bringing prices to an unremunerative level. Under our proposals, on the other hand, over a period of years, the sales of imported wheat would be at prices calculated on the average to yield neither profit nor loss.

19. In regard to those articles of food of which the import is centralised in public hands, direct arrangements might be made on behalf of the British consumers with the organised producers in the Dominions for securing a definite quantity of the Dominions' output at fair prices fixed in advance. Long contracts for bulk purchase would eliminate the price fluctuations which are now so grave a menace to both producer and consumer, and which open the door to undesirable speculation. The growth of producers' organisations in the Dominions should greatly facilitate arrangements of this kind. At the same time a fully satisfactory scheme must involve international as well as inter-imperial co-operation.

20. In addition, arrangements might be made between the British Government and the Governments of the Dominions for adopting a recognised system of grading other articles of food, the purchase of which we do not propose should be placed under public control. We think that the possibilities of such action in regard to fruit, butter and cheese should be carefully explored, and that the standing Imperial Economic Committee which we understand it is proposed to set up could usefully handle such problems.

21. At the same time it appears to us that the situation demands wider measures, and that the organisation of the League of Nations might be used for this purpose. We should like to see an International Economic Commission established as part of the permanent machinery of the League of Nations, and submit that the initiative in establishing such might well come from the Government of this country, which is so vitally concerned in the consumption of exported foodstuffs.

22. Such a Commission would have three principal functions. In the first place it would examine the operations of international combines handling food supplies, and elaborate measures for their control for the consideration of the Governments concerned. In the second place it would undertake similar duties in regard to shipping services and freights. In the third place it would provide machinery for the co-operation of the public organisations which may be set up by different nations for the purchase of foodstuffs. In our view the purchase by Governments of essential foodstuffs is likely to increase greatly in the future as the hardships of insecure food supplies and the benefits of public action are more generally appreciated. But it is essential that the creation of inter-State machinery should keep pace with the development of State activity.

23. As regards shipping in particular, it appears to us altogether anomalous that while internal freight rates are subject to stringent public control, international transport companies can charge whatever they please. Should the negotiations and proposals of the International Economic Commission which we have proposed prove inadequate to prevent restriction of shipping facilities and excessive freight charges, the Dominion Governments might well find that the best remedy would be to develop their own publicly-owned shipping lines.

24. The International Institute of Agriculture, with the value of whose work we are much impressed, should be linked up with the proposed International Economic Commission, and the scope of its investigations extended, more detailed information being collected, particularly with regard to meat supplies and the lesser cereals.

25. The establishment of an Economic Commission as part of the League of Nations would not be a revolutionary departure involving new "interference" with private industry. The Health Section of the League already enjoys wide powers, involving interference with the actions of individuals, while the International Labour Organisation lays down minimum standards designed to affect not a part but the whole of industry in the most intimate matters.

We would also remind the Commission that the Inter-Departmental Committee on Meat Supplies in 1919 reported that during the period immediately after the war, "international action may be required to secure fair treatment to the several meat-importing countries, and to enable them to obtain supplies at a just price," and suggested that this was a matter for an International Economic Council to deal with. The Sub-Committee on Meat appointed under the Profiteering Act reported in 1920 that, in view of the probability of increased meat consumption upon the Continent, it was "desirable that the Governments of the countries concerned should discuss together the possibilities of making joint investigation into the world's situation with the object of taking such common action as may be required."

26. Nor have such proposals been confined to articles of food. In 1921, a Committee appointed under the Profiteering Act, unanimously reported that the only method of overcoming the difficulties in the way of securing adequate supplies of motor fuel at reasonable prices was "combined action amongst the consuming countries through the economic section of the League of Nations," coupled with the development of substitutes free from monopolistic control. Action which is not considered too drastic by representatives of the business world in regard to motor fuel can hardly be condemned on that ground in regard to the even more vital problem of our food supplies.

Governmental, or even international action when designed to control supplies *in the sole interests of producers*, has, in fact, proved a simple matter, as witness the restriction of rubber production carried out under the auspices of our own Colonial Office. Action of this character in regard to articles of food would, of course, never be tolerated by consumers; but the ease with which it is in fact carried out, indicates the possibility of international co-operation, applied to other ends, and conceived as much in the interests of consumers as of producers.

27. International action on a large scale was contemplated also in the financial resolutions adopted at the Genoa Conference in 1921, which outlined an International Monetary Convention, designed to stabilise the value of gold. In view of the probability of a general return to a gold standard, these resolutions are likely to have great practical importance in the immediate future. We refer to them not only to illustrate the possibility of international action, but also on their own merits; for should this country return to a gold standard, the co-ordinated action which they contemplate would become imperative to prevent dangerous fluctuations in the prices not merely of foodstuffs, but of all commodities.

28. As regards the internal activities of trusts and combines operating in this country, we believe that there should be immediate legislation of a general character compelling trusts and combines, both in the food and in other trades, to disclose all possible information regarding their scope, prices and profits. Such legislation should empower the Board of Trade to investigate and report upon the operations of trusts and combines, and provision should be made where the public interest demands it for Government action of the kind proposed in the Building Materials (Supplies and Charges) Bill, viz.; for the Government to commandeer supplies, and itself to carry on the necessary functions of production and distribution.

29. Further, to deal with the special problem of the food trades, a Food Consumers' Council should again be instituted to examine prices and profits throughout the food trades, and to report thereon to the Board of Trade. This Council would act in close co-operation with the Board of Trade in the exercise of the powers regarding trusts and combines outlined in the preceding paragraph.

30. The development of home supplies is primarily an agricultural problem. The public control of imports of wheat and meat should, however, make possible increased production of those articles in this country. The difficulty with which the farmer is faced is not only that of low prices, but also that of *uncertain* prices, and he tends to base his calculations not upon the average, but upon the lowest price that he expects to receive. The sale of imports at a stabilised price known in advance would steady the market and eliminate these difficulties. In addition, the Government could assist farmers to obtain better prices for their wheat crops, and so encourage home production, by providing increased credit facilities, and promoting agricultural education and research, and the improved organisation of the industry.

31. In the foregoing evidence we have had in mind principally the problem of wheat and meat prices, as we understand that the Commission is not dealing with other commodities at this stage. We are, however, prepared, should the Commission desire, to submit further evidence dealing in greater detail with other food-stuffs, including milk and vegetables, and also with certain matters affecting the food prices generally, such as the expansion of distributive in relation to strictly productive functions in the food producing industries.



*Communication from Mr. J. ROBERTS, Secretary of the New Zealand Alliance of Labour, dated May. 13th, 1925.*

" . . . In connection with Inter-Dominion Trade Relations, this is probably the most important question of all, for we find in New Zealand at the present time that most of the industries are not controlled locally but from London, and many of them are international corporations. The effect of this in New Zealand is very far-reaching, for whether the trading concern is directed from London or whether its directorate is international, we find that there is a tendency on the part of the directors to try to reduce the standard of living of the New Zealand wage-workers to that of the workers in the country in which the directors reside. This applies particularly to the shipping industry, and I have been called upon as Secretary of the Transport Workers to resist this proposal on many occasions in recent years.

In conclusion, I have to thank you for forwarding the memorandum submitted to the British Royal Commission on food prices. I may say that most of the matter contained in the Report is not new to us on this side of the world. We realise fully that the meat trust is international, and that in New Zealand, at least, the Government is powerless to deal with it. . . .

## VI.

### TEXT OF PROTOCOL FOR THE PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES.

Animated by the firm desire to ensure the maintenance of general peace and the security of nations whose existence, independence, or territories may be threatened;

Recognising the solidarity of the members of the international community;

Asserting that a war of aggression constitutes a violation of this solidarity and an international crime;

Desirous of facilitating the complete application of the system provided in the Covenant of the League of Nations for the pacific settlement of disputes between States and of ensuring the repression of international crimes; and

For the purpose of realising, as contemplated by Article 8 of the Covenant, the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations;

The undersigned, duly authorised to that effect, agree as follows:—

#### ARTICLE 1.

The signatory States undertake to make every effort in their power to secure the introduction into the Covenant of amendments on the lines of the provisions contained in the following articles

They agree that, as between themselves, these provisions shall be binding as from the coming into force of the present Protocol, and that, so far as they are concerned, the Assembly and the Council of the League of Nations shall thenceforth have power to exercise all the rights and perform all the duties conferred upon them by the Protocol.

#### ARTICLE 2.

The signatory States agree in no case to resort to war either with one another or against a State which, if the occasion arises, accepts all the obligations hereinafter set out, except in case of resistance to acts of aggression or when acting in agreement with the Council or the Assembly of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant and of the present Protocol.

#### ARTICLE 3.

The signatory States undertake to recognise as compulsory, *ipso facto*, and without special agreement, the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice in the cases covered by paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, but without prejudice to the right of any State, when acceding to the special Protocol provided for in the said article and opened for signature on December 16th, 1920, to make reservations compatible with the said clause.

Accession to this special Protocol, opened for signature on December 16th, 1920, must be given within the month following the coming into force of the present Protocol.

States which accede to the present Protocol, after its coming into force, must carry out the above obligations within the month following their accession

#### ARTICLE 4.

With a view to render more complete the provisions of paragraphs 4, 5, 6, and 7 of Article 15 of the Convention, the signatory States agree to comply with the following procedure:—

1. If the dispute submitted to the Council is not settled by it as provided in paragraph 3 of the said Article 15, the Council shall endeavour to persuade the parties to submit the dispute to judicial settlement or arbitration.

2. (a) If the parties cannot agree to do so, there shall, at the request of at least one of the parties, be constituted a Committee of Arbitrators. The Committee shall so far as possible be constituted by agreement between the parties.

(b) If within the period fixed by the Council the parties have failed to agree, in whole or in part, upon the number, the names and the powers of the arbitrators and upon the procedure, the Council shall settle the point remaining in suspense. It shall with the utmost possible dispatch select in consultation with the parties the arbitrators and their President from among persons who by their nationality, their personal character, and their experience appear to it to furnish the highest guarantees of competence and impartiality.

(c) After the claims of the parties have been formulated, the Committee of Arbitrators, on the request of any party, shall through the medium of the Council, request advisory opinion upon any points of law in dispute from the Permanent Court of International Justice, which in such case shall meet with the utmost possible dispatch

3. If none of the parties asks for arbitration, the Council shall again take the dispute under consideration. If the Council reaches a report which is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof, other than the representatives of any of the parties to the dispute, the signatory States agree to comply with the recommendations therein.

4. If the Council fails to reach a report which is concurred in by all its members, other than the representatives of any of the parties to the dispute, it shall submit the dispute to arbitration. It shall itself determine the composition, the powers, and the procedure of the Committee of Arbitrators, and, in the choice of the arbitrators, shall bear in mind the guarantees of competence and impartiality referred to in paragraph 2 (b) above.

5. In no case may a solution, upon which there has already been a unanimous recommendation of the Council accepted by one of the parties concerned, be again called in question.

6. The signatory States undertake that they will carry out in full good faith any judicial sentence or arbitral award that may be rendered and that they will comply, as provided in paragraph 3 above, with the solutions recommended by the Council. In the event of a State failing to carry out the above undertakings, the Council shall exert all its influence to secure compliance therewith. If it fails therein, it shall propose what steps should be taken to give effect thereto, in accordance with the provision contained at the end of Article 13 of the Covenant. Should a State in disregard of the above undertakings resort to war, the sanctions provided for by Article 16 of the Covenant, interpreted in the manner indicated in the present Protocol, shall immediately become applicable to it.

7. The provisions of the present article do not apply to the settlement of disputes which arise as the result of measures of war taken by one or more signatory States in agreement with the Council or the Assembly.

#### ARTICLE 5.

The provisions of paragraph 8 of Article 15 of the Covenant shall continue to apply in proceedings before the Council.

If in the course of an arbitration, such as is contemplated by Article 4 above, one of the parties claims that the dispute, or part thereof, arises out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the arbitrators shall on this point take the advice of the Permanent Court of International Justice through the medium of the Council. The opinion of the Court shall be binding upon the arbitrators, who, if the opinion is affirmative, shall confine themselves to so declaring in their award.

If the question is held by the Court or by the Council to be a matter solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the State, this decision shall not prevent consideration of the situation by the Council or by the Assembly under Article 11 of the Covenant.

#### ARTICLE 6.

If in accordance with paragraph 9 of Article 15 of the Covenant a dispute is referred to the Assembly, that body shall have for the settlement of the dispute all the powers conferred upon the Council as to endeavouring to reconcile the parties in the manner laid down in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of Article 15 of the Covenant and in paragraph 1 of Article 4 above.

Should the Assembly fail to achieve an amicable settlement:—

If one of the parties asks for arbitration, the Council shall proceed to constitute the Committee of Arbitrators in the manner provided in sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of paragraph 2 of Article 4 above.

If no party asks for arbitration, the Assembly shall again take the dispute under consideration and shall have in this connection the same powers as the Council. Recommendations embodied in a report of the Assembly, provided that it secures the measure of support stipulated at the end of paragraph 10 of Article 15 of the Covenant, shall have the same value and effect, as regards all matters dealt with in the present Protocol, as recommendations embodied in a report of the Council adopted as provided in paragraph 3 of Article 4 above.

If the necessary majority cannot be obtained, the dispute shall be submitted to arbitration and the Council shall determine the composition, the powers and the procedure of the Committee of Arbitrators as laid down in paragraph 4 of Article 4.

## ARTICLE 7.

In the event of a dispute arising between two or more signatory States these States agree that they will not, either before the dispute is submitted to proceedings for pacific settlement or during such proceedings, make any increase of their armaments or effectives which might modify the position established by the Conference for the reduction of armaments provided for by Article 17 of the present Protocol, nor will they take any measure of military, naval, air, industrial or economic mobilisation, nor, in general, any action of a nature likely to extend the dispute or render it more acute.

It shall be the duty of the Council, in accordance with the provisions of Article 11 of the Covenant, to take under consideration any complaint as to infraction of the above undertakings which is made to it by one or more of the States parties to the dispute. Should the Council be of opinion that the complaint requires investigation, it shall, if it deems it expedient, arrange for inquiries and investigations in one or more of the countries concerned. Such inquiries and investigations shall be carried out with the utmost possible despatch and the signatory States undertake to afford every facility for carrying them out.

The sole object of measures taken by the Council as above provided is to facilitate the pacific settlement of disputes, and they shall in no way prejudice the actual settlement.

If the result of such inquiries and investigations is to establish an infraction of the provisions of the first paragraph of the present Article, it shall be the duty of the Council to summon the State or States guilty of the infraction to put an end thereto. Should the State or States in question fail to comply with such summons the Council shall declare them to be guilty of a violation of the Covenant or of the present Protocol, and shall decide upon the measures to be taken with a view to end as soon as possible a situation of a nature to threaten the peace of the world.

For the purposes of the present Article decisions of the Council may be taken by a two-thirds majority.

## ARTICLE 8.

The signatory States undertake to abstain from any act which might constitute a threat of aggression against another State.

If one of the signatory States is of opinion that another State is making preparations for war it shall have the right to bring the matter to the notice of the Council.

The Council, if it ascertains that the facts are as alleged, shall proceed as provided in paragraphs 2, 4, and 5 of Article 7.

## ARTICLE 9.

The existence of demilitarised zones being calculated to prevent aggression and to facilitate a definite finding of the nature provided for in Article 10 below, the establishment of such zones between States mutually consenting thereto is recommended as a means of avoiding violations of the present Protocol.

The demilitarised zones already existing under the terms of certain treaties or conventions, or which may be established in future between States mutually consenting thereto, may, at the request and at the expense of one or more of the contiguous States, be placed under a temporary or permanent system of supervision to be organised by the Council.

## ARTICLE 10.

Every State which resorts to war in violation of the undertakings contained in the Covenant or in the present Protocol is an aggressor. Violation of the rules laid down for a demilitarised zone shall be held equivalent to resort to war.

In the event of hostilities having broken out, any State shall be presumed to be an aggressor, unless a decision of the Council, which must be taken unanimously, shall otherwise declare:

1. If it has refused to submit the dispute to the procedure of pacific settlement provided by Articles 13 and 15 of the Covenant as amplified by the present Protocol, or to comply with a judicial sentence or arbitral award, or with a unanimous recommendation of the Council, or has disregarded a unanimous report of the Council, a judicial sentence, or an arbitral award recognising that the dispute between it and the other belligerent State arises out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the latter State; nevertheless, in the last case the State shall only be presumed to be an aggressor if it has not previously submitted the question to the Council or the Assembly, in accordance with Article 11 of the Covenant.

2. If it has violated provisional measures enjoined by the Council for the period while the proceedings are in progress as contemplated by Article 7 of the present Protocol.

Apart from the cases dealt with in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the present Article, if the Council does not at once succeed in determining the aggressor, it shall be bound to enjoin upon the belligerents an armistice, and shall fix the terms, acting, if need be, by a two-thirds majority, and shall supervise its execution.

Any belligerent which has refused to accept the armistice or has violated its terms shall be deemed an aggressor

The Council shall call upon the signatory States to apply forthwith against the aggressor the sanctions provided by Article 11 of the present Protocol, and any signatory State thus called upon shall thereupon be entitled to exercise the rights of a belligerent.

#### ARTICLE 11.

As soon as the Council has called upon the signatory States to apply sanctions, as provided in the last paragraph of Article 10 of the present Protocol, the obligations of the said States, in regard to the sanctions of all kinds mentioned in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 16 of the Covenant will immediately become operative in order that such sanctions may forthwith be employed against the aggressor

Those obligations shall be interpreted as obliging each of the signatory States to co-operate loyally and effectively in support of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and in resistance to any act of aggression, in the degree which its geographical position and its particular situation as regards armaments allow

In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 16 of the Covenant the signatory States give a joint and several undertaking to come to the assistance of the State attacked or threatened, and to give each other mutual support by means of facilities and reciprocal exchanges as regards the provision of raw materials and supplies of every kind, openings of credits, transport and transit, and for this purpose to take all measures in their power to preserve the safety of communications by land and by sea of the attacked or threatened State.

If both parties to the dispute are aggressors within the meaning of Article 10, the economic and financial sanctions shall be applied to both of them.

#### ARTICLE 12.

In view of the complexity of the conditions in which the Council may be called upon to exercise the functions mentioned in Article 11 of the present Protocol concerning economic and financial sanctions, and in order to determine more exactly the guarantees afforded by the present Protocol to the signatory States, the Council shall forthwith invite the economic and financial organisations of the League of Nations to consider and report as to the nature of the steps to be taken to give effect to the financial and economic sanctions and measures of co-operation contemplated in Article 16 of the Covenant and in Article 11 of this Protocol.

When in possession of this information, the Council shall draw up through its competent organs,—

1. Plans of action for the application of the economic and financial sanctions against an aggressor State;

2. Plans of economic and financial co-operation between a State attacked and the different States assisting him;

and shall communicate these plans to the Members of the League and to the other signatory States.

#### ARTICLE 13.

In view of the contingent military, naval and air sanctions provided for by Article 16 of the Covenant and by Article 11 of the present Protocol, the Council shall be entitled to receive undertakings from States determining in advance the military, naval and air forces which they would be able to bring into action immediately to ensure the fulfilment of the obligations in regard to sanctions which result from the Covenant and the present Protocol.

Furthermore, as soon as the Council has called upon the signatory States to apply sanctions, as provided in the last paragraph of Article 10 above, the said States may, in accordance with any agreements which they may previously have concluded, bring to the assistance of a particular State, which is the victim of aggression, their military, naval and air forces.

The agreements mentioned in the preceding paragraph shall be registered and published by the Secretariat of the League of Nations. They shall remain open to all States Members of the League which may desire to accede thereto.

## ARTICLE 14.

The Council shall alone be competent to declare that the application of sanctions shall cease and normal conditions be re-established.

## ARTICLE 15.

In conformity with the spirit of the present Protocol, the signatory States agree that the whole cost of any military, naval, or air operations undertaken for the repression of an aggression under the terms of the Protocol, and reparation for all losses suffered by individuals, whether civilians or combatants, and for all material damage caused by the operations of both sides, shall be borne by the aggressor State up to the extreme limit of its capacity.

Nevertheless, in view of Article 10 of the Covenant, neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of the aggressor State shall in any case be affected as the result of the application of the sanctions mentioned in the present Protocol.

## ARTICLE 16.

The signatory States agree that in the event of a dispute between one or more of them and one or more States which have not signed the present Protocol and are not members of the League of Nations, such non-Member States shall be invited, on the conditions contemplated in Article 17 of the Covenant, to submit, for the purpose of a pacific settlement, to the obligations accepted by the States signatories of the present Protocol.

If the State so invited, having refused to accept the said conditions and obligations, resorts to war against a signatory State, the provisions of Article 16 of the Covenant, as defined by the present Protocol, shall be applicable against it.

## ARTICLE 17.

The signatory States undertake to participate in an International Conference for the Reduction of Armaments which shall be convened by the Council and shall meet at Geneva on Monday, June 15th, 1925. All other States, whether Members of the League or not, shall be invited to this Conference.

In preparation for the convening of the Conference, the Council shall draw up with due regard to the undertakings contained in Articles 11 and 13 of the present Protocol a general programme for the reduction and limitation of armaments, which shall be laid before the Conference and which shall be communicated to the Governments at the earliest possible date, and at the latest three months before the Conference meets.

If by May 1st, 1925, ratifications have not been deposited by at least a majority of the permanent Members of the Council and ten other Members of the League, the Secretary-General of the League shall immediately consult the Council as to whether he shall cancel the invitations or merely adjourn the Conference until a sufficient number of ratifications have been deposited.

## ARTICLE 18.

Wherever mention is made in Article 10, or in any other provision of the present Protocol, of a decision of the Council, this shall be understood in the sense of Article 15 of the Covenant, namely, that the votes of the representatives of the parties to the dispute shall not be counted when reckoning unanimity or the necessary majority.

## ARTICLE 19.

Except as expressly provided by its terms, the present Protocol shall not affect in any way the rights and obligations of Members of the League as determined by the Covenant.

## ARTICLE 20.

Any dispute as to the interpretation of the present Protocol shall be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

## ARTICLE 21.

The present Protocol, of which the French and English texts are both authentic, shall be *ratified*.

The deposit of ratifications shall be made at the Secretariat of the League of Nations as soon as possible.

States of which the seat of government is outside Europe will be entitled merely to inform the Secretariat of the League of Nations that their ratification has been given; in that case they must transmit the instrument of ratification as soon as possible.

So soon as the majority of the permanent Members of the Council and ten other Members of the League have deposited or have effected their ratifications a *procès-verbal* to that effect shall be drawn up by the Secretariat.

After the said *procès-verbal* has been drawn up the Protocol shall come into force as soon as the plan for the reduction of armaments has been adopted by the Conference provided for in Article 17.

If within such period after the adoption of the plan for the reduction of armaments as shall be fixed by the said Conference the plan has not been carried out, the Council shall make a declaration to that effect; this declaration shall render the present Protocol null and void.

The grounds on which the Council may declare that the plan drawn up by the International Conference for the Reduction of Armaments has not been carried out, and that in consequence the present Protocol has been rendered null and void, shall be laid down by the Conference itself.

A signatory State which, after the expiration of the period fixed by the Conference, fails to comply with the plan adopted by the Conference, shall not be admitted to benefit by the provisions of the present Protocol.

In faith whereof the undersigned, duly authorised for this purpose, have signed the present Protocol.

Done at Geneva, on the first day of October, nineteen hundred and twenty-four, in a single copy, which will be kept in the archives of the Secretariat of the League and registered by it on the date of its coming into force

# BRITISH COMMONWEALTH LABOUR CONFERENCE, 1925.

## DECISIONS.

### INDIA:

The delegates at this Conference having heard the views of the Indian delegates recommend their constituent bodies to support the demand of India for the immediate grant of self-government.

### INDIAN LABOUR IN SOUTH AFRICA.

The Conference is of opinion that no resolution on this subject should be passed at this Conference, but that the Secretary of the Conference should write to the Labour Parties and Trade Unions in South Africa and to the All-India Trades Union Congress informing them that the question of Indian Labour in South Africa has been discussed, and suggesting that the two Parties might arrange a special conference between representatives of Labour in India and South Africa. It is understood that if no agreement is reached at such a special conference the question will be raised for discussion at the next conference of Labour Parties and Trade Unions in the British Commonwealth.

## BRITISH COMMONWEALTH LABOUR CONFERENCE, 1927

Place : London.

Date : July or August, 1927.

### PRELIMINARY AGENDA.

1. Inter-Commonwealth Relations : Political.
2. Subject Peoples.
3. World Peace.
4. State Trading within the British Commonwealth
5. Migration.
6. Socialisation : Policies of Commonwealth Labour Movements and Results.

### INTER-COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS.

#### POLITICAL.

The Conference, desiring to obtain the views of the various Labour Movements on certain aspects of inter commonwealth political relations, including the position of States forming the British Commonwealth in relation to other States, decides to request each organisation to send fully considered statements on the following questions to the Secretary of the Conference for communication to the other organisations and discussion by the next British Commonwealth Labour Conference :—

1. How to reconcile the conception of equality of status between self governing States, being members of the Commonwealth, with the requirements of Great Britain in respect to a unified foreign policy and in respect to naval, military, and aerial armaments?

2. How to reconcile the idea of a unified Commonwealth with the desire of the constituent units to be free from the consequence of automatic belligerency if the Crown on behalf of any one State (e.g., Great Britain) becomes involved in war?

3. Are you in favour of securing the inviolability from occupation by any belligerent of the territory of a self-governing unit within the British Commonwealth, when Great Britain is at war and the Parliament of that State has declared that they are not involved in the war?



## SUBJECT PEOPLES

(including Mandated Territories, but excluding India).

The Conference, desiring to obtain the views of the various Labour Movements on the questions arising out of the presence of subject peoples in the British Empire, decides to request each organisation to send fully considered statements on the following questions to the Secretary of the Conference for communication to the other organisations and discussion by the next British Commonwealth Labour Conference

1. Whether these peoples should be granted self-government immediately?
2. If not, how to apply our principle of political self-determination to these peoples?
3. How to prevent their economic exploitation, including the safeguards necessary to protect natives in the ownership and use of their land and the measures to be adopted to prevent slave labour or forced and indentured labour?
4. How to secure their surplus products for the consumption and use of other nations, and maintain a satisfactory exchange of goods between them and the rest of the world?
5. Where different races inhabit the same country, how all sections can be secured in peaceful existence and on terms of equality, and how the Labour Movement can assist to that end?
6. How the education of these peoples may best be promoted?

The Conference, desiring to obtain the views of the various labour movements on the following questions, decides to request each organisation to send fully considered statements to the Secretary of the Conference for communication to the other organisations and discussion by the next British Commonwealth Labour Conference —

## WORLD PEACE.

What is the Policy of your organisation on the Maintenance of World Peace?

## STATE TRADING.

What is the attitude of your organisation towards the proposals of the British Labour Movement on State Trading within the Commonwealth?

## MIGRATION.

What is the policy of your organisation on Migration?

## SOCIALISATION.

1. Has the Labour Movement of your country definitely adopted the socialisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange as its objective?
2. If so, what relation has its immediate political and industrial policy to the objective?
3. What results have been achieved to date?

## DIRECTORY.

- AUSTRALIA** . . . . . *Australian Labour Party*: D. L. McNamara, Acting Secretary, Trades Hall, Melbourne, Victoria.  
*Trades Unions* E. J. Holloway, Sec., Trades Hall, Melbourne, Victoria.
- BRITISH GUIANA** . *British Guiana Labour Union*: H. Critchlow, Sec., 142, Regent Street, Lacytown, Georgetown, Demerara, British Guiana
- CANADA** ..... *Canadian Labour Party*. J. Simpson, Sec., Labor Temple, 167, Church Street, Toronto, Ont.  
*Independent Labour Party of Ontario*: H. S. H. Mitchell, Sec., 75, Newlands Avenue, Hamilton, Ont.  
*Independent Labour Party of Manitoba*: V B Anderson, Sec., 308, Inkster Boulevard, Winnipeg, Man  
*Trades and Labour Congress of Canada*: P. M. Draper, Sec., 172, McLaren Street, Ottawa, Ont.
- GREAT BRITAIN** ... *The Labour Party*: Right Hon. A. Henderson, M P., Sec., 33, Eccleston Square, London, S.W. 1.  
*Trades Union Congress*: F. Bramley, Sec., 32, Eccleston Square, London, S.W.1  
*Joint International Secretary of Trades Union Congress and Labour Party*: Wilham Gillies, 33, Eccleston Square, London, S.W. 1
- INDIA** .... *All-India Trades Union Congress*: F. J. Ginwala and N. M. Joshi, M L A, Secs., Esplanade Road, opposite National Bank of India, Fort, Bombay.
- IRELAND** . . . *Irish Labour Party and Trades Union Congress*: T. Johnson, T.D., Sec., 32, Lower Abbey Street, Dublin.  
*Northern Ireland Labour Party*: H. Midgley, Sec., 62, Upper Queen Street, Belfast.
- NEWFOUNDLAND** *Newfoundland Federation of Labour*: W. J. Delaney, Sec., Cabot House, Grand Falls, Newfoundland.
- NEW ZEALAND** . *The Labour Party*: W. Nash, Sec., Fletcher's Buildings, 4, Willis Street, Wellington.  
*New Zealand Alliance of Labour*: J. Roberts, Sec., 80, Manners Street, Wellington.
- PALESTINE** . . *Socialist Labour Party, "Ahduth Haavoda"*: P O.B. 102, Tell-Aviv, Palestine.  
*General Federation of Jewish Labour in Erez-Israel*: D. Ben-Gurion, Sec., P.O. B. 303, Tell-Aviv, Palestine.
- RHODESIA** ... *Rhodesian Labour Party*: W. Morsman, Sec., P.O. B. 327, Bulawayo.
- SOUTH AFRICA** .. *South African Labour Party*: A. Jameson, Sec., 303, Smith Street, Durban, Natal.  
*South African Association of Employees' Organisations*: N. H. Andrews, Sec., P.O.B. 5,592, Johannesburg.
- TRINIDAD** *Trinidad Working Men's Association*: Capt. A. A. Cipriani, President, 95, Charlotte Street, Port-of-Spain, Trinidad.

# INDEX.

	PAGE		PAGE
Adler, Di. F . . . . .	4	Davies, R. J. . . . .	5, 8, 25-27, 33
Anthrax . . . . .	26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33	D'Egville, Sir Howard . . . . .	119
Arlosoroff, Cham . . . . .	4, 44	Directory . . . . .	146
Australia:		Disarmament:	
Foreign Relations . . . . .	17	See International Relations	
Immigration . . . . .	17, 90, 94-98	Duffy, L. J. . . . .	4, 71
International Labour Office . . . . .	30	Electric Power: Canada . . . . .	55
Labour Movement. Political Programme . . . . .	17	Emigration	
		See Migration	
Bell, Mrs. Harrison . . . . .	5, 88, 90	Findlay, A. . . . .	5
Ben Gurion, D. . . . .	4, 8, 20, 38-42, 46, 103	Fraser, P. . . . .	131
Ben-Zevie, I. . . . .	4, 12	Gilhes, W. . . . .	5, 46, 78, 80, 85, 89, 93, 112, 117, 118, 119, 120
Boyd, W. . . . .	4	Great Britain:	
Bramley, F. . . . .	132	Emigration . . . . .	104, 107, 108
British Commonwealth:		See also Migration.	
Labour Conference. See Conference		Greenwood, A . . . . .	132
Political Relations . . . . .	10-20, 73, 144	Guest, Dr. L. Haden . . . . .	5, 91, 101, 118
Subject Peoples . . . . .	14, 22-24, 50, 69, 145	Haden Guest, Dr. L.:	
Trade . . . . .	See State Trading.	See Guest, Dr. L. Haden.	
British Guiana:		Harrison Bell, Mrs.	
Immigration . . . . .	109	See Bell, Mrs. Harrison.	
Labour Conditions . . . . .	82-85	Heagney, Miss M. . . . .	4, 9, 16-18, 30, 66, 72, 78, 80, 81, 84, 94-98, 112, 113, 118, 119
Brown, J. W. . . . .	4, 34	Heenan, P. . . . .	4, 102
Canada:		Henderson, A. . . . .	5, 8, 9, 35, 56-60, 63, 65, 68
Foreign Relations . . . . .	15	Hours of Labour:	
Immigration 86-89, 90, 105-107, 110 112		Washington Convention . . . . .	26
International Labour Office . . . . .	29	See also Night Baking.	
Carlin, Miss M. . . . .	5	Immigration:	
Cham Arlosoroff:		See Migration.	
See Arlosoroff, Cham.		India:	
Chairmen:		International Labour Office . . . . .	28
See also Names of Chairmen.		Labour Conditions . . . . .	14
Chaman Lall, D.:		Self-Government . . . . .	13-15, 17-20, 21, 39, 144
See Lall, D. Chaman.		Indians:	
Conference, 1925:		Australia . . . . .	47
Agenda . . . . .	8, 46	British Colonies . . . . .	47-54
Arrangements . . . . .	7, 8	British Guiana . . . . .	47, 83
Chairmen . . . . .	7	Canada . . . . .	47, 49
See also Names of Chairmen		Ceylon . . . . .	47, 49
Commission . . . . .	20, 21-24, 46	Emigration . . . . .	47, 110
Decisions . . . . .	144-145	Fiji . . . . .	47, 50
Delegates . . . . .	4, 93	Kenya . . . . .	47, 49
Parliamentary Labour Party,		Malaya . . . . .	47
Meeting with . . . . .	21	Mauritius . . . . .	47
Publicity . . . . .	8, 9	New Zealand . . . . .	47, 131
Report . . . . .	117	South Africa 15, 18, 47-49, 51-54, 70-73, 78-81, 144	
Standing Orders Committee . . . . .	8	Straits Settlement . . . . .	47
Votes of Thanks . . . . .	119	Trinidad . . . . .	47
Voting . . . . .	8	International Labour Legislation:	
Conference, 1927:		See International Labour Office.	
Agenda . . . . .	118, 119, 144	International Labour Office:	
Date . . . . .	117	See also Anthrax; Hours of Labour;	
Place . . . . .	117	Night Baking; White Lead; and	
Questionnaires . . . . .	144-145	Names of Countries.	
Cramp, C.T. . . . .	5, 7, 92-93, 101, 105, 107	Conventions . . . . .	25-36
Critchlow, H. . . . .	4, 8, 24, 82-85, 109, 117		

International Labour Legislation—continued

	PAGE		PAGE
Delegates—Crown Colonies, etc.	27, 33, 36	Labour Conditions . . . . .	40
International Relations:		Labour Laws . . . . .	39
Disarmament . . . . .	58	National Autonomy . . . . .	40-46
Protocol of Geneva . . . . .	56-68, 138-143	Persia:	
Revision of Treaties . . . . .	59, 65	Labour Laws . . . . .	27
Security Pact . . . . .	63	Protocol of Geneva:	
World Peace . . . . .	118, 145	See International Relations	
Ireland, Northern		Purcell, A. A. . . . .	5, 7, 8, 74-78, 80, 91
Constitution . . . . .	20	Queen, J. . . . .	4, 8, 23, 65, 67, 71, 73, 85, 89, 91, 103, 110, 112, 117
Irish Free State		Race Problems:	
Foreign Relations . . . . .	10, 13, 15, 16	See British Commonwealth—Subject Peoples; Indians; Names of Countries.	
Johnson, T. . . . .	4, 8, 9, 10-13, 20, 22, 35, 40, 41, 63, 66, 72	Roberts, J. . . . .	130, 137
Joshi, N. M. . . . .	4, 8, 9, 19, 22, 24, 27, 31, 41, 43, 47-51, 70, 71, 78, 80, 107, 109, 112, 113, 119	Sampson, H. W. . . . .	4, 7, 15, 20, 22, 23, 24, 31, 34, 36, 63, 69, 71, 72, 80, 81, 84, 98, 101, 117, 119
Jowett, F. W. . . . .	5, 30, 31	Secretary:	
Lall, D. Chaman . . . . .	4, 8, 9, 13, 15, 20, 23, 24, 34, 41, 53, 65, 69, 71, 72, 73, 81	See Gillies, W.	
Lansbury, G. . . . .	5, 8, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 41, 69, 70, 71, 73, 80, 101, 113-117	Simpson, J. . . . .	4, 7, 8, 15, 22, 29, 42, 46, 49, 52, 54-56, 64, 67, 71, 72, 73, 84, 89, 101, 105, 107, 118, 120
League of Nations—Mandated Territories		Smilie, R. . . . .	5, 45
See Mandated Territories		Snell, H. . . . .	5, 84, 107
Mandated Territories . . . . .	38-46, 69, 145	Socialisation . . . . .	145
See also Palestine		See also State Trading	
Maxton, J. . . . .	5, 46	South Africa:	
MacDonald, J. Ramsay . . . . .	5, 6, 21, 23, 60-62, 63, 65	Foreign Relations . . . . .	15
MacDonald, J. Canada) . . . . .	4, 9, 20, 22, 24, 36, 64, 67, 71, 73	Immigration . . . . .	89, 98-101
MacMullen, W. . . . .	4, 20, 80, 89, 108, 113, 118, 119, 129	Indians. See Indians—South Africa	
Migration . . . . .	38, 85-112	International Labour Office . . . . .	28, 32
See also Names of Countries		Labour . . . . .	21
International Federation of Trade Unions, Conference . . . . .	112	State Trading:	
Nash, W. . . . .	121, 122, 131	British Commonwealth . . . . .	113, 117, 145
New Zealand:		Food . . . . .	132, 137
Alliance of Labour . . . . .	130, 137	New Zealand . . . . .	137
Immigration . . . . .	122-130	Stewart, J. . . . .	5, 78, 84, 97, 101, 104
Labour and Social Conditions . . . . .	122-130	Subject Peoples:	
Labour Party . . . . .	122, 131	See British Commonwealth—Subject Peoples.	
Night Baking . . . . .	26, 27	Swales, A. B. . . . .	5, 36-38, 45, 46, 51, 54
Nosworthy, W. . . . .	131	Tillett, B. . . . .	5, 24, 28
Pact:		Trevelyan, C. P. . . . .	5
See International Relations.		Walker, R. B. . . . .	5, 88, 108, 112, 113
Palestine . . . . .	38-46	Wanless, W. . . . .	5, 51, 72, 89
Immigration . . . . .	39, 42, 44, 45	Wedgwood, J. C. . . . .	5, 18
		White Lead . . . . .	26
		Williams, R. . . . .	45
		Workmen's Compensation:	
		I.L.O. Convention . . . . .	27