

S E C O N D
R E P O R T

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

SUGAR AND COFFEE PLANTING;
(*Mauritius*)

TOGETHER WITH THE

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE,

AND APPENDIX.

Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
2 March 1848.

S E C O N D R E P O R T .

THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to inquire into the present Condition and Prospects of the Interests connected with, and dependent on, SUGAR and COFFEE PLANTING in Her Majesty's East and West Indian Possessions and the Mauritius, and to consider whether any and what Measures can be adopted by Parliament for their Relief, and who were empowered to Report the MINUTES of EVIDENCE taken before them, from time to time, to The House ;

HAVE made a farther Progress in the Inquiry referred to them.

2 March 1848.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Jovis, 24^o die Februarii, 1848.

Mr. Edward Chapman - - - - - p. 1

Sabbati, 26^o die Februarii, 1848.

Sir George Gerard de Hoche pied Larpent, Bart. - - - - p. 38

Mr. David Charles Guthrie - - - - - p. 51

Mr. Nathaniel Jones Kelsey - - - - - p. 69

Mr. George William Laing - - - - - p. 72

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Jovis, 24^o die Februarii, 1848.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Lord George Bentinck.
Sir Thomas Birch.
Mr. Milner Gibson.
Mr. Hope.
Mr. Labouchere.

Mr. Matheson.
Mr. Miles.
Mr. Moffatt.
Mr. Villiers.
Mr. Wilson.

LORD GEORGE BENTINCK, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Edward Chapman, called in ; and Examined.

3442. *Chairman.*] YOU are senior partner in the firm of Chapman & Barclay, in Port Louis, in the Mauritius?—I am. *Mr. E. Chapman.*

3443. You have been resident there from 1830 to Christmas 1846?—I have. 24 February 1848.

3444. Were you a member of the Legislative Council?—I was when I left the colony.

3445. Are you also co-proprietor and director of seven estates, producing 7,000 tons of sugar a year, and agent for 10 or 12 other estates?—That is correct with reference to the number of estates, but the quantity of sugar applied to those estates would be too much. Upon the seven estates of which I was co-proprietor when I left Mauritius there was a production of 3,500 to 4,000 tons annually; but my firm received upon consignment from various estates from 8,000 to 10,000 tons annually, in all.

3446. Are you to be understood that the difference between 3,500 tons and 8,000 to 10,000 tons was derived from the other 12 estates?—Yes; from the whole business of my house as connected with plantation agency.

3447. To what do you ascribe the fall in the price of sugar?—I ascribe the fall in the price of sugar chiefly to the introduction of about 45,000 tons of foreign sugar into the market for consumption. The sugar market was affected by the circumstance of the money market during the late season in London, but comparatively little so, inasmuch as the consumption of sugar, while that of almost all other articles has diminished, has increased to the extent of 25,000 tons during the year.

3448. And that is because the inundation of foreign slave-grown sugar has more than overtaken the increased demand of 25,000 tons?—Positively so.

3449. Do you refer to the last year?—I refer to the year 1847; from January to the end of December.

3450. Forty-eight thousand seven hundred tons is the amount, is not it?—It may be more. I am convinced I am not exceeding it when I say 45,000 tons.

3451. Is it your opinion that the present prices will be ruinous to the Mauritius?—I think, under the present system which prevails in the Mauritius, absolutely ruinous.

3452. What is your calculation that the present average cost of Mauritius sugar, free on board ship in Port Louis, is?—I believe that in a favourable season, and taking the present season to be reasonably favourable, the average cost of the production of the island, taking the estates generally, one with the other, is now about 18 *l.* a ton, exclusive of 2 *l.* a ton commercial charges, which includes 1 *l.* export duty, upon our sugar.

Mr. E. Chapman.

24 February 1848.

3453. Have you got any documents to prove that calculation?—I could not furnish to the Committee documents showing the result, but I have a great many calculations made for the guidance of myself and my own house; and my own experience, which is very considerable, leads me to know that on a number of estates of which I have been agent, amounting to 20 or 22 estates, such is about the result.

3454. Can you produce those returns to the Committee?—I can produce them; but I should be unwilling to do so, inasmuch as they are entirely prospective, and would hardly prove a guide.

3455. When were they prepared?—They were prepared upon my leaving the colony in September 1846, as a guide to my calculations in London, with reference to my own friends here.

3456. Have you got no returns of what the results have been in the past year?—I have not the actual documents with me showing the accounts, and the actual result of what the cost of the sugar upon those estates has been.

3457. Have not you got the outgoings on each estate, and the proceeds of the produce of that same estate?—No; the accounts of the colony which are furnished to us in London do not exhibit them in that form. In them are included the whole of the capital sums paid for the different estates, as well as the cultivation of the estates; and it is impossible, the accounts of one season running into another, to make the separation here.

3458. Do you make no analysis of the accounts of each estate in London, showing what the different items are, with a debtor and creditor account of the estate?—Yes, we do; that is to say, we make them in the colony; but on this side the interest is a different one. I am not directly interested in the London house; the consequence is I have not the immediate power of examining their accounts, but in the Mauritius I have an account of the cost of the production on the different properties, year after year; but I cannot state to the Committee what that result is.

3459. Have you no copies of those documents in London?—I have not.

3460. They are in the Mauritius?—They are. But I have a prospective statement of the crop for 1846–47, which is not brought to a close.

3461. Can you furnish with tolerable accuracy the results?—I can furnish pretty accurately what the result of the crop of 1846–47 is likely to prove in London.

3462. Cannot you furnish the results of the year antecedent to 1846–47?—I cannot give it to the Committee in detail; I have not got the figures, in fact, but only prospectively. I have prospective calculations made, not for any purposes of this Committee, but for our own exact guidance.

3463. That is the only estimate?—It is.

3464. Do not you know whether the estimate of 1846 was a correct estimate?—The accounts have not yet been closed.

3465. Have you no earlier estimate than 1846?—I have not. In answering the question, I am not only guided by the estimates I have with me, but I speak from a knowledge of the circumstances what the real cost of sugar has been upon our most favoured estates, and others.

3466. Will you be so good as to give to the Committee the estimate which you have?—This is the estimate upon 10 estates, of which the estimated expenditure for the year amounted to 108,600*l.* The estimated revenue, taking the average price of sugar in the London market at the highest standard, with a view merely to the calculation at 40*s.*, which it is not, was 109,600*l.*; that leaves a difference of about 1,000*l.*, at those prices, in favour of the cultivation account of the 10 estates. Those estates are calculated to produce, one with another, about 6,000 tons of sugar. This calculation shows no provision for interest whatever upon the capital invested; and it is to be remembered that the season was an exceedingly favourable one in point of crop. A year of drought or hurricane would reduce the crop 25 or 50 per cent., without materially affecting the expenditure in the case of drought; while in the case of hurricane, it would greatly increase it. In consequence of the great irregularity in the supply of labour, the estates are obliged to keep a larger number of men engaged upon them by contract than the calculation made at the time allows for; consequently the expense is increased, and these calculations, though made with great care, have never been realised or carried out.

3467. Why are you required to keep more men than is necessary?—That involves

involves the whole question of labour in the colony; the irregularity of the labour is so great that to get a certain number of days' work we are obliged to keep a larger number of labourers on the estate.

Mr. E. Chapman.

24 February 1848.

3468. Have you any memorandum of the number of days' work that you have lost?—I have a great many memoranda with respect to labour altogether; but I should wish to explain a little, in my own way, how this cost of production would work, otherwise I should be led into calculations for which I am not prepared. As far as I can judge, I have already stated that the cost to the planter on board ship is about 20 *l.* a ton; now the average price of Mauritius sugar on the 15th of February was 24 *s.* 9 *d.*, the short price; from which we have to deduct 8 *s.* charges.

3469. That is for freight, commission, and insurance?—Yes, and brokerage and so on; we are paying now 5 *l.* 10 *s.* freight.

3470. What is your average freight?—About 4 *l.* 10 *s.* is the average freight; but at the present time it is 5 *l.* 10 *s.*; that leaves net 16 *s.* 9 *d.* on the average price of Mauritius sugars; taking the sugar free on board, according to this calculation of 20 *l.*, there is a loss of 3 *s.* 3 *d.* per cwt., or 3 *l.* 5 *s.* per ton.

3471. What does that amount to upon the whole of the crop?—On a crop of 60,000 tons it shows a loss to the planters on the cultivation account, exclusive of interest on the capital, of 195,000 *l.* on the crop of 1847-48; supposing an estate producing 500 tons of sugar to represent a capital of 40,000 *l.*, which it does in the Mauritius in point of fact, the interest, at the moderate rate of six per cent., would represent a further charge to the planter of 4 *l.* 16 *s.* per ton, and consequently an additional loss on the year of 285,000 *l.*; making altogether a loss of 480,000 *l.* upon the whole crop, allowing interest at six per cent. That is how the crop of this year stands with the present rate in the London market; the sugar at this moment selling, according to the last average price, at 24 *s.* 9 *d.*

3472. That is upon 60,000 tons?—Yes, the crop which the island is estimated to produce this year.

3473. You estimate that the price of sugar has been depreciated by the competition of slave-grown sugar. To what extent?—I should say that if the fall in Mauritius sugar which has taken place be taken at 13 *l.* a ton, I should estimate that at least it has been depreciated by the legislative Acts of Government, since 1846, 10 *l.* a ton.

3474. It has actually fallen 13 *l.* a ton, you think?—It has, and more.

3475. You ascribe 10 *l.* of that fall to Acts of the Legislature?—I should say decidedly.

3476. And 3 *l.* to general causes?—My opinion is that sugar could not have failed to have risen in price; we have had a large demand. The deliveries have been very great. We were assisted by the laws as to using sugar in breweries, which took 10,000 tons of our produce nearly; and we had every reason to believe we should have had a better price, but the introduction of nearly 50,000 tons of foreign sugar has completely swamped our market.

3477. Has slave-labour sugar risen or fallen in the price?—It has not fallen in the same degree.

3478. Has it fallen at all?—I do not know what the price of slave-labour sugar was at the commencement of the year 1847.

3479. Is it your estimate that the crop of this year would have cleared 120,000 *l.* instead of losing 480,000 *l.*, but for the Act of 1846?—If that is the calculated difference, I have not a doubt of it in my mind.

3480. And that after allowing 3 *l.* depreciation for the general commercial distress?—Allowing 3 *l.* depreciation for the general commercial distress. Our crop having been brought to show so large an amount as 65,000 tons, and we having the full expectation of seeing a reimbursement, or at all events a return for our capital, to find our hopes so completely blighted is the greatest affliction that could possibly befall a commercial community.

3481. Will you give the Committee any statement you have to make respecting the labour to which you are restricted?—It appears to me that the whole question regarding the existence of Mauritius and all our sugar-producing colonies, in the present state of affairs, is that of labour. If we were placed on an equality with other countries, in a fair and positive manner, no doubt we should have little cause to complain; but the thing is to look at our position, and see how the Mauritius, which has been hitherto the great field of trial for free labour,

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE TAKEN BEFORE THE

Mr. E. Chapman. labour, is situated, and how it has come into its present extraordinary position of difficulty.

24 February 1848.

3482. What portion of the charges upon an estate consists of wages for labour? — The expenses of the labourers' wages altogether are from 50 per cent. to two-thirds.

3483. Does that include immigration taxes? — I have not separated the immigration taxes; I include the whole cost of the Indian labourer to me at a certain rate. I have an exact calculation of what Indian labour costs, which I can put before the Committee. This is a positive copy of the 'books of the estates in 1846, and a calculation is shown at the bottom carried out in sterling money per month and per year. Since that period 1*l.* sterling per man stamp tax on engagements of service has been established, and must be added in each case.

[The Witness read the Statement, as follows:]

FORBACK ESTATE: CROP 1846-47.

Monthly Expenses attendant upon 100 Indian Labourers.

Wages, at \$ 4 per man per month	- - - - -	\$	400	-	
Rice, 1 ½ lbs. per man per day, at \$ 2 50 per 100 lbs.			131	25	
Dholl, 4 lb. " month			12	-	
Massala, ½ lb. " "			6	-	
Salt fish, 4 lb. " "			24	-	
Ghee, 1 lb. " "			24	-	
Rations - Salt, 1 lb. " "			1	-	
Tobacco - - - - -			-	-	
Rum - - - - -			20	-	
Add 10 per cent. for wastage and loss by desertion, } hospital rations, &c. - - - - - }			21	82	7,080 84
		Per month	\$	640	7
Clothing - Dhooties - - - - -			-	-	120 -
Unbleached cloth - - - - -			-	-	25 -
Caps - - - - -			-	-	-
Blankets - - - - -			-	-	-
Handkerchiefs - - - - -			-	-	-
Trousers - - - - -			-	-	-
Shirts - - - - -			-	-	50 -
Medical attendance and medicine, per annum			-	-	175 -
Sirdars, 3, at \$12 each per month, with their food, clothing, &c. } say - - - - - }			36	-	432 -
		For 12 months	\$	8,482	84

Or \$706 90 per month, or \$7 6 per man; 28*s.* 3*d.* sterling per month; 16*l.* 19*s.* per annum, each man.
1*l.* -*s.* stamp tax since 1847.

£.17 19

QUEEN VICTORIA ESTATE: CROP 1846-47.

Monthly Expenses attendant upon 412 Indian Labourers.

Wages, at \$ 4 per man per month	- - - - -	\$	4	-	
Rice, 2 lb. per man per day, - at \$ 2 25 per 100 lbs.			1	35	
Dholl, 4 lb. " month, at 2 25 "			-	0	
Massala, 1 lb. " " 7 "			-	7	
Salt fish, 4 lb. " " 4 "			-	16	
Ghee, 4 lb. " " 20 "			-	80	
Rations - Salt, 1 lb. " " 2 "			-	2	
Tobacco, 1 lb. " " 8 "			-	8	
Rum - - - - -			-	-	
Add 10 per cent. for wastage and loss by desertion, } hospital rations, on \$ 2.57 - - - - - }			-	25 ½	

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SUGAR AND COFFEE PLANTING. 5

Mr. E. Chapman.

24. February 1847

Clothing	Unbleached cloth, 4 ells per man per annum, } \$ - 60		
	at \$ 15 per ell - - - - - }		
	Dhooties - - - - -		
	Caps, 1 each man per annum, at \$ - 12 - - 12		
	Blankets, 1 " " - - - - - 60 - - 60		
	Handkerchiefs, 1 " " - 12 - - 12		
		1 44	
	Trousers - - - - -		
	Shirts - - - - -	- 12	
Medical attendance and medicine, per annum, \$500 - - - - -		- 10 ½	
		\$ 7 5	84 60
Sirdars, 12, at \$ 8 each per month, with their food, clothing, &c. }		13 50	164 -
say 12 sirdars at \$ 13 50 per month - - - - - }			
	400 Labourers - - - - -		33,840 -
	12 Sirdars - - - - -		1,944 -
			\$ 35,784 -
Or \$ 7 25 per man per month; 29s. sterling per month,			
or 17l. 8s. per man per annum.			
1l. -s. stamp tax since 1847.			
<u>£. 18 8</u>			

WOODFORD ESTATE.

Monthly Expenses attendant upon 100 Indian Labourers.

Wages, at \$ 3 50 per man per month - - - - -	\$ 350 -	
Rice, 1 ½ lbs. per man per day, 175 lbs.; } \$ 131 25		
month, 5,250 lbs. at \$ 2 50 per 100 lbs. }		
Dholl, 4 lbs. per man per month, 400 lbs., } 12 -		
at \$ 3 per 100 lbs. - - - - - }		
Massala - - - - -		
Salt fish, 4 lbs. per man per month, 400 lbs., } 24 -		
at \$ 6 per 100 lbs. - - - - - }		
Rations - Ghee - - - - -		
Salt, 1 lb. per man per month, 100 lbs., } 1 -		
at \$ 1 per 100 lbs. - - - - - }		
	168 25	
Tobacco - - - - -		
Rum; bottles - - - - -		
Add 10 per cent. for wastage and loss by desertion, } 16 82		6,420 84
hospital rations, &c. on \$168 25 - - - - - }		
	535 7	
Clothing - Unbleached cloth, 3 ells per man per annum, at } 37 50		
300; per ell, at 12 ½ - - - - - }		
Dhooties - - - - -		
Caps, 1 per man, 100 at \$ 1 50 per dozen - - - - -		12 -
Blankets, 1 per man per annum, 100 at \$ - 50 - - - - -		50 -
Handkerchiefs - - - - -		
Trousers - - - - -		
Shirts - - - - -		
Medical attendance and medicine, per annum - - - - -		100 -
Sirdars, 4, at \$ 8 each per month, with their food, clothing, &c. }		576 -
say 4 sirdars, at \$ 12 per month - - - - - }	48 -	
		\$ 7,196 34
Cost for 12 months - - - - -		

Or \$ 599 69 for 1 month, or \$ 6 per man; 24s. per month,
14l. 8s. per man per annum.
1l. -s. stamp tax since 1847.

£. 15 8

Mr. E. Chapman.

24 February 1848.

3484. Have you any note of the days of labour which have been lost upon the Queen Victoria estate?—I have not a correct calculation, but I am sure that in giving a statement of 10 per cent., which upon 400 men is an average of about 1,200 days' work a month absolutely lost to the property, I am speaking very much within compass.

3485. That is 14,400 days' labour a year?—Yes.

3486. Do you ascribe that to the want of longer contracts and severer vagrant laws?—I ascribe it entirely to the action of the laws under which the labourer now lives as regards our stipendiary magistrates and the Orders in Council which regulate labour. I have now shown the cost of labour on that paper; there are three grades of labour as taken from the estates which I had under my management; I have given the cheapest and the highest, and the Committee will see the rate varies only about 1 s. 6 d. a week from the highest to the lowest; and that is chiefly obtained by reduction in the rations. It depends in some instances upon the estate being nearer Port Louis. An estate within 10 miles of Port Louis will get the men 1 s. cheaper; if you go 20 miles away the men make severer bargains.

3487. Why is that?—The great pleasure they have in being near town, where they meet for the purposes of public pleasure and excitement, and being nearer the markets of Port Louis; they all cling to the vicinity of the town.

3488. Is there not a greater waste of labour from desertion and non-attendance nearer the town than farther away?—I should say it is limited to particular days, especially Saturday is the day when, if you are near the town, you cannot keep your men; they will go away. I am not prepared to state that there is a great deal of difference; I do not think Indians mind walking the distance; they absent themselves as much from one estate as another. One of the chief reasons of absenteeism is the short engagements they have now; they contract engagements under a great number of masters during a few years in different parts of the island; they form connexion with women and so on in different places, and they absent themselves from the estate and visit their former relations a week or a fortnight at a time. And then there is another description of absenteeism, which is for a day. If a man goes out for a day he is absent 24 hours perhaps; after a night's debauch he will go and hide himself in the canes, and go to sleep all day. We make a difference between what we call "grande absence" and "petite absence."

3489. Is there any penalty for a day's absence?—It is to be obtained by going before a magistrate, who will stop the man's pay, and require him to work two days for one day's absence; but considering that the man is only engaged for one year, I am at a loss to know how you are to get the man to work two days for one without keeping him beyond the year, a penalty never yet exacted; and not only that, but we cannot get him convicted without going to the stipendiary magistrate's office, perhaps five miles off, and taking many of the band to which the man belonged as witnesses.

3490. What is the expense of labour and time occupied in carrying a labourer before a stipendiary magistrate?—To get a man convicted for an act of violence or misconduct, it could not be done under a very considerable loss: you would have five or ten men to take as evidence: the manager himself must go and leave the estate; it would take up the whole day, thus losing the work of the men taken as witnesses, to say nothing of his own most valuable time being lost, and the next in authority to himself perhaps also, all for the purpose of getting anything like reasonable redress for some fault or misdemeanor requiring correction.

3491. In consequence of all this expense and loss of time in obtaining justice you never attempt it, probably?—It is scarcely ever attempted, unless for some great offence; it is out of the question.

3492. In point of fact the labourer, under the existing laws, is the master of the planter?—He is *bonâ fide*; he is completely free from anything like positive control, notwithstanding his contract. His contract is of the most formal description, but nevertheless it does not bind him.

3493. You were understood to say that all that the magistrate would do was to make the Coolie forfeit one day's wages, that is, the day he did not work?—Yes; and he would order him to work two days of the week, which is absurd. We cannot get a common day's work out of him; how are we to get two days more?

3494. The

3494. The magistrate cannot make seven days' labour out of six working days?—No; but if we were to reverse the question, and the Coolie were to go and complain of a master that he had given him a box on the ear, that would be a very different story; the result would in all probability be the breaking of the engagement with the man, and a heavy pecuniary fine, amounting to more or less, according to the temper or humour of the magistrate at the time.

3495. What is the heaviest fine you ever knew exacted under such circumstances?—I have known a fine of 10 *l.* to have been inflicted upon a planter, of which half was given to the Indian in his presence. I have not only heard of that fact, but of the Indian having gone to the master, and offered him his cheek, and said, "I should be obliged to you if you will give me another box on the ear on the same terms." Those are occurrences with us that happen every day in principle, though on a small scale.

3496. A day's labour amounts to something less than 6 *d.*, does not it?—A day's labour amounts to about 6 *d.*; that 6 *d.* a day is exclusive of lodging.

3497. The utmost fine exacted against a labourer for the loss of a day's work is 6 *d.*?—There would be a simple authority given to the master to deduct it from his pay at the end of the week, or he might tell him to deduct two days' pay; it would depend upon circumstances.

3498. And it would cost the master 2 *l.* or 3 *l.*, perhaps, to get redress?—Very likely more than that; at all events it would be worth a great deal more than that. There are different grades of punishment for more serious offences; sometimes we have our men condemned to break stones for several days, but that is, generally speaking, for offences of a serious nature, but not for anything like neglect in work.

3499. That is considered a very severe punishment, is not it?—It is the most severe punishment to which they are liable.

3500. How long are they condemned to that?—From a week to a fortnight is the extreme I have known men condemned to.

3501. For what sort of offence would they be condemned to a week's stone-breaking?—For such an offence, for instance, as a man threatening his overseer with his tool; a man threatening personal violence to anybody placed over him.

3502. What would be the penalty to the master if he threatened violence to the labourer?—I have not the Order in Council before me, but the power is very great indeed; when I say 10 *l.*, I believe the fine may go very much further than that, even to five times the amount, at the option of the magistrate. I consider that the whole, or the principal question between ourselves and slave-countries is that of labour; it is the main point upon which we stand in our present state of ruin. The Mauritius has been the only place where free labour has been tried; there have been an immense number of people imported into the Mauritius, and it has proved a failure. It was tried in the first instance upon a sound and excellent basis; we had men brought from Calcutta and Madras, that answered every purpose and gave us every prospect of prosperity, and we were then under laws that worked to the satisfaction of all parties.

3503. Was that from 1834 to 1838?—Yes, till the promulgation of the Order in Council of 1838.

3504. Up to that time the contracts were of five years' duration, and that worked remarkably well?—So far as the labourers were concerned, it worked particularly well; we had no reason to complain; there was a great deal to bear with on the part of the planter; the men had to be taught everything, but towards the approach of the second and third year they became efficient men, and the colony was just getting into a prosperous and healthy state when the Order in Council of 1838 was promulgated.

3505. What was the Order in Council of 1838?—It was a special law attended with the appointment of a stipendiary magistracy, with a view to the protection of Indian labourers throughout the island.

3506. The stipendiary magistrate, originally appointed in 1834 for the protection of negro apprentices, had his power extended to the protection of Coolie labourers?—And others appointed, but under an entirely new law; the protection given to the black was changed by an Order in Council in September 1838.

3507. And that, you say, was entirely subversive of all discipline between the master planter and the Coolie labourer?—The history of the present difficulties of Mauritius lies in this fact, that the planters, up to that time, from 1834 to 1838,

Mr. E. Chapman. had at very great expense introduced a large amount of labourers. I believe about 250,000 *l.* had been laid out, exclusively by private individuals, solely for immigration. Matters were going on satisfactorily, and a good return was then secured to the different parties concerned in the trade.

24 February 1848.

3508. Up to 1838, notwithstanding the high cost of these Coolies, the planters of the Mauritius, as a body, were well satisfied?—Yes.

3509. And getting good profits?—The return was satisfactory to all parties concerned at the time. There was great confidence prevailing as regarded the affairs and prospects of the colony.

3510. In 1839 the immigration was stopped?—Yes; and the apprenticeship was cut off. That was just as prosperity dawned upon the colonists, leaving the planter with a large amount of figures to his debit, the result of his late efforts; for there had been great efforts made to bring the colony into a state of healthy cultivation, the capital employed in which by the planter had not been paid off, and subsequent circumstances have prevented its being so.

3511. Was the effect of that measure to reduce the production of sugar from 35,000 tons to 25,000 tons, between 1838 and 1843?—The production in 1843 was 25,000 tons; in 1838 it was 37,500 tons.

3512. That reduction in the produce was entirely owing to the loss of the apprenticeship, coupled simultaneously with the interference of the stipendiary magistrates?—The stoppage of immigration being the second blow we received, the effect of which acts of the Legislature was to double the cost of production in the colony. Such excessive wages were exacted by the labourers, that it raised the cost of production to another figure altogether.

3513. Upon the abolition of apprenticeship and the stoppage of immigration, did the wages of the labourers rise from 10 *s.* to 40 *s.* a month?—In the latter part. It was not only so much the rise of wages, which was very rapid, but the exaction of rations; the men exacted rations, not only to keep themselves and their families, but to feed their stock.

3514. The additional charge of 30 *s.* a month would not at all represent the real cost, to the planters, of that alteration in the policy of the Colonial Office?—No, for including the amount of rations, the charge was more than doubled; the increase was enormous.

3515. The cultivation, which had previously been annually extending, was very much retarded, and the estates became very short-handed?—The rate of production became nearly doubled at that time from the advance in the wages and the excessive rations exacted by the labourers.

3516. During that period, from 1838 to 1843, do the Committee understand that the colony, generally speaking, was in a falling and ruinous condition?—It was so far falling from 1840 to 1843 that scarcely any new canes could be got into the ground. We had a considerable spread of canes planted under the new system, and it was as much as we could do to keep those canes cleaned so as to cultivate them to exhaustion; that is to say, we cut them as long as we could; we could not plant. The colony had a fresh start to make from 1843, and it was a question with other houses, and I may say for myself, that a member of the London firm for which I acted came out to Mauritius for the purpose of visiting the properties, to see whether or not they were to be resuscitated. Government having consented to immigration under one year's engagement, it became a question whether we were to go on and renew the struggle.

3517. In 1843, when the new instructions came out from Government enabling you again to import free labourers, the spirits of the planters revived, you invested new capital in the island, and again very much increased the cultivation and production?—I may say that when immigration was renewed an entire restoration of the estates was necessary, at an enormous outlay, calling for the last resources of those interested in them. Nevertheless the sacrifice was made, confiding in the privilege of the British markets and an abundant supply of labour, which we hoped to see fairly placed at our disposal. The estates were replanted on a large scale and upon an improved system, so as to represent by increased production the large amount of capital which had been expended upon them. It was not a speculative increase; we were compelled to make every possible exertion, with a view to cheaper production on a large scale.

3518. Can you give any estimate of the amount of new British capital invested at the Mauritius from 1834 to 1838, and again in 1843, 1844, and 1845?—

I look

I look upon the years from 1834 to 1837 as having been years of very considerable outlay. The crop of 1837-38 was a very satisfactory crop to Mauritius. We were going on satisfactorily at the time; but when the apprenticeship was done away with, and the immigration stopped, the position of the colony became so doubtful and threatening, as to check further investment of capital at that time. We were working with every prudence at the time; and were getting in as much as we could and spending as little as possible, under a system of labour which we knew could not allow us to cultivate with any prospect of success, wages having risen so high. In the years 1843, 1844, and 1845, the amount expended in the Mauritius has been enormous. Judging by our own affairs, I should say that the increased investment of capital since 1843 cannot be less than half a million sterling.

Mr. E. Chapman.

24 February 1848.

3519. That was the increased outlay between 1842 and 1845?—Yes.

3520. When you did get this new permission to import labourers you were restricted to yearly contracts, and, in point of fact, by the inconvenience and mischief of those short contracts your hands were tied from the free use of the labourers you did get?—Your Lordship does not even qualify it in a sufficient way. The labour system has been a complete disappointment to us. We have been completely ruined by the plan pursued by the Government in the introduction of free labourers into the colony. The temptation to us to keep on our estates under the labour system has been the chief cause of our difficulties; our labour has been rendered so defective in every essential point.

3521. In what way has it been so defective?—In the first place, it has been exceedingly costly, so costly as to enable a labourer to save the whole of his money-wages. He has been placed in a position to save the whole sum of money he has received, to the extent of 16% a year, for he has been provided with everything, and has had the power of keeping stock and animals with his excess of rations. The consequence is that he has been an enormous gainer, while we have been suffering exceedingly. Another point is the excessive irregularity of the labour. Notwithstanding the number of men introduced into the island, and the number of men there are there now, nothing can be so irregular and uncertain as procuring labour in Mauritius. If you have an estate requiring 300 men, and 100 or 200 men leave you next week, you may be full a month or six weeks before you can replace them. That is the state of affairs at the present moment, to say nothing of the irregularity of the work; their labour is in no way continuous. A man under an engagement will walk away from the estate before his master, telling him, "Cut me a day's work." Frequently bands of 50 at a time leave in a morning without saying a single word to the master, leaving him probably with his canes before his mill, without any means of redress or prevention. Another most important thing is to see, that in the absence of any coercive laws, there is no inducement whatever, and no money will prevail upon the Indian to do anything like the quantity of labour obtained from a person under slavery. It is not to be expected that a free man would do what a slave is obliged to do. It is absurd to suppose that under any circumstances any free man will undergo anything like the continuous labour that is obtained in slave countries.

3522. Since 1843, which was the period of short contracts, has the character of the industry of the people become changed entirely?—I think, since the change of contracts, the loss to the planter of the labour of the Indian is more than 50 per cent.; it has decreased in effect fully 50 per cent.

3523. From idleness, demoralization, and vagabondage?—From an assumed independence; from a total change of character. The man is no longer a labourer, in fact; when he chooses to work he will; when he does not, he will idle about the country:

3524. It is since 1843 that this system of desertion has become so intolerable?—It began before 1843, when immigration had stopped, and the men became so scarce. As soon as those men got the high wages they did they became unmanageable; it was the result of the men possessing too much money. Towards the latter end of 1840 and 1841, and so on, our labourers became in the receipt of such large sums of money they were no longer available to us.

3525. The five years' contracts had run out by that time?—They had; we were renewing contracts then under the new system.

Mr. E. Chapman.

24 February 1848.

3526. Did vagabondage and demoralization increase?—It requires to be understood what vagabondage in those colonies means. Our law there constitutes a vagabond only a man who asks alms, who goes about the streets with his person exposed; but it in no way reaches the thousands of men who are living upon the Government lands as squatters. Those men contribute in no way to the colony, and by such permitted squatting thousands of persons are enabled to abstract themselves from any labour or useful employment to the public. That is the state of Mauritius at this moment.

3527. They become squatters?—A squatter is supposed to be a person who gets into a wild country, and by industry lives in his own way; but these people have no overt industry. It is so little understood how they live, that none of us can account for the thousands of people who are inhabiting the environs of Port Louis, on the Government lands: we do not know where they can find the means of existence; so little overt means is there of judging how they live.

3528. Are the Committee to understand that nothing of this sort could take place so long as the men were bound under a five years' contract?—The men were settled then; a man engaged to work for five years, and there was a mutual interest between master and man. The man's family became located on the estate; he had his garden and his stock about him, and he became a parochial resident; his whole character is now changed from what it was under that system.

3529. Does this idleness, demoralization, and vagabondage among the Coolies date from the period of the short contracts?—Most decidedly; it has greatly increased under them.

3530. Has the island ever made any efforts to have stringent vagrant laws enacted?—The Legislative Council have been occupied on more than one occasion with the endeavour, not to make what would be called, by parties seeking to protect the negro or the coloured man, a stringent law, but to make laws so reasonably binding upon the man with respect to his conduct, as to induce him to become settled, and to give the master sufficient power to keep him within bounds to a certain extent.

3531. Have those laws been sent home to successive colonial offices here, and invariably rejected?—I can only answer for one. I can answer for one law passed by the Legislative Council, in 1842. One of the principal features was the repression of vagabondage; and these daily absences rendering it compulsory that any man under engagement should not leave his master's estate without a ticket of leave, that he should be obliged on passing the police station to be asked, "Have you your ticket of leave?" That, however, was disallowed, and our men are now enabled to leave their employ. They walk away in bands of 25 or 50, and no man has any right to stop them. It is civil redress you have against the men, and nothing more.

3532. Have you no vagrant laws, such as exist in this country?—No. The vagrant law might be the same, but we have not the same circumstances; there are no beggars. There is not such a thing as a man asking alms in the whole colony of Mauritius.

3533. Is it your opinion, that if the vagrant law which has passed the Legislative Council, to which you have referred, had been allowed by the Colonial-office, instead of being disallowed, it would have gone a great way to cure the idleness, demoralization, and vagabondage you complain of?—I do not think we should succeed at all under those short periods of service with large bands of men. Where there are bands of 400 or 500 men upon an estate, and those changes are going on in that rapid ratio, that every week 25 or 50 men are leaving, and 25 or 50 are coming, we should never get any satisfactory result.

3534. You think there is no cure for this spirit of idleness and desertion but a five-years' contract?—I should say a prolonged engagement of service. But I would particularly call the attention of the Committee to the futility of anything like a statement of the comparative money-cost between free labourers and slaves. Nothing is easier than to make the comparative money-cost of the one and the other, and it may be so worded as to bring the one close upon the other; if you take in the interest on capital, and the mortality, and so on. But we are working at present for our existence; we are not thinking of our invested capital, we are looking for our daily current expenses from month to month. Consequently the question is, what we are compelled to pay and what slave countries are compelled to pay monthly, each of us having sunk our capital to a certain extent. But supposing them

them even to be the same, and that the interest and mortality, and so on, comes up to the figure that our monthly cash outlay comes to, the quantity and the quality of the labour given by a slave defies all comparison with our free labourers. There is no comparison to be established.

Mr. E. Chapman.

24 February 1848.

3535. Are you of opinion that if you were not restricted in the market where you obtain your labour, you might obtain an ample supply of free and excellent labour from Madagascar?—I think we should get a very efficient set of labourers (they are a most efficient people), if our Government were to go earnestly to work with the government of Madagascar. Hitherto the government of Madagascar has been opposed to it, which I consider has always been for the want of some reasonable and proper indemnity given to them in a proper way. If there were an export tax granted to the Queen of Madagascar, or a yearly indemnity of some sort given to them, I have no doubt we should get labourers in abundance.

3536. Is the Mauritius placed under great disadvantages by the bad relations now existing between it and Madagascar?—Very much so; so much so that we are very nearly deprived of the necessaries of life.

3537. The Mauritius is entirely dependent for its supplies of cattle and meat upon Madagascar?—For live stock generally.

3538. What is the difference in the price of cattle, and the difference in the price of meat arising out of the quarrel between Great Britain and Madagascar?—We have had no cattle introduced since our communication has been cut off from Madagascar; we have been driven to fetch bullocks from South Australia and the Cape of Good Hope, so that the price has been raised from the Government contract of 4*d.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* a pound; the gentry of the place latterly have not had beef upon their tables at all.

3539. Neither sheep nor cattle will live there?—They will not bear exposure to the sun there, except our colonial cattle.

3540. Are there any goats?—No, they all die.

3541. Were not you in the habit of paying for the cattle, and paying for the rice, and paying for the meat, that you obtained from Madagascar with British manufactures imported into the Mauritius?—Imported through the Mauritius, and which were re-exported to Madagascar.

3542. In payment for cattle, and rice, and meat?—In a very large proportion; the proportion would be about two-thirds; the remainder would be in Spanish dollars.

3543. With respect to the taxes in the colony you have great reason, have not you, to complain of the taxes in the Mauritius; there is first a registration fee on the transfer of property equal to 3*l.* 10*s.* per cent. on the value of the property transferred?—It is three per cent.

3544. That amounts to 34,000*l.* a-year, does not it?—The Government have received 34,000*l.* a year only from that tax. But if the tax had not completely set aside its own intended result, from its enormity, it probably would have been double the amount. I suppose not one-third of the deeds which ought to be registered in the Mauritius are registered on account of the enormity of that tax; it is avoided from necessity.

3545. Is it necessary in registration that you should incur a further notarial expense?—That is an expense attached to the deed; there is the further charge of one per cent. by the notary who prepares the deed, but the Government charge is three per cent.; two per cent. for registration, and one per cent. for transcription.

3546. That transcription is necessary, is it?—It is necessary in order to constitute a clear possession. The registration of a contract between me and another party is simply a fact giving effect to the agreement between us; but if I wished to have the property in my own possession, free from his liabilities, I must transcribe it into my own name.

3547. There is a charge upon the island of 16,000*l.* a year for the colonial allowance to the troops?—From 15,000*l.* to 16,000*l.*

3548. And also the further charge of 5,000*l.* a year for keeping up the garrisons of the island?—Yes.

3549. Is not there also an additional charge for the maintenance of the garrison or fortification of Seychelles?—There is; I do not know what amount, but the whole charge of the Seychelles falls upon the Mauritius.

Mr. E. Chapman.

24 February 1848.

3550. That amounts to 4,000 *l.* or 5,000 *l.* more?—Something of that kind.

3551. Is the whole cost of the government of the Mauritius for 1846, 238,000 *l.*, exclusive of the 1 *l.* a ton export tax?—The 1 *l.* export tax has nothing to do with the expenditure for immigration; it forms part of the general revenue. The expenses of the colony, exclusive of the immigration, have been 238,000 *l.*; but there has been no special application made of the 1 *l.* export tax to the immigration. It has been argued that this tax could not be taken off, because we have the expenditure for immigration, but it is lumped still in the general revenues of the country. The immigration is only an argument for its being kept up.

3552. What is the entire revenue of the island?—Within the last year it has been 350,000 *l.* including the tax on immigration.

3553. That would be nearly 6 *l.* a ton upon the production of sugar?—We produce 65,000 tons of sugar a year.

3554. Do you consider the present machine of government too cumbrous and expensive?—By one-half, I should say; it is altogether too powerful a machine; it is a government calculated to rule a continent, rather than an island such as ours is.

3555. You think that for about 150,000 *l.* the colony could be as well governed as it is now?—I have had myself information from a gentleman with whom I have been in the habit of working, in the Council of the Mauritius, in the Finance Committee of the Council, and he states that this year he sees his way clear for surrendering 25,000 *l.* of our taxation; and he thinks that if immigration were better managed, 25,000 *l.* might be economised, making at once a reduction of 50,000 *l.* a year upon our general taxation.

3556. Do you know what the expense of maintaining the police is?—I think the expense of the police is about 30,000 *l.* a year.

3557. The Committee have heard that the island of Mauritius is 60 miles long?—It is about 60 miles long by 30 in width.

3558. This police is pretty nearly as inefficient as any police can be, is not it?—It is inefficient, not only from the materials of which it is composed, but the legal power does not exist of interfering with the labouring classes, unless it be for felonies, larcenies, &c.

3559. Is it your opinion that if you had a British police organized upon the footing of the metropolitan police, half 30,000 *l.* would suffice for a far more efficient police than now exists?—No doubt the expense might be reduced; but the expense is comparatively less important than the absolute impossibility of the island going on under its present system of police, divided as it now is between the police force properly so called and the stipendiary magistracy, the latter rendering the former nugatory; it forms the only point which renders our labour absolutely inefficient.

3560. The power of squatting is one of the reasons that renders your labour inefficient, is not it?—We owe that exclusively to the Government, and they have done it with their eyes open; they have seen those people squatting there, paying no tax and no rent; a man who can live upon a bag of rice during a month, earned by lurking about the streets seeking casual jobs, will not work.

3561. The colonial government is virtually despotic in the island, is not it?—Practically quite so.

3562. Therefore it rests entirely with the Colonial-office to reform all those bad laws which you speak of?—We must have stringent measures, with a view to enable us to continue to produce sugar; we want a complete local reform, to give to the colony that energetic and natural power within itself which has been completely paralyzed by the experiment which has been tried by the Government. Government have tried an experiment in the Mauritius with respect to this free-labour system, and it has failed within the last few years most completely; there never was such a cruel failure as this has been allowed to be.

3563. The waste lands of the colony are Crown lands, are they not?—The Crown lands are particularly a belt round the coast, which are reserved for the purposes of fortification, and in the proximity of the town; there are other lands in the interior which are comparatively of little value.

3564. Where is it that those Coolies squat?—Chiefly in the immediate proximity of Port Louis and upon the borders of the sea, where they live by fishing.

3565. In

3565. In the very localities reserved by Government for the purposes of fortification?—Yes, for the defence of the colony.

Mr. E. Chapman.

3566. And in localities probably which would be by their position valuable?—They are extremely valuable; some of them form the most valuable possessions that we have.

24 February 1848.

3567. Their value, instead of being turned to gain, is turned to loss and to the injury of the colony, by permitting those vagabonds to squat there?—Yes.

3568. And you think that nothing would be so simple as for the Government to reach them and drive them off, if they thought fit?—Nothing could be so easy; one proclamation in the Gazette would drive many thousands to labour; a proclamation inflicting upon those people either a sufficient tax for their dwellings, or any means whereby they could be made responsible to Government, or for non-employment, would bring many thousands into service.

3569. If these people could be brought back to industry the colony would not be starving for the want of cheap labour?—If we had had those sort of regulations made with a just view to the order that should prevail among those people, the colony would never have been in its present position.

3570. Supposing they were to be driven from the localities in which they are now squatted, would not they take refuge in the mountains?—That would be private property, and we should not allow it; the land there is private property. If Government prevented, which it has the power of doing, those people from squatting upon their grounds, they would be obliged to labour.

3571. In fact the colonial government is entirely responsible for all this mismanagement and misgovernment of the island?—The orders emanate from home, I imagine.

3572. In short, it may be presumed, may it not, that the misgovernment of successive administrations in the Colonial Office in Downing-street has proved the curse of the Mauritius?—I do not like to make use of so strong a word.

3573. It is too true?—It is true.

3574. Mr. M. Gibson.] You mentioned the importance of settling these Coolies upon the estates with their families; in importing men without women, is it probable that such a settlement of families can be effected?—No, I do not think it is; but we have known large numbers of women introduced with the men.

3575. The first importation of Coolies consisted of the very large number of 24,000 men, and only about 500 women?—There were a number of women also imported; a number of vessels came down with women alone.

3576. Were there not very few women as compared with the whole number of men?—They were comparatively few.

3577. Was not that likely to throw very great difficulty in the way of effecting those settlements of families upon the estates which you so desire?—I think it was, but I think at that time there was a great change going on in the quondam apprentice population; there were a great many women who attached themselves to the labourers at that time, and had we had families it would have been a great improvement upon a system that was in itself working well. I myself sent orders to India for the dispatch of several vessels, laden alone with women, for the different estates to which they were destined, and they came down.

3578. You have said a great deal about vagabondism; is it the habit of the planter, in all cases, to pay the wages of the labourers in cash regularly?—As a positive rule, it is. I do not think there is an instance on record, in the Mauritius, where a labourer has lost one single rupee by the wages not being paid upon the estates; there are cases from unforeseen circumstances and from misfortunes in which the wages have fallen into arrear, but always with the knowledge of the magistrate of the district, who has kept his particular lien upon the produce made, and upon the whole plant of the estate, and the first property realized in any form, whether by the sale of sugar or otherwise, has gone to pay the labourers, so that it is my belief that no labourer has ever been wronged out of a dollar, in the form of wages, earned on a sugar estate in the Mauritius.

3579. Has the habit of letting wages fall into arrear prevailed?—No, it is quite an exception, it is where the estates do not happen to have agents; but where there has been a regular agent connected with London houses, there has been no case in which wages have fallen into arrear.

3580. Is not it your opinion that it is an important consideration, that by paying the labourers punctually their wages in cash, it is likely to give them

Mr. E. Chapman.
24 February 1848.

habits of regularity, and attach them to their employers?—Decidedly. I have been anxious to establish the principle of paying them once every quarter or every six months; I think that would keep them quieter than paying them monthly. I think the receipt of money monthly, considering that every expense is provided for them, is a great means of exciting them to debauchery. I would rather, therefore, pay them three or four times a year, or twice a year.

3581. You do not pay the labourers, do you, for loss of time; you do not take them into your employ for weekly wages, but you only pay them when they are wanted?—Every man's name is upon the muster-roll of the estate, and the only deduction that is made from him is the number of days he is absent from the property.

3582. He does not claim anything when he is absent from the property, does he?—Yes; he begins by taking his rations, and no magistrate will allow you to stop his rations, whether he works or not. The stipendiary magistrate will tell you, If you have any civil demand against the man, come to me, and I will give you redress in another form. He is liable to deductions for absence; if he is absent for three or four days, three or four days are deducted.

3583. The only loss when the labourer is absent is in the rations?—The rations and the clothing, particularly when bands go in numbers of 20 or 50; it is a very great loss.

3584. You would recommend, as a very desirable thing, that the period for which contracts may be made should be considerably lengthened?—I think it is the first step towards bringing anything like free labour to approach the produce of slave labour; that is the only way in which I can see that the thing can be made to work at all.

3585. Do you combine with that, that there should be a power of enforcing those contracts?—In a legitimate manner; I would do away with all special law; we desire to see the law strictly enforced between master and man, and that there should be no favour in the matter; that the contract should be a fair arrangement, and each party responsible for the fulfilment of it.

3586. You spoke of the price of sugar as being under the present system at the Mauritius quite ruinous?—I look at the present system as conducive to an enormous cost in raising the produce. Looking to the total inefficiency of our labour, and the accumulated expenses of the colony, I think the expense of production under those circumstances is double what it ought to be.

3587. When you speak of the present system, you consider that the planters in the Mauritius conduct their affairs without any fault; that there is no improvement in point of management that can be introduced by them, but that everything is to be laid upon what you call the Government mismanagement?—I consider that the inhabitants of the Mauritius, as a body, are as industrious, hard-working, intelligent men as can be found anywhere; and I think there has been more real hard capital and energy employed by the merchants connected with the Mauritius than ever was exhibited in any case whatever, in any colony or country connected with Great Britain. That is my opinion of what has been done in the Mauritius; and how the case stands between the colonists and those connected with them in London; and I do attribute our present misfortunes to over-legislation. It has been a constant system of change and over-legislation. It has been an alternation of excessive hope, excited by laws which we hoped to see lasting, and disappointment which has followed as rapidly as it well could, the one after the other, in every case.

3588. You say that this fall of price, which under the present system is so ruinous, has been occasioned by what the Chairman called an inundation of slave-grown sugar?—I think the immediate cause of the fall of price has been the introduction of slave-grown or foreign sugar. The introduction of those 45,000 tons of sugar during this last year has been the immediate cause of the fall of price.

3589. And that fall of price is the immediate cause of the consequences which have ensued?—I wish particularly to explain that I think it sealed the ruin of the houses, but I think they were very much exhausted by the efforts they had made since 1843; we have been very much exhausting our resources since that time; it was an immense effort bringing our estates up to their present rate of production since we got a return of Indian labour.

3590. You think the Bill of 1846 was not the cause of the ruin of those houses connected with the Mauritius, but that it merely brought to a crisis what was

was

was about to take place?—I think before the Bill of 1846 passed we had every hope of seeing a fair and reasonable return for our capital, for we did not take borrowed capital for the purpose; we were using our own funds. We never thought for an instant of being so unfortunately exposed as we were to such a competition as results from the now gradually declining scale of the duties.

Mr. E. Chapman.

24 February 1848.

3591. Supposing slave sugar had been excluded, do not you think that the inundation of foreign free-labour sugar would have been sufficient to produce the effect; was not there 45,000 tons of free-labour sugar introduced?—No; I think that a great proportion of that comes under the head, if not of slave labour, of compulsory labour; I very much doubt whether any portion of it is made otherwise than under compulsory labour.

3592. The importations from the Mauritius during 1847 were somewhat larger than during the year 1846. By an account which has been laid before Parliament, it seems that there were 845,198 cwt. imported from the Mauritius. The Gazette average price of sugar was 32 s. 2½ d. for molasses sugar during the year 1846. It appears that during the year 1847 there were imported into England, from the Mauritius, 1,194,047 cwt. of sugar; and the Gazette average price was 24 s. 5 d. a cwt., so that it appears that the value of the sugar in 1846 was 1,362,001 l. 9 s. 8 d. In 1847 the value of the sugar from the Mauritius was 1,457,733 l. 7 s. 7 d.; so that there was obtained for the whole quantity of sugar in 1847, over the sum obtained in 1846, the sum of 95,731 l. 17 s. 11 d. The sugar growers in the Mauritius, therefore, obtained from the British public, during 1847, the sum of 95,731 l. 17 s. 11 d. for their sugar more than they obtained in the year 1846; how do you explain that, as the value of the whole quantity of sugar was greater, the colony, on the whole, was worse off?—Because there was a much greater outlay attending the increased production.

3593. Do you never make up by a good crop what you lose in the price per cwt.?—It depends upon the scale of the outlay and the scale of the return; but I have endeavoured to show the Committee how it is that the funds of all parties in the Mauritius have been completely exhausted by renewed efforts up to the present time.

3594. The sugar brought them back more money in 1847 than in 1846?—I do not assume that because we had a bad year in 1847, we should not have a worse in 1846. We were worse in 1847 than we were in 1846.

3595. But you had more sugar?—We had an increased outlay.

3596. Had your outlay been greater in 1847 than in 1846?—First of all, the expenditure has been going on; there has been an increased demand for interest; the burthen has become greater; the burthen of all capital tends in commerce to become greater, unless it is reduced by a process of liquidation, and of that we have had none. We have worked at a loss annually since 1843, and even before that. We have worked at a very considerable loss during the last four or five years. We were in the expectation of redemption. We had done our part in the matter, and then came the final seal to our distresses by the Act of 1846, which left us without any hope. We had been in hopes before that we should have been able to stand.

3597. You did not explain clearly in what respect this increase of cost has taken place in 1847 over 1846, so as to counterbalance the advantage you obtained from sending a larger quantity?—It is the general run of the account. I do not know whether the scale of burdens were greater in 1847 than in 1846, as a general rule; but there having been no liquidation in either year, the London houses were subjected to a demand upon their capital and interest, at the rate of 5 or 6 per cent. Supposing there were no liquidation, that would constitute an increased demand upon them.

3598. An increased demand for interest?—As part of the commercial burden.

3599. When I see that cultivators have, upon the whole, received more money for their produce one year than another, that on the whole the return has been greater, it is very natural to ask, inasmuch as they complain of being worse off in the one year than the other, what it is that has counterbalanced the advantage of this increased return?—I think the increased return of 95,000 l. is a small sum. Even supposing the expenses were the same in the colony, it is only an alleviation of the loss.

3600. In fact what you say is this, that there has been for a considerable time a considerable loss upon the cultivation in the Mauritius?—There has been since this change in our labour system; we have not worked to any profit. The labour

Mr. E. Chapman. has been so completely deceptive in its result that our hopes have been altogether frustrated by it.

24 February 1848.

3601. You do not lay so much stress upon the withdrawal of protection as you do upon the inefficacy of the arrangements as to labour?—I look upon that question as most easily answered, and one that may be most clearly understood. In order to place us upon a level with those countries against which we have to struggle, it is evident that we must be placed on an equality with them as respects labour, as near as can be done without approaching to slavery. We want economy in all that concerns our local government and our local expenditure, and until those matters are arranged we want a protection always more or less according to the difference of cost between slave labour and free; we cannot work our free labour with slave labour on equal terms; it is a moral impossibility; it cannot be done.

3602. What is the length of your experience?—I have been 17 years constantly occupied in the superintendence of sugar production.

3603. You knew something of the state of affairs during the existence of slavery?—I did.

3604. Can you state whether the profits then were large?—I think the most satisfactory time I have known in the Mauritius was the time when we had the apprenticeship combined with the five years' engagements; that gave the first extension of sugar plantation in the Mauritius. I think that was a period when every one connected with the island had a very reasonable prospect of success.

3605. Do you see any reason for doubting that, with a better arrangement in respect to labour, that prospect which existed in 1838 may be restored?—I think myself it is entirely in the hands of the Government. I think the Government have it in their power to make the Mauritius one of the most flourishing colonies, producing a very large quantity of sugar at a moderate cost.

3606. Do not you think that the planters and managers of estates might do something for themselves?—I think they do; I think they are a most industrious and diligent set of people, devoted to their business; they never leave their estates, and are most energetic, sober, industrious, and economical. I do not mean to say that we have no improvements to make, but we must first of all begin by seeing our way clear. We have magnificent estates, and splendid machinery, and our estates are in the best order; we have kept them in the hope of seeing a change in circumstances, and at this moment we are not without hopes. The colony is in the most beautiful state of cultivation; at least it was so when I left it; and we have been daily expecting some important measure of relief which would enable us to render this capital and this investment of some advantage to us, which it is not now.

3607. *Mr. Miles.*] With reference to the amount received for sugar from the colony last year, is not it a fact that upon every ton of sugar imported into this country there was a loss?—Most decidedly, in my opinion; every ton of sugar I had anything to do with left a loss.

3608. Was that the case in 1846 also?—I think it was in 1846 also.

3609. Were you engaged in the actual superintendence of the estate yourself?—No; I was not resident on the estate, but every detail connected with the properties passed through my hands.

3610. Were you manager in the town for several properties?—Yes; I furnished the funds myself, and was in the habit of superintending the estate myself; and not only so, but the managers and all of them were under my appointment and administration.

3611. You had power to appoint fresh managers?—Yes; the entire power, as much as if the property had been my own.

3612. What establishment had you on those properties; take, for instance, the one which had 400 labourers; should you call that your best estate?—No; it is a very fair estate; it produces about 1,000 tons of sugar; we have a manager at 480*l.* a year; we have an assistant under him in charge of the field works at 14*l.* a month or 168*l.* a year; we have a second for the works at 96*l.* a year; and we have a third, book-keeper and store-keeper, at 72*l.* a year.

3613. Have you an engine on the estates?—Yes.

3614. Have you any engineer?—We have a coloured man as engineer.

3615. No superintendent of that man?—No.

3616. In case anything goes wrong what is done?—They are very efficient.

3617. What

3617. What is the rate of wages you pay your superintendent engineer?—We pay the man who manages our mill 50*l.* a year. Mr. E. Chapman.

3618. Have you any other head men on the estate?—We have carpenters and wheelwrights, besides the chiefs of bands of the Indians. 24 February 1848.

3619. Will you enumerate the carpenters and so on?—On this estate we have three carpenters; they get 36*l.* a year each; the blacksmith the same, and the wheelwrights the same; we have four coopers at 36*l.* each also.

3620. What do the head men of the gangs of labourers get?—Thirty-two shillings a month.

3621. In this establishment do you think you could effect any reduction?—I should say the only hope we have in the reduction of cost is in the reduction of labour and rations.

3622. Do all those men get rations?—Yes.

3623. In what proportion?—They get, generally speaking, a large ration; it is scarcely measured to them; instead of getting the exact measure the labourers get, they get a fuller ration.

3624. Have you any idea what that would cost?—About 12*s.* a month besides.

3625. Have any of the book-keepers any additional rations to their allowance?—They take the general rations of the estate, and when they have families we allow them a bag of rice per month.

3626. What is the common number of hours the labourers work on the estate?—We do almost all our work by taskwork; that is to say, a great portion of it. We do carting by taskwork, and so on; and cleaning, generally speaking, is done by taskwork; the only men that work otherwise are in the sugar-house and court-yard attached to the manipulation.

3627. Do they get higher wages in the sugar-house?—They get higher wages and extra rations.

3628. What more wages do you give them?—The men in the sugar-house get 2*s.* to 4*s.* a month more, and they are without any allowance as to their rations. We cook food for them during the day, and they get as much as they like. We have on some estates rice and curry, and so on, boiled in the yard; that they can take when they like.

3629. What number of hours do they work in the sugar-house?—From six in the morning till about seven in the evening.

3630. How many sets of pans have you got?—Two sets upon this estate, and a large vacuum-pan besides.

3631. Is that for converting the sugar made in the first process?—Yes; we clean and concentrate the sugar to about 15 or 16 degrees, and then it is passed into the vacuum-pan.

3632. What quantity of it can you make in a week?—On an average about 10 tons a day when we are in full work; but in wet months, when we are only at half-speed, we cannot get anything like that made. In the five months of the year, October, November, and December, we can easily make 12 tons a day.

3633. It is of great importance to get the sugar off quick in the earlier part of the season?—We are obliged to cut the canes as they come to maturity; they do not ripen all at once.

3634. Have you any difficulty in obtaining the labourers at the proper time?—Yes, the utmost difficulty. I have seen this estate left with 100 men out of 450.

3635. So that all your fixed machinery in your works is obliged to stand still for want of labour?—That is the case in crop-time; to prevent which we are obliged to take men at almost any price, to prevent such a severe loss as would otherwise follow. We are without any sort of efficient control over the labourers.

3636. You say they work by task in the field; what number of hours are they in the habit of working in the day?—You will see men go out in the morning at six o'clock, and come in at 10 and 11, having finished their task.

3637. They will not work after that?—No; they will not work after that.

3638. Then the rest of the day is devoted to idleness?—To what they please.

3639. Have you never been able to induce them to work longer than that?—We cannot; in every band of men we have generally one-third efficient good men, one-third middling desultory workers, and one-third good for nothing.

Mr. E. Chapman.
24 February 1848.

3640. The labour you obtain there is not longer than they have in the West Indies?—That is the amount of labour that we can get.

3641. What quantity of cattle and mules have you upon this estate?—We have 58 mules and 50 bullocks.

3642. How far is the estate situated from the shipping place?—About three miles and a half.

3643. These mules and cattle are employed in bringing canes to the mills and bringing sugar to the wharf?—Entirely.

3644. Have there been any tram-roads laid down?—We have nothing of the sort at present.

3645. On no estate?—No, no such thing; no such thing has been tried as yet.

3646. Do you make any rum?—We have given it up; the taxes upon stills are so enormously heavy that it has been quite out of the question to seek a profit from that; we cannot distil with any advantage.

3647. Was this tax introduced with a view of stopping the distillation of rum?—That was the Government idea very much; it was with a view of stopping the distillation of rum on small estates.

3648. The tax is 300*l.* on a still, is not it?—It is.

3649. What do you do with the molasses?—We make syrup sugar; we use the vacuum pan, consequently we work up our molasses very close indeed.

3650. Do you export that sugar to the Cape or to Australia?—No; we mix it with white sugars and send it home.

3651. Does not that deteriorate the price?—It does; but we consider it the best way.

3652. Is that done with any reference to the classification duties?—No; our sugars are not good enough to come any way near the classification duties.

3653. Not even with the vacuum pan?—No, we do not get colour enough; we do not use any animal charcoal, or any substance for the purpose of producing artificial discolouration.

3654. Do you make any sugar equal to the crystallized Demerara sugar?—Our sugar is of a very good crystal, but it is not of a good colour. We could do so, but we are prevented from doing so by want of labour; our expenses are so enormously great for labour that we cannot attempt anything of the kind. Sugar coming from the Havannah is beautiful sugar; that is entirely owing to their regular system of labour.

3655. Do you ever grow any Guinea grass in the island?—No, we have nothing of the kind.

3656. Have you ever tried it?—No.

3657. There is nothing that answers to that in the Mauritius?—No; our natural pasturages where we have them are very good.

3658. Has it never occurred to you to introduce Guinea grass or something of that kind for feeding cattle?—We have been so short of labour that we have never been able to give our attention to anything of the kind. We have been struggling for existence the last four or five years.

3659. Which has driven you to the entire cultivation of sugar?—Yes. There has been a constant struggle between us and the Government, and we have neither had means nor anything else to apply to any purpose of that sort.

3660. You stated that the labourers are almost the masters of the planters; how are the stipendiary magistrates' courts held?—At a certain place in the district, generally the private residence of the magistrate, where he lives.

3661. What effect would it have if the stipendiary magistrate were allowed to take the circuit of the different estates, so as to adjudicate each case upon the estate?—If he did it for purposes of good, it might do good. We used to have weekly visitations formerly, and they spread disorder throughout the entire country.

3662. The effect of their decisions was against the planter?—Very generally. It was that which first upset our system of profitable production.

3663. How were the cases adjudicated upon between 1834 and 1838?—We had a regular police law; we had a protector of the quondam slaves. That was on a very different footing; the apprentice was bound to do his duty, and the labourers that were first introduced came under the same law as the apprentices were subject to.

3664. Who were the magistrates that introduced this system?—We had stipendiary

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SUGAR AND COFFEE PLANTING. 19

diary magistrates for the purpose, who were called protectors, sent out from England. Mr. E. Chapman.

3665. Were those same men continued afterwards?—Some of them; we had a great many new ones. 24 February 1848.

3666. Do you know what the number of stipendiary magistrates in the island is?—Twelve or 14; I am not quite sure of the number.

3667. Have you any plan to propose as to how justice should be administered with respect to stipendiary magistrates?—What we are most anxious for is to see a simple police law enforced in the colony, in lieu of special laws. We are now governed by Orders in Council, and those Orders in Council not put in practice; but there are private orders issued from the Governor to the stipendiary magistrates, which govern their conduct. As for anything like law, we do not know what law we are governed by, because they receive private instructions, first one week and then another.

3668. They are liable to have fresh orders issued any day?—They are issued according to the Governor's wishes; he sends a circular round to these magistrates, and they are considered by them as law.

3669. Is no information laid before the colony of what those orders are?—No, they are secret orders; they are not even laid before the Council.

3670. Is it entirely a summary jurisdiction which those stipendiary magistrates possess?—It is; and with no appeal.

3671. Where the planter appeals to the magistrate himself, does he say under what authority he has acted?—He gives his judgment. The only cases of appeal that have been ever known to be listened to, are where a magistrate gives an ultra-judicial sentence; that is to say, where he outstrips his power altogether.

3672. Have any petitions been sent in from the planters themselves on the subject?—There has been no end to the representations that have been made to the Government.

3673. Has any notice been taken of them?—We have received letters in answer showing the good-will of the Government, but we have seen nothing done.

3674. Has there been any general meeting of the colonists held to lay their grievances before the Government here?—There have been on so many occasions that the number of the petitions would be tedious to recapitulate.

3675. You have never received any encouragement from the authorities, have you, in any way?—No, not by any overt law have we received anything to lead us to hope that the system will be changed to a good purpose; and I do not hesitate to say it is a perfect farce to suppose that any British colony can thrive under such a system of free labour as we have been living under for some time.

3676. You say that labour at present is about 6*d.* a day, and increased by the cost of the rations about 1½*d.* a day?—It is about 6*d.* a day, which includes rations; that is the full cost of the labourer.

3677. Would you object to pay that rate for labour supposing you got full days' work continuously, without the labourers absenting themselves?—If we had efficient labour we could afford to pay wages something like that; we should not grumble at the wages, but it is a melancholy thing to see such a sum of money paid for such an unsatisfactory result as we get.

3678. Do you think the profitable cultivation in the Mauritius depends upon the wages being reduced below 6*d.*?—I think, considering that we feed them, we ought, looking to the proximity of India, to have men at the rate of about five rupees a month; on that scale of wages the Indians saved large sums of money, and thrived exceedingly.

3679. In the Mauritius?—Yes; perfect satisfaction reigned among the Indians and all classes, and we had efficient work from them: if wages are increased continually, the inefficiency of the man increases as a matter of course; he will not continue to cultivate the cane.

3680. When you say 10*s.* a month, do you mean rations included?—Five rupees a month, with reasonable rations.

3681. Have you had any difficulty with the labourers as to the amount of rations given to them?—Of late years it has been a constant scene of exaction; the man is asked by the stipendiary magistrate as to whether he stipulated for this and that, and so on; the man is reminded as to what he has not asked for as well as what he has, so that the exactions become very great.

3682. Would not it be much better for both parties that they should have

Mr. E. Chapman.

24 February 1848.

simply wages, without rations at all?—The Indian, I think, is too improvident for that: they very likely would almost starve themselves, and we should get nothing out of them.

3683. Would they have any difficulty in going to shops to purchase?—The Government have done everything it could to prevent our having shops upon the estates.

3684. In that case they would have to go to the towns?—There are shops in the country, but it would be attended with great desertion; it would add to the difficulty of continuous labour.

3685. If labour is not reduced in the Mauritius below what you now have it, do you think you can continue the sugar cultivation successfully at the present scale of expense?—I think with the present quantity of labour, and with our local expenditure, we cannot think of competing with any slave-growing country; it is out of the question, in my opinion; it is certain ruin.

3686. You think that under no circumstances whatever could the Mauritius compete with slave-grown sugar?—Not without moderate protection; the protection may be very moderate; things to result in the same thing must be equal; if our local expenditure be changed, and the character of our labour improved as it ought to be, under sound regulations, a moderate protection would be sufficient for the colonies to equalize the difference between the slave and the freeman.

3687. What do you call "moderate protection"?—I think we cannot do at present with a less protection than 10 s.; but I do not mean to say that, in a few years after we get the new system organized, we might not be subject to some reduction from that amount.

3688. For how long a period would you require this protection of 10 s.?—It depends entirely upon the measures of the Government itself; I do not think we can ever do without some degree of protection; I think it will always be more or less necessary.

3689. Have you been able to arrive at any calculation as to what amount of protection a free-labour colony must require over a slave colony?—I should say if our labour were really placed on an efficient footing, with a reduction of expenditure, we might do with a less protection than 10 s.

3690. Would 5 s. be sufficient?—Five shillings to 6 s. might be sufficient; but I am in earnest with respect to the change of system. With that, I think a moderate protection might be sufficient.

3691. If Government were to set vigorously to work to remove all existing restrictions, how long a period do you think it would take to get things in order?—To get the system fairly at work, from two to three years, I think.

3692. Do you think the planters in the Mauritius would go on with the cultivation of their estates if they had a protection of 10 s. for two or three years?—I think even then we should want the local changes I have spoken of; but at the present moment, I speak it as a positive fact, having still in my own hands the administration of a large number of estates, that the credit of the Mauritius by the existing laws is annihilated in London; we cannot get assistance from London merchants for the purpose of carrying on our production.

3693. What course do you mean to pursue?—I think everything will depend upon the result of the Report of this Committee; we are completely stopped at the present moment; we are selling our sugar in the Mauritius at the best price we can get.

3694. Applying the money you get there to the cultivation of the properties?—Yes.

3695. That in a short time of course must cease?—It will cease most certainly; the principal merchants of this country connected with Mauritius are now in a state of insolvency, though the estates are in a perfect state of production, and complete as to machinery, buildings, &c. One would have thought, therefore, that we should have found houses in London glad to advance money on the cultivation account, but we cannot find them.

3696. You cannot get advances at so much per ton?—No, not to cover the expense of cultivation.

3697. What is the alternative, supposing no remedies are proposed by Government?—The estates will cease to be cultivated.

3698. They will be abandoned altogether?—Yes.

3699. That refers to the estates in your own possession?—Yes, about twenty estates.

3700. You

3700. You would take off the canes already on the ground?—It would be a matter of calculation what we could save from the existing position of the estates at the least possible outlay; but the whole *vis* of the thing, the whole spring and energy of the colony is gone; the thing remains in order, but it is in a state of absolute prostration. The last three or four months in the present state of the market have been ruin to the Mauritius, under the accompanying circumstances. I do not mean to say that we cannot produce sugar to meet a market like that, if Government would assist us in good faith.

3701. What do you imagine you could really produce sugar for in the Mauritius?—I should say as cheaply as in any part of the world, if we had continuous labour.

3702. As cheaply as they could produce it in India?—Probably cheaper, considering their difficulties of internal carriage, and that our soil is much better.

3703. What is about the return per acre of your cultivation?—About a ton, I should say, thereabout.

3704. Are you satisfied with that?—We are not satisfied with that. I think if we had a better system, if we had not spread our cultivation so much, we should have got more to the acre, and perhaps worked it at a greater economy; but we have been forced into the rapid spread with a view to relieving the burdens which have existed on our property.

3705. Are there any agricultural implements used upon your property?—No; the surface of the soil is too difficult.

3706. There is no hope of reducing the cost of cultivation, as far as improved machinery goes?—Not as respects any application to the surface of the soil; it must be manual labour.

3707. There may be probably a reduction of the cost in the manufacture itself?—I think we may have less waste; but still a great deal has been done in the introduction of new machinery since 1843. Great efforts of that kind have been made.

3708. With respect to the taxes collected in the island, you stated they might be reduced by one-half?—I should say at least one-half.

3709. With respect to the general wants of the island, are the public buildings, such as hospitals and prisons, and so on, in such a state that you want to spend any large sum of money upon them?—There are certain things required; but a great deal depends upon the scale upon which they are done. I should wish to see them done with a greater regard to economy than some of the sums I have seen voted by the Government. By the last accounts from the island, they had voted 30,000*l.* to build new court-houses, and their present court-house is equal to any one of the district court-houses in this country; but this is to be set aside, and a new one built at a projected estimate of 30,000*l.*, which probably will be 50,000*l.* before it is done with.

3710. During the whole time this large taxation has taken place, has there been no improvement in the prisons, or things of that kind?—There has been a great deal of expenditure on the roads and bridges, and on some of the public edifices; but the money is principally applied to official establishments, and to the garrison, and what you call the expenses of the Crown, as connected with the garrison and the maintenance of the troops in the colony.

3711. Do you think, in regard to the wants of the colony at present, the roads and bridges, and different buildings, they are in a sufficient state for you to say that a great reduction of the expenditure may take place?—Notwithstanding the requirings of the colony in these respects, I think a great saving of expense might be established.

3712. You think that a very large reduction may take place in the official salaries?—I should say very large, but particularly in the numbers employed.

3713. Sir T. Birch.] You spoke of your great difficulty being in getting continuous labour?—We have no continuous labour; it is not a difficulty, but there is no such thing.

3714. You also said that sugar might be produced at one-half the present price if certain laws or regulations were passed enforcing continuous labour?—I did not separate the necessary changes to enable the colony to produce its sugar cheaper; it is both a reduction of the expenditure, and continuous labour we want, with a moderate protection; and that while we get those internal improvements, in order to keep a check as regards the difference between slaves and

Mr. E. Chapman. freemen, working as freemen ought to work, a certain degree of protection is absolutely necessary to us.

24 February 1848.

3715. Have you turned your attention so far to the subject as to enable you to point out to the Committee what laws and regulations there might be applied to labour?—One of the simplest things that has been proposed on the subject, viz. that no man should be allowed to leave his master's establishment without a ticket of leave, has been disallowed by the Government. The greatest evil, however, is the short period of contract service; there is no continuous labour under such a system.

3716. Cannot the contracts be enforced?—The man is not under contract under the present system; he has only to go and provoke his master to use any sort of violence towards him, and he can get his contract broken.

3717. Then lengthening the contract would do no good?—I consider that the contract in that case would be a very different engagement between the master and the man. It would not be the sacrifice of the two or three months' service which the labourer might still owe his master, but perhaps three or four years.

3718. You think if a different kind of contracts were established it would have a good effect?—That would be the first base upon which improved free labour can be obtained.

3719. Is there anything else you would recommend?—I think doing away with anything like special law would be an advantage, and that the remedy should lie in a simple judicial plain police law between man and man.

3720. *Mr. Matheson.*] You spoke of the improvidence of the Indian's character as being a reason why you think it desirable to give rations. Are you aware that it is not the custom to give rations to the same class of people in India?—It is not.

3721. Why do you therefore conceive it to be necessary in the Mauritius when it is not so in India?—I do not think there is any parallel. I think in India the labourers swarm, and if you lose the services of 500 men one day you get another 500 the next morning; and there is no necessity for any precaution.

3722. Have you not plenty of people also in the Mauritius?—I have explained that the difficulty of obtaining labour in Mauritius is such that you may be left, on an estate requiring 300 men, to work it with 50, without the means of replacing the others, in the middle of your crop, and you may remain in that state for a week or a fortnight together.

3723. That is owing to the imperfection of the Government regulation by which those men should be kept under control?—It is owing to the facility with which they squat and absent themselves from every kind of useful employment whatever.

3724. *Mr. Hope.*] In the event of sugar not being produced at the Mauritius, do you think anything else can be produced?—I do not think anything else can be produced to represent in any proportion the capital now invested in the colony. I think if we had recourse to any other means of production whatever, it would be a wiping out of the whole of the capital now invested in it.

3725. The contract with the labourer must now be made in the Mauritius, must it not?—Yes.

3726. Whereas, under the former system, it was made in Calcutta?—Yes.

3727. Do you think that has worked injuriously to the colony?—Yes. I think, upon reconsidering the question of the improvement of Indian labour, one of the points is that we should have power to contract with the men in India, and obtain them as we want them from their own country; the engagement might be made under the superintendence of a magistrate, to see that justice is done to the contracting party.

3728. Do you imagine that the competition for labour when the labourers arrive in the Mauritius, acts detrimentally to the planters?—It is so detrimental that it raises the price of wages; it is the cause, in fact, of everything that is bad; of necessity it induces the planters to compete one with the other; having planted their canes in the expectation of labour to get them off the fields at crop time, they are compelled to competition.

3729. You were asked whether you thought anything could be done by the colony itself in the way of improvement; are not you at this moment asking Government for the permission to be allowed to make those practical improvements?—I do not mean to say that the Mauritius may not be improved as a sugar

sugar producing country, but it must be under hope; we are totally without hope at present; in fact we are ruined; the resources of the colony are prostrated.

3730. Are you not at this moment asking Government to give you an opportunity of making those very improvements which will increase your power of competition?—We are, no doubt of it.

3731. Another question was asked you as to an increased quantity of sugar compared with the price you obtained for it. Is that a fair way of comparing the crop of 1846 and 1847, unless you take the price per ton which you obtained for it?—There is no other way of testing the price that I know of than taking the price per ton.

3732. An honourable Member of the Committee took it by comparing the quantity in hundred-weights, and then the quantity in money received?—I cannot understand such a comparison. I do not see that it involves any result whatever.

3733. You think the only way of testing the comparative produce of one year and another is taking the price per ton?—No doubt of it.

3734. What the crop fetched you in the market?—Yes.

3735. You mentioned the amount of 45,000 tons of foreign sugar imported in 1847; what do you derive that figure from?—I derive it from official public statements.

3736. Do you mean that there was no more than 45,000 tons of sugar imported?—That was taken into consumption, the duties were paid and it came into consumption.

3737. The importation of foreign sugar was very much more than 45,000 tons, was not it?—I am sure I am not very far from the mark. The Chairman stated that it was 48,000 tons.

3838. I should wish you to draw a distinction between importation and consumption?—I am not aware what the importation was.

3839. Will you draw a distinction between the sugar that was taken into consumption and that which was imported?—I distinctly did so in the early part of my evidence; I said that 45,000 tons of sugar had come into consumption.

3740. Do you know anything with regard to the condition of the negroes after the apprenticeship ceased?—Yes; I know as much about them as anybody does, I think, and I believe that scarcely anybody knows very much what has become of them, they have been so thoroughly lost sight of in various ways, that no good account of them is to be given by anybody.

3741. Are you aware whether any attempts were made to induce them to labour?—I think every possible attempt was made to do so; every inducement that could be held out to them was held out to them to induce them to stay on the estates and labour.

3742. Everything in the way of offering them fair wages?—Yes; and I think they would have worked had it not been for the facility given them by Government of settling upon the Crown lands; I think that was a fatal blow to the industrial employment of the *quondam* slave population.

3743. In fact the result has been that they have not worked?—The result has been that only a fractional part of them have ever remained and been seen in our sugar-works.

3744. You think the planters themselves are not to blame?—I am certain they are not to blame in any way; they have done their utmost to induce those people to work by every kindness and persuasion, and by the offer of most liberal wages, and always placing them in honourable employments, and those which were calculated to distinguish them.

3745. Mr. Moffatt.] How many years have you been connected with the Mauritius?—Seventeen years.

3746. In what year did the export of sugar commence?—I cannot tell you; it was many years before I arrived in the colony; about 1825, I think.

3747. You are partly a producer of sugar; you have estates of your own, and you have also the agency of other estates?—That has been my position in the colony.

3748. The Mauritius sugar of a fair average quality you say costs you in production about 18*l.* a ton?—Yes.

3749. Will you give the Committee the details how you ascertain that cost?—I have not got the details of it; it is divided under various heads.

3750. Is the statement you hold in your hand a return for one year?—It is not an absolute return; it is a statement of the projected scale upon which an estate

Mr. E. Chapman. was decided to be cultivated in conformity with the then existing circumstances of the colony.

24 February 1848. 3751. Can you state to the Committee the actual result from your own estates of the cost of production?—I have not the documents with me to prove the exact result.

3752. Are they in this country?—No.

3753. You can only in respect to the cost of sugar give an estimate?—I can only give an estimate.

3754. And that estimate shows a cost of 18*l.* a ton?—Yes; we have some estates which can produce sugar cheaper; there are some that produce it considerably higher.

3755. Will you state to the Committee in that estimate what proportion consists of labour?—In this estimate it is about 50 per cent.; that is, nothing but absolute labourers' wages and expenses.

3756. You state that in that estimate it is for an estate which has produced 1,000 tons of sugar?—Yes.

3757. What number of acres were under cultivation to produce that 1,000 tons?—I think 700 or 800 acres.

3758. That is equivalent to an acre and a quarter per ton?—Yes.

3759. What quantity of rum was produced on that estate?—None; it is worked with a vacuum pan, which leaves little or no residue applicable to the making of rum, even if the revenue laws of the colony allowed us to make rum to advantage, which they do not.

3760. What do you estimate to be the average cost of cultivation per acre?—I cannot state that, inasmuch as it differs according to the age and state of the canes.

3761. In fact, you have no positive details that you can give to the Committee as to the actual cost of producing sugar?—No; I can only give an estimate of it. The last three years in the Mauritius has been a period of great and unusual effort; it has not been matter of calculation exactly what the total cost is per cwt., in consequence of our efforts having been unusual and excessive to enable us to compete in the home market.

3762. You stated that there was a great want of capital in the Mauritius at the present time; can you give the Committee any idea of the amount of capital which has been invested in the Mauritius since 1843?—Since 1843, I can only judge of it from the published accounts of the large houses which have failed in connexion with the Mauritius. Judging from my own friends I have put it down as exceeding half a million.

3763. Has that money been invested on mortgage?—No; in cultivation. The amount of half a million of money has been *bonâ fide* advanced for cultivation during the last three years from 1843 to 1846, I should say, at least.

3764. Secured to the parties who have advanced it by mortgages on the estates, their produce being consigned to houses here?—Such advances are very seldom secured by mortgages.

3765. Upon what security has this half a million of money been advanced?—It has been advanced on the credit of the estates, to the planter who is on the nearest relations of trust, and so on, with the agents of the house advancing the money in the colony.

3766. That money has been mainly advanced by the commercial houses in this country?—Almost entirely so.

3767. Upon the faith that the produce should be consigned to them?—Upon the faith that the produce should be consigned to them or sold on the spot. The planter might send it to London or sell it on the spot, as the greatest advantage might be gained from it.

3768. Have you been largely engaged in negotiating such advances?—Yes, very.

3769. Can you give the Committee a statement of the charges which the goods are subject to, both when they are sold on the estates in the Mauritius and when they come to London?—Interest on advances in the Mauritius varies from six to nine per cent., according to the circumstances of the case.

3770. Is not the colonial rate of interest generally at nine per cent. where you have made advances upon estates?—It is not with us; we have been compelled to reduce it; very generally advances on an estate are at seven per cent. The legal

legal rate of interest in the colony is nine per cent. The next charge is commission on sale. Mr. E. Chapman.

3771. Which is five per cent., is it not?—It varies from two and a half to five per cent. 24 February 1848.

3772. The next charge?—We have no other commercial charges, except those which are *bond fide* paid, such as wharfage charges, warehousing, and so on, which come to 10 per cent.

3773. That is on sugar sold in the Mauritius?—Taken in this sense, there are four per cent. commercial charges, and six per cent. reduction for discount sold for cash, as shown by the price current; the commercial charges amount to four per cent. on the planter's sugar, and six per cent. on sales allowed the purchaser.

3774. Then there is agent's commission also?—Two and half per cent.

3775. And brokerage one-half per cent.?—Yes.

3776. Then there is the charge for counting and paying money?—That is never charged to our own estates, of course; nor do the planters who are in a moderately independent position pay it; it is a charge we stipulate for when we make large advances, but as a general rule it would not apply.

3777. It appears from the statement you have been good enough to give in that the planter pays, when you are very lenient to him, 21 per cent.; when you exact to the ordinary point it is 24 per cent.?—If the interest of the account current comes to his credit, which it does in the course of the year on the cultivation account, instead of that you must take off seven per cent., and add something in his favour; the interest on the account is simply this, the difference between his expenses commencing the 1st of May, paid monthly, and the proceeds of his sugar sold from the 15th of September. The difference at the end of the year is a mere question of interest of a few hundred dollars.

3778. The question refers to those planters whose estates are under mortgage, and pledged to you and your correspondents in London?—He is subject to a legal charge of seven per cent. as a general rule.

3779. It appears therefore that a planter, from his commercial position, labours under a disadvantage before his sugar quits the Mauritius of a charge varying from 21 to 24 per cent.?—I cannot understand for an instant how you come to such a conclusion; many planters owe nothing on their estates.

3780. The question refers to those planters who are involved?—It cannot be said that the man's produce is saddled with that charge; he has his engagements to meet; his commercial charges are as light as they can be in any part of the world.

3781. The questions I have asked you are from the official statement, sent home by Sir William Gomm; that statement is substantially confirmed by you in reference to planters who have received advances from the London houses?—I think a very erroneous impression may be taken from those figures; the six per cent. in reality makes no difference to the planter whatever; it is a mere conventional charge between the buyer and the seller; the price is not influenced by it in any way.

3782. It is six per cent. out of the pocket of the planter, is not it?—Certainly not; it is a mere condition between myself, for instance, or a person selling the sugar for me, and the buyer.

3783. Is the value of his sugar less six per cent.?—The planter receives the price at which the sugar is sold at the public sale less six per cent., and the real value of the sugar is always taken that way, as being the established rule in the market.

3784. Is it the practice to sell by public auction?—Yes, by a similar process, "*ventes en concurrence*;" and whatever is sold as a matter of course is sold under six per cent. discount.

3785. Remitting that, it would appear there remains a charge to the planter of 16 per cent. upon the value of his goods?—I do not see how that is made out. I have seen the statement to which the Honourable Member alludes before, and it is a most decided misrepresentation of the circumstances; nothing can be more incorrect than the way in which that statement is put upon paper; it leads to most erroneous impressions.

3786. The supposition has hitherto been that the sugar is sold in Port Louis; what are the additional charges, in case the sugar is brought home here to be sold?—The charges here are two and a half per cent. commission, and half per

Mr. E. Chapman. cent. brokerage; all the rest are the charges for warehousing and dock dues, and so on.

24, February 1848.

3787. The highest known charge in this market is two and a half per cent., is it?—It is, and half per cent. brokerage.

3788. What is the charge for del credere?—One per cent.

3789. Those charges are *bond fide* upon the value of the sugar?—They are *bond fide* upon the sale price of the sugar.

3790. Is that the real price, or is it the price with the duty added to it?—It is the *bond fide* money which the merchant has to encash, and the sum that passes through his hands.

3791. Will you state whether the price upon which you make those charges includes duty or not?—Yes; it is $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon the price of the sugar.

3792. And the del credere applies to that?—Yes, I believe it does.

3793. Will you state what number of estates are under advances in the Mauritius?—I should think almost all of them are more or less dependent upon advances for assistance.

3794. You state that those are the additional charges upon the sale of the sugar duty-paid; are those charges imposed on foreign sugars when they come to this country?—If duty is paid upon them.

3795. Do you know it?—Most decidedly.

3796. Do the East India houses charge commission and del credere?—There may be one or two exceptions in London; but generally speaking, the rule is to charge commission on the long price; the merchants advance the duties and come under disbursements to the Government previously to the sale.

3797. You attribute the great disadvantage under which you state the Mauritius to be labouring at present to the inefficiency of the laws regarding labour?—The principal cause is the inefficient state of our labour; it is not only the laws with regard to it, but its whole position is inefficient for the purpose.

3798. Do not the laws as at present in force empower the planter to stop rations as well as wages during the absence of a labourer; and further, do they not enforce a penalty equal to the wages which would have been received had the men been at work?—The law is a dead letter as regards any power the master has; the law as regards the power of the master, as we read it, is a dead letter in the Mauritius.

3799. Am I right in my impression as regards that clause?—You are wrong as regards its application.

3800. Is that the law?—It may be the law, but it is subverted by the local instructions which are given to the stipendiary magistrates, and the manner in which they are carried out.

3801. Is not there this provision also, imprisonment with hard labour, at and after the rate of one day's imprisonment for each day's absence?—It may be so in the law, but it is seldom or never enforced.

3802. And that the absentee shall make up, at the termination of his engagement, whatever period he has been absent?—It is never in any instance in the Mauritius known to have been obtained by a planter; it is a dead letter to all intents and purposes.

3803. Are there not other penalties in the written law protecting the planter against the misconduct of the labourer?—There is in the colony an interference with the law on the part of the local authorities, which subverts its activity and renders it a dead letter as regards any use to the parties.

3804. You referred to private circulars sent by the Governor; can you produce any such circular?—No, they are kept secret in the colony, but the magistrates say themselves they have acted under such orders.

3805. Were not you a member of the Legislative Council?—I was.

3806. Could you not protest against those private circulars?—I never had it in my power, not having actual documents to prove it, but I have often raised the question as to labour.

3807. It is only, then, upon hearsay-evidence that you have stated that such private circulars were issued?—It is upon the declarations of the stipendiary magistrates themselves.

3808. But you have never had sufficient proof to warrant you in making that statement in your official character as member of the town council?—No, I have not.

3809. Are you aware that there is a law in existence in the island which renders

renders all Coolies, not under a stamped engagement to a sugar-planter, amenable to a tax of four dollars a month?—That has been passed since I left the colony.

Mr. F. Chapman.

3810. When did you leave?—In September 1846.

24 February 1848.

3811. Do you know what the operation of that law is?—I had a letter from the Mauritius the other day stating that the only part of the law which was totally useless was the tax on unemployed labourers, which was never put into execution.

3812. Under the same law, enacting that all persons harbouring Coolies not under such engagements are subject to a heavy fine, cannot their houses be entered for the purposes of search and inquiry?—That is a new law which has been published in the Mauritius with a view to improvement; I trust it will produce it; it comes at the eleventh hour at all events.

3813. The accounts you have subsequently received give some little hope and promise from that law, do they?—I think it will be a means of improvement, and we need it.

3814. You stated that the planters were exceedingly oppressed by heavy taxation; will you state what amount of direct taxation the planters have to bear?—I look upon the Mauritius as being solely a sugar-producing colony, and that its produce is more or less directly taxed for the whole colony. The planter pays, directly or indirectly, the whole taxation, or very nearly so; there is no other means of revenue to the colony but the staple produce of it.

3815. The direct taxation is equivalent to about 1 s. per cwt. ?—He pays that at all events, for he pays the amount of duty of 1 l. a ton before it leaves the harbour.

3816. The charges of the Mauritius, as a military station, are not borne by the planters, are they?—They are borne by the Government, to a considerable extent; we pay the colonial allowance for the troops.

3817. You stated in regard to paying the labourers, that they could not be trusted to buy their own rations; that they were an exceedingly improvident race?—I do not think, myself, it would answer; I think it would work ill.

3818. And yet you stated that many of them had accumulated large sums of money?—Yes; I wished to have qualified the expression when I used it. I look upon them, as regards money, as a most provident people; they are very saving; but I believe if they were compelled to find their own rations, they would almost starve themselves rather than buy a sufficient quantity. I do not think they are to be trusted to care for themselves and their families to buy the necessary supply of provisions.

3819. Do the people hoard a great deal of money?—Yes.

3820. That would confirm the report of Sir William Gomm, on the 11th of March 1846, that the departures of these Indians, at their own expense, continued to be very numerous?—I think there were a great many went away.

3821. You have stated that it is impossible that the Mauritius can compete with the Havannah, by reason of labour being so much cheaper in the Havannah?—I have said that our labour is so extremely unsatisfactory and so insufficient, that at the existing prices we cannot compete. I do not know what the cost of labour is in the Havannah; I only know that ours is comparatively useless for our purposes; it is exceedingly expensive, and totally inefficient.

3822. You have not instituted any comparison as to the cost of labour in the Mauritius and in the Havannah?—I do not know the cost of labour in the Havannah, therefore I could not do so.

3823. But you have expressed an opinion that slave countries can produce sugar much cheaper than you can?—I am sure they can in our existing position.

3824. Do you know anything as to the capital employed in the sugar cultivation in the island of Cuba?—I am conversant with the working of slavery, and the supply of labour that they have, and that they must produce very cheaply as the natural consequence.

3825. At what do you estimate the cost of slave labour?—In the Mauritius we have not seen anything but qualified slavery; I have seen slavery there, but not slavery in active force, but only under protecting laws, and with qualifications which would divest it of its severity.

3826. What was the cost of slave labour that you had experience of in the Mauritius?—I have reason to think that the cost was from 3 l. 10 s. to 4 l. a man, per annum.

3827. Upon what calculation do you base that?—Upon a calculation I have made;

Mr. E. Chapman.
24 February 1848.

made; that is the cost of food and clothing, without any reference to interest of capital.

3828. Mr. Wilson.] What do you estimate to be the wear and tear of slave labour?—I have heard it differently stated; the mortality varied; on some estates it was less and on others it was more; the public returns showed that our mortality in the Mauritius was not more than three per cent. during the period that I was in the colony.

3829. Mr. Moffatt.] What was the estimate of the value of the slaves?—Our slaves were valued for the compensation at 6*g* *l.* a head, but we received in reality only 30 *l.*

3830. The current rate of interest of money in the Mauritius varies from seven to nine per cent. ?—Yes.

3831. You stated that you thought the colony of Mauritius would revive if you maintained a moderate protective duty, and you went on to say that 10 *s.* per cwt., you thought, would be a moderate protective duty?—Our object before this Committee is to state the plain truth of the case as regards the sugar plantations in the Mauritius; I do not think the Mauritius can live unless new regulations take place in its economy, and a complete change be made in the system of its labour; and added to that, I think a moderate protective duty must be maintained, first of all, to allow us to regain our position under the new regulations to be introduced, and next, to meet the difference of expense as between slave and free labour; for, in my opinion, it is utterly impossible that with any free labour, such labour as Englishmen would wish to see existing in the colony, you can have the same result as they have with slavery, and there ought therefore to be a duty either more or less in amount. Till we can see our way clear I should ask to have a 10 *s.* duty, and I should hope that we should be able, before long, to see that duty reduced; but I ask for that, in order to place us in the same position as the Spanish planter, under the advantages which he has of his slave labour.

3832. If you had efficient labour it would reduce the cost of your sugar to half?—I think it would; but we should not be even then on an equality with the planters in the Spanish colonies, and therefore we say, place us on an equality by giving us a moderate protection. It would be necessary to give us that protection in order to place us on a fair footing of equality with the slave owner and the slave proprietor, or his labour will beat us out of the field by the very considerable advantage that he has in his labour being continuous and more productive.

3833. You stated that the misgovernment of the Colonial Office was a cause, and a great cause of the evils under which you were suffering in the Mauritius?—The word was not my adoption, and I wish not to use that expression, because I do not approve of it; but the government of the Colonial Office has, in my opinion, been one great cause of the evil.

3834. You do not attribute the evil to free trade, but to the misgovernment of the Colonial Office?—The Act of 1846 found the planters in the Mauritius reduced to their last resources, and effectually sealed their ruin; they were not able to meet it, having exhausted their resources in the hope of better times coming.

3835. Can you give the Committee information with respect to the cost of sugar in 1844, when the duty was reduced?—The change of duty found us in a state of the greatest difficulty; we were struggling for existence; 1843 found our estates in a state of abandonment; we had been before that time at great expense in renewing them.

3836. Was there anything in the legislative interference in 1838 which caused that state of things that you speak of?—Certainly; we were deprived of labour for four years.

3837. Are you conversant with the state of labour in the Mauritius, from 1834 to 1839?—Yes.

3838. Was there any restriction then?—Yes; in 1838 came the Orders in Council, from London, restricting labour.

3839. What was the amount of the export of sugar in 1834?—In 1834-35, it was 36,000 tons.

3840. What was the amount of the export of sugar in 1836-37?—Sixty-five thousand tons.

3841. So that it appears that, under all those restrictions, your production has more than trebled itself?—But the colony has laid out, I am afraid to say what

what sum; but I should say altogether, privately and otherwise, 600,000 *l.* to 700,000 *l.* for immigration. Mr. E. Chapman.

3842. Have you any data for that?—Yes; 250,000 *l.* were stated to have been paid by private individuals alone, and at least 300,000 *l.* or 400,000 *l.* have been paid by Government at different times for immigration, which would make it about 650,000 *l.* I have not the exact figures, but I shall be able to furnish them. 24 February 1848.

3843. You calculate that as part of the cost of the production of sugar?—I put that as the reason why the colony was in a condition to produce that quantity of sugar.

3844. Then that is to be put upon the cost of the production of sugar?—I beg your pardon; the cost of producing sugar as stated by me is the absolute cost, the outlay of the merchant. I do not include in that the payment by Government for immigration.

3845. You say that 700,000 *l.* has been paid by the estates for immigration?—I mean to say that it has been paid by the colony, and that with a view to increase the power of the colony to produce sugar.

3846. The taxes have been raised to defray that expense?—Yes; or it has been paid out of the private purses of individuals, of which at least 250,000 *l.* has been so paid.

3847. Mr. Wilson.] Supposing a protective duty of 10 *s.* a cwt. were put on sugar now, have you considered how long that protective duty should be continued?—I am inclined to think that if we had a duty of 10 *s.* a cwt., and also legislative enactments in order to give us an efficient description of labour in the Mauritius on a fair and proper footing, in two or three years you would see the Mauritius, and other colonies similarly situated, produce sufficient sugar for the consumption of this country, and that we should leave the foreigner to find his own way; and then the protective duty, if it were reduced to 5 *s.* or 6 *s.*, would act merely as a check in the event of any unfortunate season that might happen, in order to protect the British manufacturer from the importation of sugar grown by slave labour, with all the abominations attending it.

3848. If there were a protective duty of 10 *s.* a cwt., and regulations with respect to labour were introduced, that would be sufficient?—Fresh confidence would be given to the cultivation of sugar in the Mauritius.

3849. And we might fairly look for a large increase in the produce of sugar in the British colonies?—I have not a doubt that there would be a considerable increase if that system was carried out in good earnest by all parties.

3850. That is, if you have no impediment placed in your way with regard to obtaining labour?—Yes, if proper arrangements were made, and we got proper laws to secure the performance of labour on the part of the immigrant.

3851. Do you happen to know what was the total quantity of British sugar that was imported into this country last year?—I am not aware.

3852. You are not aware that it was 280,000 tons?—I believe it was somewhere thereabouts.

3853. What was the entire consumption of the country?—Two hundred and ninety thousand tons.

3854. Therefore already the British colonies produce within 10,000 tons of our entire consumption?—They do, but they are rapidly decreasing in prospect.

3855. Supposing this protective duty of 10 *s.* a cwt. were really conceded to the British colonies, and all other arrangements were made which you propose with regard to labour, there would be no reduction, but on the contrary a considerable increase in the cultivation?—I do not know the state of the West India colonies sufficiently to say whether there will be a falling off in the production this year, but I think that the cultivation in the Mauritius would be taken up again, it being at this moment, I may say, prostrate.

3856. Looking at the East Indies, where we know the price alone regulates the amount that comes to this country; looking to the Mauritius, and to the capabilities of Trinidad, Bahama, and all the West India colonies, the resources of which are not yet drawn out more than a hundredth part; your belief is that we should produce more sugar than we consume in this country?—Yes, that is my opinion.

3857. Supposing we produce 350,000 tons, that would not be a material increase upon the present quantity produced?—No.

3858. If we consumed only 300,000 tons, leaving 50,000 tons surplus, have

Mr. E. Chapman. you considered what would be the effect of the protection that was given, and what would be done with the 50,000 tons over and above that which we should consume?—But taking the rule of price at a moderate standard, I think we should see our consumption considerably exceed 300,000 tons, but at present we are too much maimed to make any very rapid increase.

24 February 1848.

3859. It is no matter to you as a sugar importer whether a low price is produced by the increased quantity or by the diminished protection; the only question with you is the price?—No doubt of it.

3860. It is a matter of indifference to you from what the low prices arise, but the real thing which does influence you is the price?—Yes.

3861. Therefore, if your condition is to be improved, it can only be by raising the price of sugar?—By diminishing the cost of production; it is not merely raising the price.

3862. If the protection is to act in your favour, it can only act by raising the price: an increased quantity of labour will operate in reducing the cost; but as far as the 10 s. protection goes, if it is to be a benefit to you, it can only be by raising the price?—I should say that it would have the effect of preventing a fall of price rather than of causing a rise; it would give us an access to this market for a certain time.

3863. With our extensive sugar colonies, if we were to encourage them in the way you propose that they should be encouraged by the protective duty of 10 s., and by regulations giving them an additional supply of labour at a reduced cost, it is quite clear that there would be a large increase of production; but do you see any reason why we should anticipate a material increase in the consumption?—I see from such changes the certainty of a reduction in the cost.

3864. But in the first instance the reduction in the cost would be interfered with by the increased protection; if you are to have a lower price of sugar the protection will do you no good, because your present position is one of ruin?—But then, I would ask, are you satisfied that the Spanish colonist is at present producing at his lowest price? I do not think he is.

3865. Have you reflected upon what the consequence would be of the increased production consequent upon those two causes?—I have, and I am inclined to think you will bring about a low standard of price, and I think that is before us as a matter of certainty. What we are wishing for is to obtain such a reduction in the cost of our labour as will enable us to meet the planters of Brazil and Cuba. The object of protection at the present time is to enable us, at all events, to look and see how we can go on in competition with the Brazil planter. If we do not increase our production in that time, it will be very sad to find ourselves exposed without protection to a system that is sure to ruin us. Let protection take place now, and it will be easy for Parliament a short time hence to say, that any law made for our protection shall be done away.

3866. An increase of production has taken place to a large extent, and if the protection were to be continued at 10 s., and confidence restored, and labour were more abundant, the production would necessarily go on to increase; if we are to believe anything we hear about the capabilities of Trinidad, and Bahama, and the East Indies, and Singapore, we are led to that conclusion?—I should say it would; but the colonies are so paralyzed as to require time to produce that result.

3867. But in that case they would be no longer paralyzed; you would have the cure that you propose?—They are now reduced to such a low ebb as to require time to recover themselves; they require assistance for a year or two to enable them to gain something like strength; they are completely in prostration.

3868. Has the export of sugar from the colonies in the last year been larger than for many years?—But it has been at a great loss to the planters.

3869. But is it not the fact that the growth of sugar in the colonies has been larger in the last year than for many years?—Yes.

3870. And does not the growing crop show a very little reduction in that amount?—About 10 per cent. reduction as regards Mauritius.

3871. Then what you fear and what the colonies fear is, not so much the actual state of things at present, as the prospective consequence of the present prices and the present state of the law?—But the present state of the law is ruinous.

3872. It is ruinous as far as the profit is concerned, but not as regards the extent of cultivation?—Because we have maintained our estates and laid out our capital in the hope of better times, and it has not been based upon a speculation which was

was in itself calculated to restore us to prosperity; it has been a last effort that we have made. Mr. E. Chapman.

3873. But at the present moment the cultivation has not ceased?—No; but it threatens to cease. 24 February 1848.

3874. But the injury that you apprehend to the sugar cultivation in the British colonies is a prospective injury?—We are suffering under the Order of 1846 at this moment as much as persons can suffer from any wound whatever.

3875. You are suffering from low prices having stopped the supply?—Yes; attended with accumulated charges which are sufficient to ruin us.

3876. I understand the reasons from which the colonies are now suffering, but that has nothing to do with the extent of sugar which is under cultivation at the present moment. Supposing this very night Parliament were to pass a Bill giving you a protection of 10s. a cwt. for 10 years to come guaranteed, and that you had every reason to believe that all the regulations with regard to labour that you have suggested, and all the regulations that you have urged with regard to the government of the island of Mauritius would be carried into effect, by the next overland mail, everybody interested in sugar cultivation in the Mauritius would send out instructions to continue the cultivation of sugar?—I think they would.

3877. Then there would be no material reduction in the amount of production?—The reduction in that case would only be the effect of the season.

3878. Supposing that we produce 350,000 tons, that would be an increase of only 70,000 tons upon our present supply; and supposing we were to increase our consumption to 300,000 tons, we should have 50,000 tons of surplus: what should we do with that 50,000 tons of surplus?—Of course it would seek a foreign market.

3879. Then those 50,000 tons would go in competition with Cuba and Brazil sugar in the continental markets, in the same way as it did fifty years ago?—Yes.

3880. And the entire 300,000 tons which were consumed here would be sold at the same price as the 50,000 tons that were sent to the continent, for no person would send sugar to the continent to be sold at a lower price than he could get on the spot?—No.

3881. Therefore in that case the 10s. protection would be inoperative?—Believing as I do that the cultivation of sugar in our colonies is likely in such a case to be extended, it would only act as a temporary means of restoring the colonies. I think it would give us the strength which is necessary to raise us, and such is the opinion I think of all parties connected with the colonies; I do not know anybody who is of a different opinion; but if the effect of the protective duty were such as to become inoperative, the country would suffer no burden from it.

3882. You can only be restored to a temporary prosperity by rise of price; nothing but a rise of price above the present rate could restore you?—It is not so much a rise of price, but a moderate rise of price attended with a reduction of cost, which we hope to accomplish, would be the means of enabling us to carry on the cultivation. We are not wishing to lean upon this country to the full extent of the 10s. protective duty; we want to see a reasonable assistance granted to us only till we see that we can go on; we hear of regulations for the supply of efficient labour being about to be proposed, but they come into operation very slowly; we do not know how long it will be before the reductions that are talked of will be accomplished; and what we say to this country is, "We entreat you to save us; we are dying; give us the protection which will give confidence to us in the London market; enable us to go on till those measures which are so slow are brought into operation."

3883. Does not that mean that there shall be an increase of price?—As a temporary thing, certainly.

3884. And it is also quite clear, is it not, that we are close upon the point at which we shall have a surplus?—Not at the present moment, because we are upon the eve of seeing the produce of the colonies cease altogether.

3885. But I am supposing that your system is to be carried into effect?—But looking at this matter in its true light, we are completely on the edge of a gulf; we may be on the verge of prosperity under a new system, or we may be on the verge of ruin; we come to Parliament and beg them to hold out a hand to save us.

3886. You are satisfied that Parliament could do that?—Yes; and if it is a burden upon the country, it was self-imposed when the great principle of doing

Mr. E. Chapman.

24 February 1848.

away with slavery was adopted by this country; it was part of the understanding that this country was to bear the burden, and that we were not to be left to perish.

3887. Is it your opinion that free labour can compete with slave labour?—I do not think that the free labour can ever compete with the slave as an abstract fact. I think that no free man will produce what the slave will produce under compulsion.

3888. Mr. Villiers.] You speak with some confidence as to the superiority of slave labour over free labour; is that from any observation you have made of both?—I have seen free labour at work, and I have seen the effect of forced labour. I do not speak of what a man can actually do; but I am perfectly sure that in the tropical climates no free man will, of his own good-will, exert himself to the extent that a slave is forced to do.

3889. But I understood you to make the whole difference with regard to the future prosperity of our colonies to depend upon whether the labour is free or forced, when you compared our own colonies with other colonies in which slave labour existed?—I think it is painful to reflect that the Brazils are allowed to continue the supply of their slaves, and to make the quantity of sugar that that country is capable of making from that large supply of slaves; and it is a sad reflection to imagine what is to become of our sugar-producing colonies, and I do not see how we can meet the present state of things without some check is placed on slave produce.

3890. Do you consider that that is a distinct advantage which the Spanish colonies have over us, that they have forced labour, whilst we have free labour?—Yes; there are other matters which affect the economy of their position, but of those I am not a judge.

3891. Do you know anything of those colonies?—I know from hearing gentlemen who have visited them converse respecting them, but I have never been there.

3892. Have you ever had opportunities of knowing the difference of soil between Cuba and some of our colonies?—I have heard a good deal of it. I understand that there is in Cuba an abundance of new soil, and that it is not their habit to cultivate old land; but that they remove their moderate establishments for the purpose of cultivating new land, the land there being so cheap.

3893. Do not you suppose that that is a much greater distinction between two countries than the labour?—I think we have a splendid soil in the Mauritius; some of our land is magnificent.

3894. Do you think it is equal to Cuba?—I think it is. I have heard it talked of in comparison, and from what parties who take an interest in the matter have stated, I believe it to be equal to the soil in Cuba.

3895. Do you proceed in the Mauritius in the same way as they do in Cuba, leaving the old lands, and cultivating new lands?—Our lands are far too costly to permit us to do that; and we have expensive establishments raised up, the work of years; but in Cuba the greater portion of their establishments are lightly constructed, and the expense of removal is very small.

3896. Then that is a great distinction, with respect to the sugar cultivation, to your disadvantage in the Mauritius when compared with Cuba?—With regard to the soil I should be much inclined to think ours is the best.

3897. But as regards the mode of cultivation they have an advantage?—Yes; they have the land at a lower rate.

3898. In comparing the cost of production, is not that a material element?—But I have not calculated the interest upon capital; the cost of production which I stated of 18 l. a ton is the absolute cash cost of production. I throw aside the capital invested; I do not mention it.

3899. Supposing you were to mention it, and supposing that the land in the Mauritius could be got at no rent, and if that could be cultivated with as great advantage as in Cuba, would it not make a great difference in the expense to the planter?—I think it would.

3900. Are you prepared to say that, in that case, if you had not forced labour in the Mauritius you could compete with any colonies having forced labour?—With the enactments which we hope to see established, I should say decidedly, yes. I know no reason why we should not.

3901. Notwithstanding there are differences in the circumstances in which they cultivate land in the Mauritius and in other countries, you think that forced labour

labour is the only material difference?—I think it is the main and essential difference; I think the character of our merchants and the energy that they display would remedy that evil, as compared with those Spanish colonies.

Mr. E. Chopman.

24. February 1848.

3902. At the same time you have never made a calculation of what advantage the Spanish colonies have?—I do not like to say that I have, from my own knowledge, because I do not derive it from my own actual observation, but I feel myself perfectly conversant with it from having heard others speak of it.

3903. But you have never made a calculation of what their outgoings are?—I have not.

3904. How then can you compare the circumstances under which they cultivate sugar with the circumstances under which you cultivate it?—Because we, who have been accustomed all our lives to the cultivation of sugar, can tell what their expense must be, giving them all the advantages of a new country and slave labour.

3905. Supposing a country were very much nearer to England, which is the market of sugar, than the Mauritius, would not that make a difference in the cost of bringing sugar to the market?—It might make a difference.

3906. If the freights are much less, is not that another item?—Of course it is; but it is not practically so, for we get our freights nearly as cheap as they get them from the Spanish colonies.

3907. If your freights were lower would it not be an advantage to you?—Yes.

3908. Then there are many items of cost besides the labour that you have to calculate?—There are not many other items; there is some difference in the freight.

3909. Have you ever made a precise calculation, as regards the Mauritius, of the difference in the cost between forced labour such as it used to be in the Mauritius before 1843, and free labour?—I have made a calculation as nearly as I could.

3910. Can you state what it is, taking the expense of cultivating a sugar estate now, as compared with the cultivation of the same estate before?—I should say the difference in the cost of production was between 40 and 50 per cent.

3911. That is the loss of labour under the present system that you used not to lose under the old system?—Yes.

3912. If you had in the Mauritius better vagrant laws and better regulations with respect to labour, the loss would not be so great?—No. I have already said that it is in the power of Government, without the sacrifice of any great principle, to arrest the evil and to restore us to prosperity.

3913. That difference is not between slave labour and free labour, but between slave labour and labour under the defective laws which now exist in the Mauritius?—We none of us, I believe, wish to see slave labour restored to us, but we wish to see a sound system of contract service.

3914. You stated that there was a difference of 40 or 50 per cent. between forced labour and the present system of free labour in the Mauritius; that arises from the defective regulations with regard to vagrancy and with respect to labour?—I should say very much so; that is, supposing the whole of the regulations and the administration of the law with regard to labour to be put on a proper footing.

3915. Supposing you had such vagrant laws as you think required in the island of Mauritius, what would be the difference between the cost of slave labour and of free labour under that state of things?—Those regulations, I apprehend, would give authority to continue the contract of service made in their own country with labourers, for a longer period than one year, extending to five years.

3916. But if those regulations were made, what would be the difference between the cost of slave labour and of free labour?—There would be still a difference between them, for which I should hope to see the colony protected to a certain extent.

3917. Can you give us an estimate of what loss would arise in such a case?—I should be afraid to say, but we should bring ourselves then very nearly within the cost of production of the slave colonies; we should still be placed at a positive disadvantage as compared with slave planters. I have, therefore, a right to claim that we should be placed, by a moderate protection, on an equality with them. I do not mean to say that we should cultivate our sugar by slave labour,

Mr. E. Chapman.
24 February 1848.

because that does not enter into the mind of any sugar cultivator in the Mauritius.

3918. Do you then conceive that with the great advantages conferred upon you which you do not enjoy now, after you had those regulations in force in the island which you require, you would be in as good a position as the slave planters in the Spanish colonies?—I think we should be in an excellent position, and one that it would be satisfactory for this country to dwell upon.

3919. You have no want of labour in the Mauritius?—If the labour we have there were brought into action it would be abundant, but we are introducing labour at a great expense, by votes of Council, because we cannot make the labour we have there applicable; for it is the greatest possible pity that, with the great number of men we have in the island, their labour is not made available by regulations made for that purpose.

3920. Is there any difference in the island with reference to the opinions you have now expressed?—I do not think there is. I have been a member of associations in the island, and I do not think there is any difference of opinion between us.

3921. Is there a difference of opinion between the island and the Colonial Office upon the subject?—There has been some difference of opinion; we proposed a regulation with reference to the extension of engagements; we have not received any positive refusal of that from the Colonial Office, but I do not think it has been favourably considered.

3922. The Colonial Office has considered some of the proposals of the island, and determined in favour of them, has it not?—I know nothing except the order which has gone out for the reduction of the registration dues; despatches have been recently sent. That there has been a disposition to meet the colonists in their views, we do not doubt.

3923. The bank established in the Mauritius is an advantage, is it not?—Yes; it is merely a bank for making loans secured upon produce.

3924. You are in frequent negotiation with the Colonial Office?—Yes, the association of which I am a member is in frequent negotiation with the Colonial Office.

3925. You have no reason to despair of getting the arrangements which you would wish introduced into the colony, which would enable the colony to prosper?—I should be afraid to say that, for hitherto nothing has been done; we have been entreating for assistance, and have had no practical relief; we are, I may fairly say, promised it, and such is the intention of Government, but it comes very slowly.

3926. I believe Government takes all the sugar that is offered to it?—They advance 9 *l.* a ton upon all the sugar that comes to the disposal of the commissioner whom they have sent out.

3927. That has come into operation?—Yes, the commissioner left England three months ago.

3928. And that is not confined to any one class of planters?—No, it is only confined to reasonably good sugars; it is a measure intended for the general good of the island.

3929. *Chairman.*] Mr. Milner Gibson examined you at great length, and tried to ascertain from you how it was that in 1847, you, I mean the whole island of the Mauritius, had not upon the aggregate increased your profits 98,776 *l.*?—I confess I was unable to understand the reasoning of the Honourable Member.

3930. I think Mr. Milner Gibson used this argument: that in 1846 you produced 845,198 cwts. of sugar at 32 *s.* 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.*, whilst in 1847 you produced a much larger quantity of sugar, 1,194,047 cwts. of sugar, which you sold at 24 *s.* 5 *d.*; and after calculating the value by the increased produce, but with a diminished price, he made out that the sum total which you got from your sugar in 1847 was 1,462,656 *l.* against 1,363,880 *l.* in 1846, showing an increase in the gross value of your sugar in 1847 of 98,776 *l.*; and Mr. Milner Gibson was entirely at a loss to understand how it could be, upon the face of these figures, that the Mauritius made a more losing trade in 1847 than they made in 1846. The question I have to ask you is this: whether Mr. Milner Gibson did not leave entirely out of his calculation, first of all, the export duty and other charges on board, amounting as you stated to 2 *l.* a ton, and also charges amounting to 10 *l.* in London upon 17,442 tons, the increased produce of 1847 as compared with

1846, which would make 174,920 *l.*; and whether he did not altogether leave out of his calculation the freight, insurances, and charges upon that increased quantity of 17,442 tons, amounting to 18 *l.* a ton, which, estimated upon 17,442 tons, gives 313,956 *l.*, making a sum total of 488,376 *l.*, which he forgot to account for, being the extra charges after the sugar had left the factory, and which are to be deducted from the imagined profit of 98,776 *l.*; is that so?—That is the case.

Mr. E. Chapman.

24 February 1848.

3931. How much does that leave you a loser?—£. 389,600, as compared with the previous year.

3932. What number of estates did you say you had under your charge altogether in 1834?—In 1834 I cannot tell precisely; it has been more or less in number according to different seasons; in 1834 the number was less, about 14 or 15; now we have about 18 or 20.

3933. Do you not consider it very important for the labourers of Mauritius that the cultivation of the sugar estates should continue?—At the present moment, if the cultivation of sugar in the Mauritius is discontinued, I do not know what would become of a large portion of the population, because it would be the ruin of the whole colony; the ruin would not be confined to one class, but extend to the whole colony.

3934. Do not you apprehend that the Government would have to maintain the labourers in the Mauritius?—I can imagine no other result but that, the colony being deprived of its last resource; for I consider that the whole means of support of the Mauritius is derived from the cultivation of sugar estates, directly or indirectly.

3935. The population rely for their subsistence upon imported food?—Entirely.

3936. Would they not be starved to death if the Government did not feed them?—So the Government appear to think, for they have already ordered provisions to be sent, anticipating a short supply if certain events happen.

3937. But what is your own opinion upon that?—I think it is self-evident that they must starve; they would be in a state of complete misery and of want of the necessaries of life.

3938. The result is, that if a reduced price of sugar should throw the Mauritius out of cultivation, the expense of maintaining her population must fall upon the Government of this country in a great degree?—There is not a doubt of it.

3939. Will you state what the common rate of interest in the Mauritius is?—It varies from six to nine per cent.

3940. The sugar crop is almost the entire export crop of the Mauritius?—I may say entirely; we have nothing else exported.

3941. You export little or no rum?—Very little.

3942. What is the reason that you manufacture no rum in the Mauritius?—At the present moment we are prevented from entering upon it by the excise duty imposed upon the stills.

3943. That is a duty imposed by Government?—Yes.

3944. Is it 300 *l.* upon every still?—Yes, it is 300 *l.* for every still that opens its works.

3945. If there were no duty upon stills, would there be anything to prevent your manufacturing rum to the same extent that it is manufactured in other sugar colonies?—I think we should manufacture rum very largely. The market for our second quality of sugar is now very much taken from us, and I think that the planters in the Mauritius for the future would convert their molasses into spirits to greater advantage a great deal than making the low qualities of syrup sugar.

3946. In your statement in answer to Mr. Miles, of the expenses of particular estates, you omitted to state what was the price of cattle and mules?—The average price of mules with us is about 40 *l.*, and the Creole bullocks are valued at 16 *l.* a piece.

3947. Are they maintained upon imported food?—The bullocks are not, they are maintained upon the pasturage of the island; but the mules are entirely fed upon imported food.

3948. What do you estimate to be the annual cost of the food of a mule in the island?—They cost, as nearly as possible, 1 *l.* a month each; 12 *l.* a year. On some estates it is as high as 18 *l.*, and on some as low as 12 *l.*; but it depends upon the extent of pasturage. There is a certain quantity of pasturage attached to all the estates, and they turn them out upon the pasturage.

1 Mr. E. Chapman.
 24 February 1848.

3949. Mr. *Wilson*.] You do not include the cost of pasturage in that 12*l.* per annum?—No. We lost the whole of our cattle three or four years since by an epidemic disease, and we were driven to employ mules upon every estate in the island, and that has increased the expense of our production very much.

3950. *Chairman*.] Your mules are imported from France?—From Nantz; what is called the Poitou mule.

3951. Can you explain how it comes about that French wine is not permitted to be exported from France to the Mauritius in French bottoms?—That is part of the Navigation Laws; but it comes into Bourbon, and then it comes up in British vessels from Bourbon to the Mauritius.

3952. Wine is the only thing that cannot come in French bottoms?—No, the produce of France generally cannot come into Mauritius in French bottoms.

3953. You said that there were many thousand people who were living in the island of Mauritius without any honest means of getting their livelihood?—Yes, but all of those obtain their existence, directly or indirectly, from the planters and from the cultivation of sugar; it is a notorious fact, that at all events, what employment they do get, and the means of existence that they get, are derived more or less from the general means of existence in the colony, which is dependent upon the sugar estates. A great many of them frequent the towns during a certain part of the day, or on certain days of the week, and get employment on the wharfs and fishing boats; and a great many live by cutting grass on Government grounds, and in the neighbourhood of Port Louis, and selling it in the market, using the privilege of going upon the Government domains; and numbers go into the mountains and steal firewood, and sell it, which is an illicit trade, and yet they are never interfered with.

3954. Mr. *Wilson*.] If sugar cultivation was discontinued there would be a strong tendency in the Coolies to return to India; and in fact they are constantly returning, and no fresh Coolies would be brought?—The emigration would be at the charge of the Government in carrying them back to India.

3955. *Chairman*.] How would the colony be able to bear the expense of carrying back those Coolies to India if the island itself were to go out of cultivation?—I think the cessation of the sugar cultivation is synonymous with an empty treasury; I think they would have to draw upon London for the expenses.

3956. Mr. *Wilson*.] Was there not a recent order sent out by Government to repeal the duty on stills?—We had imagined that the order was sent out to repeal the duty, but on communication with the Colonial Office we found that there was no distinct order to repeal it, but only to consider it.

3957. Does this duty of 300*l.* apply to every still?—Yes; the duty is imposed before the still is open. The custom of the excise officer is to go round and put a seal upon the still; and before you can work that still you must pay the 300*l.*

3958. How long has the tax been in existence?—It was enacted in 1846. Sir William Gomm considered, and very properly, that it was very desirable to stop the illicit manufacture of spirits in the colony, especially in the case of small planters, who supplied their spirits to the Indians. It created great disorder in the colony, and therefore they put a heavy tax, thinking that the larger estates only in that case could use stills, and that it would be out of the means of smaller planters to pay 300*l.* before they commenced to manufacture rum.

3959. Then it was done in order to confine the manufacture of rum to large estates?—Yes, that was the object of the law, but practically it has shut up most of the stills in the colony.

3960. *Chairman*.] Do you know how many stills it has shut up?—I know that not one of the estates that I have an interest in has a still at work now; and we have a still upon almost every estate.

3961. Mr. *Wilson*.] Do you know what revenue that duty yields?—I am not aware.

3962. Do not you stand very favourably to the Australian colonies for the supply of rum if you could manufacture it with advantage?—I think we do; at present they import the whole of their rum from England.

3963. There is a large importation of rum into those colonies, is there not?—Yes; I look upon the manufacture of rum for the future as an important feature in the cultivation of the Mauritius.

3964. In your opinion the Committee could not hesitate to recommend the repeal of the duty on stills in the island?—No.

3965. There

3965. There is no moral or commercial reason for the continuance of that duty?—My opinion has always been, that whilst every difficulty should be placed in the way of retailing small quantities of spirits in the colony, every facility should be given to the exportation of spirits.

Mr. E. Chapman.

24 February 1848.

3966. Supposing you had no check upon stills, and that stills of any size could be used by the small planters and others, do you see any possibility of preventing the sale of that rum in retail to the natives?—Yes; suggestions had been made by the Excise Office, in London, of stills, upon the principle of ascertaining the quantity of liquor as it flows from the still itself, and that it should be so confined that it could not be taken out, except in the presence of an excise officer.

3967. You would require a system of excise to carry that out?—You require now an active system of excise.

3968. It would be a great restriction upon the manufacturer?—Yes; but if that were done in a proper manner, the expense of it would be light as compared with the advantage to be derived from it.

3969. The former state of things was a serious evil?—We were in a sad state from the excessive inebriety of the working classes.

3970. *Chairman.*] Before this law was put in force of levying 300 *l.* upon any still, were you able to export rum?—We were; we had commenced distilling on all our estates, but the consumption of rum in the colony has been very great; we have consumed for the most part what we have made.

3971. Then you, in point of fact, considered that the disadvantage of a drunken population was greater than even the loss of the sale of your rum?—At that time there was an impression upon the public mind in the Mauritius, that it was necessary to take some measures to prevent that drunkenness.

3972. Would not a high licence upon every spirit-shop have had a much better effect than a high licence upon the stills?—There is no doubt of it; or any measure calculated to check the retailing of spirits, at the same time accompanied with every facility for manufacturing spirits for export.

3973. *Mr. Wilson.*] If there were no check upon the manufacture of spirits, would a high licence upon the retail of spirits be sufficient?—The two must go together.

3974. Would not a regulation of this kind operate very much, that you should not have a still below a certain size?—That was thought of; but the difficulty might be easily solved by having one man in charge of three or four stills, who would visit them every day, or twice a day, and the owners of those stills would be charged with the expense of that officer; that would be a trifling tax as compared with the present expense.

3975. Have you any excise system at present?—Yes; an extremely expensive one.

3976. For what purpose?—For the purpose of watching those stills; those that do not work as well as those which do.

3977. If it were illegal to use a still below a certain size, if you discovered a small still it would be evidence of illicit trade?—Yes; but a still must be in proportion to the size of the estate; it is useless to have a large still on a small estate.

3978. What would you say to a 50-gallon still?—A 50-gallon still is capable of doing a great quantity of work; we have some smaller still, and some larger. I think that is about the usual size.

3979. *Mr. Moffatt.*] Is there much illicit distillation going on in the island of Mauritius?—I do not think there is, but they make a great deal of spirits, and instead of passing them through the bonded warehouses they are retailed among the people. They make the spirits, and under various declarations, and so forth, they get those spirits into consumption in a way that they ought not to do.

3980. There is no duty upon the spirits going into consumption?—I think there is none.

3981. Do you know what the export of rum was last year?—No, but it was very small.

Sabbati, 26^o die Februarii, 1848.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Lord George Bentinck.
Sir Edward Buxton.
Mr. Gibson.
Mr. Hope.
Mr. Matheson.

Mr. Miles.
Mr. Moffatt.
Mr. Villiers.
Mr. Wilson.

LORD GEORGE BENTINCK, IN THE CHAIR.

Sir *George Gerard de Hochepied Larpent*, Bart., called in; and Examined.

Sir
C.G. de H. Larpent,
Bart.

3982. *Chairman.*] YOU are a Proprietor of Estates in the Mauritius?—I am one of the proprietors of estates in the Mauritius, consisting of about 3,787 acres, of which 1,500 are under cultivation of the cane.

26 February 1848.

3983. Will you state the details of your property?—The property was valued in the year 1844–45 by our agent there, at our express request, at about 490,440 dollars; it was afterwards reduced in the year 1846 by 50,000 dollars, leaving 440,000 dollars, which at 4 s. a dollar I calculate to be about 90,000*l.* In a recent estimate of our assets, it was taken by us at about 75,000*l.* We first came into possession of this property in the year 1834; at that time the apprenticeship system was commencing, we having received for the slaves we had upon the property under 30*l.* each, the calculation of the value of the slave being at that time I believe 69*l.* From our Indian connexions we expected to be able to supply cheap labour from India, either from Bombay or Calcutta. Under the Order in Council in the Mauritius, dated November 1835, we commenced the importation of Coolies from Bombay and Calcutta; we did import labourers, and the first importation was on the 27th of October 1836. In July 1838 the importation of the Coolies was prohibited by Parliament. Apprenticeship expired the 1st of April 1839, and consequently the supply of labour was very much reduced upon our estates. Such was the effect upon properties in the Mauritius, that in the year 1840 a committee was established in the Mauritius for the purpose of endeavouring to persuade Parliament and the Government to allow the introduction of Coolies. The chairman of that committee I believe was Mr. Dick, the secretary of the government; and parties were deputed to this country to endeavour to make an arrangement satisfactory to all. The result was that an Order in Council, I believe in January 1842, was issued, permitting the importation of Coolies under certain restrictions, under the authority of Parliament; the restrictions, however, were so great, that this did not work well. There certainly was a greater inclination to support the apprentices than to support the masters who employed them. The consequence was, that, in point of fact, the restrictions of which complaint was made were not practically removed till January 1843, and the result of that intermission of an adequate supply of labour was most ruinous to all parties. When we first had the properties in the years 1834–35, the produce might be estimated at somewhere about 400 tons. A good deal of money was required to place the property in a proper state: a supply of adequate machinery was necessary, and we calculated the produce to be about 400 tons, expecting that we should considerably raise that amount of produce. We did successfully raise part of it under the importation of the Coolies, and got near upon 600 tons in the crop of 1837–38; but afterwards, from the circumstances which I have mentioned, an inadequate supply of labour, the produce dropped to 360 tons; the losses were so great upon the properties, that we have ultimately written off upon the accounts of those properties a sum of not less than 95,000*l.* of losses upon them.

3984. Within these few years?—Taking it as a whole, we wrote it off in 1844–45. When the arrangements for the introduction of the Coolies, which I alluded to, in January 1843, were made, and the supply of labour was increased, we also increased the outlay of our capital; and the result was that the produce gradually increased also, and the returns to the estate were from 600 to 800 tons; and in last year, 1846–47, not less than 1,100 tons of sugar; that would have paid us interest upon the capital expended, assuming that to be somewhere about 100,000*l.*, had not the price fallen so greatly in the year 1846–47.

1846-47. The result has been an additional loss, and the difficulty now is to know by what means those estates can be hereafter cultivated with any hope of a successful result, or so as to avoid the abandonment of the property.

Sir
G.G. de H. Larpent,
Bart.

3985. Do you estimate the average fall in the price of sugar consequent upon the introduction of slave-labour sugar, at 10 l. and upwards a ton?—I am bound fairly to state that many concurrent causes, perhaps, led to the fall in the price of sugar; but I have also no doubt that the protection upon which we calculated, when we laid out our capital in those estates, has not been actually sufficient to enable us to get the return which we might reasonably have expected. There is no doubt other circumstances, such as the increased production of sugar elsewhere, the increased production of sugar in the Mauritius itself, and the difficulties of the markets in Europe, and in England especially, may have led to a greater fall; but at the same time I do think that the consequence of the alteration of the law has been to increase the quantity of foreign sugar; and by increasing the quantity of foreign sugar in this market, to have had a considerable effect, though not the entire effect, in reducing the price of sugar in our market.

26 February 1848.

3986. The Committee may probably assume that the difference in the operation of general circumstances upon the price of slave-labour sugar, and of Mauritius sugar, may be taken as a depreciation for which the Act of 1846 is wholly chargeable. If it should appear that slave-labour sugar has fully maintained its price, and Mauritius sugar has fallen from 10 s. to 12 s. per cwt., the Committee may assume that that difference in the operation of general circumstances upon slave-labour sugar, as compared with Mauritius sugar, is entirely owing to the Act of 1846?—In confirmation of that view I have before me the comparative prices of West India average brown sugar, paying 14 s. duty, and Havanna yellow sugar. In the year 1846, in May, the West India sugar, compared with the Havanna sugar, was 36 s. and Havanna was 24 s. I have every month's prices here of both, down to the last, in January 1848 and in February 1848, at which time West India was 23 s. and Havanna 24 s., West India 24 s. and Havanna 24 s.; so that that which assumed a difference in May 1846 of not less than 12 s., has become equal, in one instance 1 s. less, in January and February 1848.

[The following Comparative Statement was delivered in by the Witness:]

COMPARATIVE PRICES.

West India Average Brown, paying 14 s.; Havanna, fine Yellow, 20 s.

1846:		s.	1847:		s.
May	West India	36	April	West India	34
	Havanna	24		Havanna	30
June	West India	35	May	West India	31
	Havanna	24		Havanna	28
July	West India	34	June	West India	28
	Havanna	26		Havanna	27
August	West India	32	July	West India	26
	Havanna	26		Havanna	27
September	West India	33	August	West India	26
	Havanna	26		Havanna	26
October	West India, fall of 4 s.	32	September	West India	26
	Havanna, rise of 6 s.	31		Havanna	26
November	West India	32	October	West India	25
	Havanna	31		Havanna	25
December	West India	31	November	West India, fall of 13 s.	22
	Havanna	31		Havanna, rise of 1 s.	25
1847:			December	West India, fall of 12 s.	23
January	West India	35		Havanna, even	24
	Havanna	33	1848:		
February	West India	34	January	West India	23
	Havanna	30		Havanna	24
March	West India	34	February	West India	24
	Havanna	30		Havanna	24

Sir
G. G. de H. Larpent,
Bart.

26 February 1848.

3987. There can be no doubt of what has created that difference?—I have samples here of those qualities of sugar, that a fair comparison may be instituted between them (*producing the same*).

3988. The result of this is, that in June, the month immediately preceding the passing of the Act, the price of West India sugar was 35 s., and in January last it was 23 s.; so that West India sugar has fallen 12 s. a cwt., and Havanna sugar maintains its price?—The Table will show that result.

3989. In point of fact, between June and December 1846, the Table shows that Havanna sugar rose 7 s. per cwt., and West India sugar fell 4 s.?—I believe the Table will show that.

3990. Therefore taking the difference to be 12 l. a ton, the difference in the value of the produce of your estates would be 13,200 l. upon 1,100 tons?—Upon the value of the property. I would say that, taking the cost of production at 20 s., and the freight and charges at 7 s., if we had a price at all corresponding to the prices we had before the fall in West India sugar compared with Havanna sugar, we could pay from 4 ½ to 5 per cent. interest upon the capital I have stated to be the value of the estate; whereas it does not pay us any interest, but leaves us a loss, indeed a considerable loss.

3991. You waited some time last month, in company with others, upon Lord John Russell, Lord Grey, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, did not you?—I did.

3992. What statement did you make to them?—I stated to them what was pretty well known, that upon general principles I was a strong advocate for free trade, but that, as I understood those principles of free trade, they meant that the producer should be as free as either the distributor or the consumer of the produce; that I felt that while he was not in possession of the cheapest mode of producing, he did not stand in a fair position with those who did enjoy that cheapest instrument of production; that however it might be thought, and in that thought I shared, that slave-labour would ultimately prove to be dearer than free-labour, yet I felt, from what I had heard, that there could be little or no doubt that from the manner in which slave-labour was obtained and exercised in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies, as compared with the manner in which free labour was allowed to be exercised in the Mauritius, with all the restrictions and all the preferences given to the workmen over the master, in point of fact the instrument with which we work in the Mauritius was not the cheapest instrument, and consequently our case should be taken out of the category of free trade; that if it had been otherwise, so firmly was I impressed with the soundness of the principles of free trade, I should not have hesitated in at once saying "I abandon the cause altogether," but that I saw in this a total departure from what I considered to be the main foundation of the principles of free trade; that we did not possess the instrument of work which the others did, therefore unless you countervailed that disadvantage, our ruin was certain; that whether that was the case or not, we had under the sanction of the Legislature embarked our capital, and were to receive for that a certain protection, which was assumed to be the rule upon which legislation would proceed; and that without giving us some time to remove that capital, after having obstructed us in obtaining labour for so many years, from 1838 to 1842, we found ourselves without that protection upon which we might have relied. Whether protection was wise or foolish was not our affair, but we had a right to act upon what was then supposed to be the opinion of the Legislature, which should not have been departed from without giving compensation to us, or putting us in a position to recover those losses which we had suffered from the departure of the Legislature from those principles.

3993. Did you represent to Lord John Russell the special situation of the Mauritius and its population?—I stated that it was quite a matter of notoriety that the bulk of the inhabitants of the Mauritius were French; that, what was not perhaps the same in our other colonies, many of the planters residing upon their properties were of French origin, and had still continued their affections and attachment to France. I spoke from hearsay, because I had never been there, but I felt that while Bourbon had the protection which the Mauritius was in course of being deprived of, the Mauritius might reasonably and fairly look with some degree of discontent to the acts of the Legislature which placed Bourbon in a more favourable position. I believe the Bourbon protection to be about 10 s. a cwt. That being the case, I stated that you could

could not expect planters of French origin, severed from France by conquest, seeing a neighbouring island in the situation of Bourbon, would not feel that they were in some degree injured; that it was quite notorious that during the war, before the conquest of the Mauritius, it was a nest of privateers which had done great damage to our trade in India; that such circumstances might arise again, or they might be prevented only by a large military force; that that military force must be kept up at the expense of the mother country, for by the mode in which the commerce of the Mauritius had been recently carried on, the whole colonial revenue, which gave a considerable surplus some years back, had been absorbed altogether, and that the military defences of the island must rest upon the mother country; that under those circumstances I thought, whether they maintained the same opinion, which they might do, as to the expediency of granting protection or not as an economical question, there could be little doubt but that the alternative was, that the island of Mauritius, if it could not support itself by the manufacture of its staple production sugar, would be in almost a state of utter dissolution. I stated that that was the view entertained by those who were most conversant with the state of the island, and that therefore you had the alternative, either of violating whatever might be considered your principles in an economical point of view, or leaving this settlement exposed as it were, and also putting a great burden upon the finances of the country. I venture to state that as a matter of opinion only, not having been in the island myself.

Sir
G. G. de H. Larpent,
Bart.

26 February 1848.

3994. You also stated to Lord John Russell that the nominal existing protective duty between Cuba sugars and Mauritius sugars were, in point of fact, a complete delusion?—I stated that I had been informed upon what I had believed to be competent authority, and I think the samples I have produced will bear out the fact, that one cwt. of Cuba sugar yielded 102 lbs. of white saccharine matter, while Demerara sugar yielded only 84 lbs., and that therefore the 20*s.* protection against the 14*s.* was rendered by that means nugatory; the analogy I introduced was that with Demerara sugar. That is a matter which persons conversant with the article as brokers would give more correct information upon than I can possibly do.

3995. But you know that it is the general opinion of the trade that such is the case?—So far as I was the mouthpiece of those parties who desired me to make the statement; I was authorized to make it upon the authority of persons upon whom I place confidence as to the accuracy of their information.

3996. Sir *E. Buxton.*] You stated that you received compensation for slaves; how many slaves were there upon the estate at the time?—We have now upon the estate 895 labourers; in 1844–45 the crop was made with that number of labourers.

3997. Can you furnish the Committee with the number of slaves you received compensation for, and the number of effective slaves among them?—The number of slaves for which we received compensation was 382; we have no returns as to their effectiveness.

3998. You said, in the course of 1844–45 you wrote off a loss of 95,000 *l.*; which loss was, of course, before the Bill of 1846 was thought of?—Certainly altogether before that time; it was written off in 1845.

3999. So that the estate had been unprofitable before the Bill of 1846 was brought in?—I think the estates were rendered unprofitable by the circumstances I have mentioned; namely, our having been deprived of labour, by legislative enactments, from 1838 and 1839, when we were prohibited from importing Coolies; and when apprenticeship expired: those two main circumstances occasioned great losses upon that property by reducing the quantity made; and I should remark here, that on properties such as estates in tropical climates, you are obliged to keep up the whole machinery and to continue the cultivation of the estates at almost any expense, to prevent their going into total ruin; such is the power of vegetation.

4000. Will you give the Committee the profit or loss upon each year since you had this estate?—I am not sure that I can give it very accurately. There is one circumstance which ought always to be mentioned, in taking the profit and loss upon estates of this kind; which is, that you lay out a great deal of capital, and it is difficult to know whether the returns for that capital ought to

Sir
G.G. de H. Larpent,
Bart.

26 February 1848.

be spread over any given number of years: for instance, a certain amount of dollars may be spent in what may be called the production of the crop of 1841-42, but a considerable portion of that may be considered as plant; and in a tropical climate, in the production of sugar, it is not till the third or fourth year that the effect of your capital can be shown by the increased quantity of sugar: but I think I have correctly shown, that while we were deprived of that labour, our quantity of produce was diminished to the lowest point; that upon every successive improvement in the mode by which we could obtain labour, the produce increased; and it was the difference between that increase and the outlay, which gave us either a profit or a loss; because in the calculation which I have of the cost of production, I find that one-half is labour. In the expenses of our estates in the year 1844-45, I find that, out of 110,000 dollars expended on everything, local, permanent, and everything else, not less than 50,895 dollars was for labour; so that half of the whole expense of the crop may be considered to be for labour, and that is the great element which affects the result in every part.

4001. If you can give the Committee the total amount of profit of sugar, or the total amount of loss, between 1834 and 1845, it will be valuable?—In managing these properties we charged interest upon the capital, but finding the interest was merely nominal, we wrote it all off in this 95,000*l.* As the estates belonged to parties with different interests, and became more like the private property of partners, each having a different share, than one property belonging to the house, we charged commission upon the sales; but as we found it to be perfectly visionary, we wrote it all off. We have never aggravated the value of those estates in our books, but met fully every possible loss upon them by writing off to the extent of 95,000*l.*, leaving the amount upon our books of the value of those estates in accordance with the exact value we have from our manager, a most highly respectable and intelligent man, sent to us as late as 1846; which in the estimate of our assets I have reduced from 90,000*l.* to 75,000*l.*

4002. Up to 1845 there had been a great loss upon the whole?—If it is meant to throw the whole loss we have sustained upon the Act of 1846, I repudiate the assertion altogether; I put the case in this way: in the year 1846, when I was working those estates under the certainty as I expected of protection, I got the quantity up to 1,100 tons per annum, by the increased labour and outlay of my capital; and if I had got a reasonable price for that, which I contend I should have done had not there been another element of loss introduced, namely, slave sugars, I should have had a return for my capital, and my estates would have been worth a great deal more for sale than they are at the present moment.

4003. What price do you think would have been sufficient, then, to have enabled you to cultivate those estates profitably?—Taking the cost of cultivation at 20*s.*, and the freight and charges at 7*s.*, and the interest upon 100,000*l.* at five per cent., I should say from 30*s.* to 33*s.* would have probably paid me a return.

4004. Are you acquainted with the other estates in the Mauritius?—No; we acquired our estates, and held them as private property. I have no other concerns with the Mauritius whatever.

4005. Do you know whether any other estates in the Mauritius were profitable?—I know nothing but general hearsay from others engaged there, and in the correspondence we have.

4006. Do you suppose, if there were an entire protection from foreign sugar, in the long run the Mauritius could compete with India?—Certainly. I have stated in a very long examination which I had in the year 1840, before both the House of Lords and the House of Commons, upon the petition of the East India trade and the East India Company, my opinion very fully as to sugar from India. I consider it will never come here in any large quantity unless you have high prices here. India is a great sugar consuming country; the average price for a series of years, in India, has not been less at Calcutta than nine rupees a maund, and it requires a high price in this country to enable them to pay. The equalization of duties in 1836 became profitable solely because the quantity from the West Indies had during that period greatly declined;

declined; from 200,000 tons I think in the year 1831, to 110,000 in 1840 and 1841. It was that which gave an impulse to India, and a profit to India; but unless a great alteration be made in India, it is nothing but a high price of sugar here that can lead to a profitable exportation from India: the price of sugar has hitherto been such, in Calcutta, as to preclude any exportation except at a high price in England, unless it be for the purpose of dead weight. It was the concurrence of various circumstances which made the equalization of duties in 1836 very profitable to India, which induced an extended cultivation by the application of European and native labour and machinery, and which would not have occurred unless there had been such a different state of circumstances as to influence prices at home.

4007. How did it happen then, if the West India colonies could compete so well with India, that there had always been a differential duty against India till 1835?—At the time I mentioned the quantity from the West Indies had so much diminished that there was a positive deficiency of sugar, and consequently a high price, and it was then that we came in with our India sugar. I stated in my evidence then, and I have a synopsis of that evidence then given, that “while there was an abundant supply of West India sugar, the equalization of the duties was a matter of comparatively little importance to India, except in regard to the trade in dead weight, as nothing but a high price would make sugar an article of large export from that country. But when, instead of a surplus in the West Indies, there arose a deficiency, the equalization of the duties became a matter of the utmost importance, both to India and to the consumer at home. The continued reduction of the supply from the West Indies, without a corresponding increase from India, will produce clamour on the part of the consumers, and must lead to the introduction or an attempt at the introduction of the Brazil and Cuba sugars, which would stultify all our proceedings with respect to the slave trade. It is the duty which precludes the consumption of those sugars, and the price must rise largely before they could be introduced; but if the deficiency be not supplied from India, it would be almost an inevitable result that we must supply it from countries where sugar is the produce of slave labour. Part of the sugar now refined and in bond for exportation is from Brazil and Porto Rico, consequently the produce of slave labour.” The view I then took has been confirmed by what has taken place since; the quantity from India has not increased to that overwhelming amount which was predicted at the time. I think that the then Chancellor of the Exchequer deprecated an immediate equalization of the duty, upon the ground that sugar would be poured into this country in such large quantities; and our only answer was, that there was not freight enough in India to bring it. You will find that the whole was visionary, as to any great and extended quantity beyond the amount which we have seen in these last few years.

4008. You said you were injured by the importation of Coolies having been prevented in 1838?—Yes.

4009. Do you know what it was that led to the alteration of the system?—There were statements made to the East India Company through the Government, I believe, which expressed an idea that improper practices had taken place. I do not wish to speak in the slightest degree offensively, but there was a morbid sensibility with regard to introducing labourers for sugar plantations, supposing that they would be treated as slaves, which I think was not justified; and it was a disgrace to the Government of India, and to the Government of the Mauritius, if means could not have been taken to have prevented the improper obtaining of persons to go as labourers to the Mauritius, and of protecting them while they were there. I have always thought that there was a great deal more made of the objections than the circumstances justified, but of course that was the ground upon which the interdiction was made.

4010. The Government and Parliament agreed in that, did not they?—The Government and Parliament agreed in it.

4011. You have stated that we cannot compete with Cuba or the slave-trade colonies under present circumstances; by that, do you mean that we must either have protection or slavery?—One of the causes which have led to the great losses of the Mauritius, I conceive to be the increased production of slave colonies and countries. The general price of sugar in the market is very

Sir
G. G. de H. Larpent,
Bart.

26 February 1848.

Sir
G. G. de H. Larpent,
 Bart.
 16 February 1848.

materially influenced by the amount obtained from those places: for instance, in a statement recently given to the public by the "Economist," we see that the amount of sugar from Cuba and from Porto Rico is put down for the year 1848 at no less an amount than 305,000 tons; whereas, upon the best calculation I can make from the statistical works I have consulted, I find the utmost from those two places in the years 1842 and 1843 was about 150,000 to 160,000 tons; consequently I do attribute a very considerable increase in that which has weighed down the market here to arise from your having given a stimulus to the production of sugar in Cuba and in Porto Rico.

4012. Do you suppose that if the system of slavery in our colonies had continued we could have competed with them?—I think it is so totally out of all question that anybody could contemplate for a moment a return to slavery in the colonies, that one can hardly form an opinion upon the subject. I have seen calculations, from which I find that during the period of slavery in the West Indies the cost of production was very considerably lower than it has been since the alteration that has taken place; but to look back, or to attempt for one moment to return to the system of slavery, is impossible: but how to modify our laws and regulations against the increased action of slavery in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies, is the question.

4013. Considering the present depressed state of our colonies, what is the remedy you would propose?—I am fearful it is exceedingly difficult to find any remedy in the present state of things; but I think we are so far entitled, having laid out our capital, and having acted upon what we consider to be the principle of protection granted by Parliament, at least to have a certain time allotted to us by a more consistent course of legislation, to give us a chance of recovering the position in which we had been placed. I do not say that I am confident that, under any circumstances, we should recover what we had lost, or be able to supply sugar at so cheap a rate as other countries may; but I think we are at least entitled to this, that we ought to have a certain opportunity given us of endeavouring, under a system of protection, upon the faith of which we laid out our capital, to place ourselves in a better situation than we now are. By a diminished cost of production, and by economy, and various modes which necessity would induce, during a certain period, I hope it is possible we may recover our lost ground, or perhaps establish, by the excision of some of the worst estates in the Mauritius or in the West Indies, a profitable return to many of a superior character; but I speak without any very great confidence as to any remedial process, from the great losses we have sustained.

4014. Great losses, both under protection and under free trade?—Under the whole of the circumstances I have stated. From 1838 to the present time, the vacillation of Parliament, the changes of legislation, and the departure from what was understood to be the system to be adopted during the time we laid out our money, and sent out our machinery, and carried on those works, has been such as to bring these enormous losses upon us. I beg distinctly to say, I do not attribute all the losses to the Act of 1846; but when we were getting out of our difficulties, that Act of 1846 plunged us back again into them.

4015. *Mr. Matheson.*] You spoke of the impossibility of the East Indies competing with the West Indies in the cultivation of sugar: considering the very great advantages possessed by the East Indies in the abundance of food and cheapness of labour, to what do you attribute that impossibility?—My reason was grounded upon this, that India is a very great consuming country of sugar. In fact the population very much live upon a coarse kind of sugar; it forms, even in their small way, one of the items of their consumption throughout the whole country, and I have seen that for a series of years the price of sugar has been maintained in Calcutta at the steady rate of nine or ten rupees per maund; therefore I fear the home demand of India will take off the sugar at that rate, and consequently it will never answer to a merchant to export, unless it be from particular circumstances, for dead weight or from the markets at home offering a price higher than that which has been found to be the level of the price of consumption in India. India has such capabilities, that if we were to introduce improved modes of conveyance, alterations in the assessment of the land, and various circumstances connected with India, that would improve India,
 I believe

I believe it to be the country, of all others, the most likely to produce inexhaustible quantities of sugar; but under the existing circumstances, placed as we are, and, as the hon. Member knows, the mode of conveyance being so tardy and expensive an item that enters so largely into the cost of almost every Indian production, we are not in a situation to avail ourselves of the extraordinary power which India possesses; but that it has those powers lying dormant now I have not the least doubt: it only requires skill and capital and general improvements to call them forth, and I believe when they are called forth, India probably will be one of the chief countries for producing tropical productions of any in the world.

Sir
G.G. de H. Larpent,
Bart.

26 February 1848.

4016. In point of fact, what you mention of the largeness of the internal consumption of India ought to be a reason for stimulating the extension of the production?—As long as the demand will give those prices, nothing but a higher price elsewhere will induce anybody to ship; as long as nine rupees can be obtained currently in Calcutta or in the Mofussil, no one would ship sugar to this country unless he could get a higher price than has prevailed here recently.

4017. This largeness of the internal consumption should be an additional stimulus to production, if it were not checked by other causes?—Certainly.

4018. You would consider those other causes as the most legitimate reason for the difficulty that may have existed?—Yes; the price not being lower, so as to admit of export.

4019. The sugar factories in the Mauritius are of comparatively modern date, are they not?—Yes: I believe you will see that when the duty upon the Mauritius sugar, in the year 1825, was equalized with West India sugar, the production of sugar in the first two or three years after that was not more than from 20,000,000 to 30,000,000 of pounds weight. That has got up during that period of time to not less than 60,000 tons; so that from 10,000 tons it has got up to 60,000 tons. That arose from the equalization of the duties on Mauritius sugars in 1825, placing them upon the same footing with West India sugars.

4020. There are now no sugar interests in the Mauritius which are of a sufficiently old date to be affected by the terms of the capitulation which stipulated for protection?—I cannot say; we acquired ours in the year 1834, therefore I know nothing before that period.

4021. Mr. Miles.] What you want is time, now?—I repeat that I am not very confident of our ever being able to get over our difficulties; but under the circumstances I have stated, the only chance we have is not by making any alteration of the present duty, but by letting us remain where we are. I am not confident however, and I am loth to give any decided opinion; but under all the circumstances I have stated, I think we are entitled to such consideration as may save us from the total ruin which meets us now, or at least the destruction of one-half of our properties, that the other half may, by accommodating itself to the circumstances in which we are placed, make an adequate return for the diminished capital which our properties would then stand at. I have in my hand a statement showing the total cost of production of a crop of 75,000,000 lbs. of sugar, by 200 estates, with labourers' wages at 250 dollars per month. The number employed is 20,000 men; the interest of capital 4½ per cent. per annum; and the value of the land, &c. 30,000 l. per 1,000,000 pounds of sugar.

[The Witness delivered in the Statement, which is as follows:]

(No. 1.)

STATEMENT showing the Total Cost of Production of a Crop of 75,000,000 lbs. of SUGAR by 200 Estates, with Labourers' Wages at \$ 250, (50 L.) per Month. The Number Employed as 20,000 Men; the Interest of Capital at 4 ½ per Cent. per Annum; and the Value of the Land, &c. at 30,000 L. per Million Pounds of Sugar.

20,000 labourers, at \$ 250 or 50 L. per month, with food, at exchange of 4 s. per dollar, and clothing as per Statement No. 3 - - - - -	\$.	c.	£.
Expenses over and above the labour and provisions, as per Statement No. 4 - - - - -	1,200,000	0	or 240,000
	1,911,000	0	or 382,200
Total Cost - - - \$	3,111,000	0	or 622,200
Proceeds, as per Statement No. 2 - - - - -	3,626,885	03	or 725,377
Net proceeds of crop 1844-45, giving interest on \$11,250,000 (2,250,000 L.), } value of 200 estates, at 4 ½ per cent. per annum - - - - -	\$	515,885	93
			£. 103,177

The colony, however, is now incurring a further outlay of capital attendant on the employment of 20,000 newly-imported men, now costing, as per Statement No. 3, \$5 (1 L.) per month; the result of whose labours cannot be realized until the crop 1845-46.

We take the date of the employment from 1st January 1844 to 1st October 1845; causing an additional investment in anticipation of crop 1845-46, say \$ 2,100,000 (420,000 L.)

(No. 2.)

STATEMENT showing the probable Net Proceeds of the Crop 1844-45, taking the Quantity at 75,000,000 lbs. of SUGAR; of which, 67,500,000 lbs. White or Vesou Sugar sold in London at the London Average Gazette Price of the 17th October 1843, viz. 32 s. 3 d. per cwt., and 7,500,000 lbs. of Syrup Sugar sold at Mauritius at an average of \$3 (12 s.) per 100 lbs. French weight.

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.
500,000 bags of vesou sugar, weighing 67,500,000 lbs. or 650,000 cwt., at average price of 32 s. 3 d. per cwt. - - - - -	1,048,125	-	-				
Add 14s. duty - - - - -	450,000	-	-				
				1,498,125	-	-	
							1,498,125
CHARGES.							
At Mauritius:							
Sugar, valued at 22 s. per cent. - - - - - \$	3,712,500	0					
	or £. 742,500						
Export dues, at 1 d. per cent. - - - - - £. 33,750 - -							
Quay dues, at 1 d. per bag - - - - - 2,083 6 8							
Tonnage dues, at 9 ½ d. per ton - - - - - 1,371 1 -							
	£. 37,204	8 6		or \$ 186,022	12		or 37,204 - -
Landing from the boat, at 1 d. per bag - - - - -	10,000	0		or 2,000	-	-	
Cartage to stores and from thence to the wharf, at 2 s. per 10 bags - - - - -	59,000	0		or 10,000	-	-	
Warehouse rent, at 1 d. per month - - - - -	10,000	0		or 2,000	-	-	
Weighing, at 1 s. 2 d. per 1,000 lbs. - - - - -	20,250	0		or 4,050	-	-	
Shipping, at 2 s. per ton - - - - -	16,875	0		or 3,375	-	-	
Marking, postages, and petties - - - - -	5,000	0		or 1,000	-	-	
Brokerage, one quarter per cent. on \$3,712,500 (742,500 L.) -	9,281	25		or 1,856	-	-	
Commission, 2 ½ per cent. on \$4,019,923. 37 c. (803,986 L.) -	100,498	20		or 20,099	-	-	
Charges at Mauritius - - - - - \$	407,926	57		or 81,584	-	-	1,498,125

	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.
In London :							
Brought forward - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,498,125
Insurance on 1,000,000 l. at 50 s. per cent. duty, and commission half per cent.	32,500	-	-				
Freight at 4 l. per ton, and primage 5 per cent.	136,500	-	-				
Duty at 14 s. per cwt.	450,000	-	-				
Interest on duty and freight advanced in anticipation of proceeds, say 1 per cent.	9,555	-	-				
Landing, delivery, rent inward, entry and stamps, fire insurance, sale charges, and postages	27,000	-	4				
Brokerage, 1 per cent.	18,281	5	-				
Commission, 2 ½ per cent.	45,703	2	4				
Delivered, half per cent.	9,140	12	4				
	728,680	-	-				
	Or Dollars	3,643,400	0				
Charges in London - - -	-	-	-	728,680	-	-	
Charges at Mauritius - - -	-	-	-	81,584	-	-	
							810,264
Net proceeds of Sugar sold in London :							
55,000 bags of syrup sugar, weighing 7,500,000 lbs.; sold here at \$ 3 (12 s.) per cent.	225,000	0		or 45,000	-	-	687,861
Discount 6 per cent.	13,500	0		or 2,700	-	-	
	201,500	0		or 47,700	-	-	
Charges :							
Landing from the boat, at 1 d. per bag -	1,100	0	cr 220				
Cartage to the stores, at 50 c. (2 s.) per 10 bags -	2,750	0	or 550				
Warehouse rent, at 1 d. per bag per mo.	1,100	0	or 220				
Weighing, at 30 c. (1 s. 2 ½ d.) per 1,000	2,250	0	or 450				
Petty charges -	530	0	or 106				
Brokerage, half per cent. on \$ 225,000	1,125	0	or 225				
Commission of sale, 2 ½ per cent. -	5,037	50	or 1,007 10				
	\$ 13,912	50		or 2,778	-	-	
							44,922
Net proceeds of sugar sold at Mauritius - - \$	187,587	50					
Net proceeds of crop 1844-45 - - -	-	-	-	-	-	-	732,783

(No. 3.)

CALCULATED ANNUAL EXPENSE attending the Employment of 100 Indian Labourers on a Sugar Estate.

	Doll.	c.	£.	s.	d.	Doll.	c.	£.	s.	d.
100 Men :										
Wages, at \$ 2 50 c. (10 s.) per man, is \$ 250 (50 l.) per month, per annum	\$ 3,000	0	or 600	0	-					
Food : Rice, at 1 ½ lbs. per man per day, is 5,200 lbs. per month, or per annum 62,400 lbs. \$ 2 (8 s.) per cent.	1,248	0	or 249	12	-					
Dholl, 4 lbs. per man per month, is 4,800 lbs per annum, \$ 3 (12 s.) per cent.	144	0	or 28	16	-					
Salt fish, 4 lbs. per man per month, is 4,800 lbs. per annum, \$ 6 (1 l. 4 s.)	288	0	or 57	12	-					
Salt, per annum	24	0	or 4	16	-					
Add 10 per cent. for wages and loss by desertion; hospital rations on \$ 1,704 (340 l. 16 s.)	170	0	or 34	-	-					
Rum and ghée; these articles are not universally given, but it is well to calculate them at \$ 27 (5 l. 8 s.) per man per month	27	0	or 5	8	-	4,874	0	or 974	16	-
Clothing : 8 ells of unbleached cloth, 25 c. (1 s.) per ell, is \$ 2 (8 s.) per annum	200	0	or 40	-	-	327	0	or 65	8	-
2 dhootys per annum, at 75 c. (3 s.) \$ 150 (30 l.)	150	0	or 30	-	-					
1 cap, per man at 25 c. (1 s.)	25	0	or 5	-	-					
1 blanket, at 75 c. (3 s.)	75	0	or 15	-	-					
Medical attendance and medicines	150	0	or 30	-	-					
3 sudars, at \$ 3 50 c. (14 s.); their food, clothing, \$ 2 03 c. (8 s. 1 ½ d.) \$ 16 59 c. (3 l. 6 s. 4 ½ d.) per month per annum	199	08	or 39	16	3 ½					
						799	08	or 159	16	-
						Dollars	-	-	-	-
						6,000	08	or 1,200	-	-

The total cost of each labourer per month, \$ 5 (1 l.)

(No. 4.)

STATEMENT of Expenses incurred by a SUGAR ESTATE working Two Batteries, over and above the Cost of Labour and Provisions.

	Dollars.	cents.	£.	\$	c.	£.
Administration— 1 Manager - - - - -	150	0	or	30		
1 Regisseur - - - - -	60	0	or	12		
4 ditto, at \$ 25 (5l.) - - - - -	100	0	or	20		
5 Servants, at \$ 5 (1l.) - - - - -	25	0	or	5		
Per month - - - Dollars	335	0	or	67	4,020	0 or 804
Mechanics - - 2 Carpenters, at \$ 10 (2l.) - - -	20	0	or	4		
1 Blacksmith, at \$10 (2l.) - - -	10	0	or	2		
1 Assistant ditto, at \$ 5 (1l.) - - -	5	0	or	1		
Per month - - - Dollars	35	0	or	7	420	0 or 84
Animals - - 20 Mules, as per Statement No. 5 - - -	200	0	or	40		
60 Bullocks, - ditto - No. 6 - - -	110	0	or	22		
Per month - - - Dollars	310	0	or	62	3,720	0 or 744
Carts - - - Repairs, equal to two new carts, per ann.	-	-	-	-	400	0 or 80
Machinery - Engineer's fee for attendance - - -	100	0	or	20		
Replacing damage, wear and tear - - -	500	0	or	100		
Tallow, hemp, oil, &c. - - - - -	150	0	or	30		
					750	0 or 150
Sugar House- Remounting batteries - - - - -	200	0	or	40		
Lead, copper, solder, firebricks - - -	120	0	or	24		
Replacing one pan annually - - - - -	150	0	or	30		
Skimmers, spoons, filterers - - - - -	100	0	or	20		
					570	0 or 114
Buildings - - Lime, planks, nails, tin, &c. and extra labour - - - - -	-	-	-	-	500	0 or 100
Forge - - - Tin, steel, charcoal, &c. - - - - -	-	-	-	-	150	0 or 30
Tools - - - Peoches, axes, baskets, rope, &c. - - -	-	-	-	-	250	0 or 50
Bags - - - For 1,000,000 lbs. of sugar, say 16,000 vacoa and gunny bags, at \$12 (2l. 8s.) per cent. - - - - -	-	-	-	-	1,920	0 or 384
Cartage - - To town of 1,000,000 lbs. of sugar, an average distance of 18 miles, at 20 cents (9 ½ d.) per cent. - - - - -	-	-	-	-	2,000	0 or 400
						Dollars
					14,700	0 or 2,940
Take 100 estates, working two batteries, producing 100 millions of sugar - - - - -	-	-	-	-	1,470,000	0 or 294,000
„ 100 estates working one battery, producing 50 millions of sugar - - - - -	-	-	-	-	735,000	0 or 147,000
200 estates, 150 millions - - - - -	-	-	-	-	2,205,000	0 or 441,000
The above calculations include bags and cartage for the estates when in full revenue. As the crop of 1844-45 is calculated at 75,000,000 lbs. of sugar only, half these charges must be deducted, viz.—						
100 estates, producing 500,000 lbs. each, will require 8,000 bags, at \$12 (2l. 8s.) p' cent. = \$ 960 (192l.)	96,000	0	or	19,200		
100 estates, producing 250,000 lbs. each, will require 4,000 bags, at \$12 (2l. 8s.) p' cent. = \$ 480 (96l.)	48,000	0	or	9,600		
And cartage on 100 estates, producing 500,000 lbs. each, will require \$1,000 each (200l.) - - - - -	100,000	0	or	20,000		
And cartage on 100 estates, producing 250,000 lbs. each, will require \$ 500 each (150l.) - - - - -	50,000	0	or	10,000		
Total of Bags and Cartage to be deducted - - - - -					294,000	0 or 58,800
						Dollars
					1,911,000	0 or 382,200

(No. 5.)

Sir
G.G. de H. Larpent,
Bart.

CACULATED MONTHLY EXPENSES of Twenty Mules in a SUGAR ESTATE.

26 February 1848.

	Doll. c.	or	£. s. d.
Grain, 6 lbs. of grain per diem, say 3,600 lbs., at \$2. 75 c. (11 s.)	99	0	or 19 16 -
Shoeing, at \$1 (4 s.) per month each	20	0	or 4 - -
Harness, at \$12 (2 l. 8 s.) per annum per mule, say \$1 per month	20	0	or 4 - -
Three grooms, at \$2. 50 c. (10 s.), with food, clothing, &c., say at \$5 (1 l.), as per Statement No. 3	15	0	or 3 - -
Mortality, at the rate of 10 per cent., two mules at \$200 (40 l.), is \$400 (80 l.) per annum	33	34	or 4 13 3
Brushes and medicines, per month	2	76	or - 11 -
Add for wastage of grain, rations to managers, horses, &c., say 10 per cent.	9	90	or 1 19 7½
\$.	200	0	or 40 - -

(No. 6.)

CALCULATED MONTHLY EXPENSES of Maintaining Sixty Bullocks (equal to Twenty Mules) in a SUGAR ESTATE.

	Doll. c.	or	£. s. d.
10 lbs. of manioc per ox per day, or 18,000 lbs. per month, should be grown on the estate, but if purchased will cost 50 cents. (2 s.) per 100 lbs., is \$90 (18 l.) per month during six months, or during the year	45	0	or 9 - -
Pasturage during six months, ditto, at 40 cents. (1 s. 7 d.) each	12	0	or 2 8 -
Mortality, at 15 per cent., is nine bullocks, at \$50 (10 l.) each, say \$450 (20 l.) per annum	37	50	or 7 10 -
Two guardians, at \$5 (1 l.), including food, clothing, &c.	10	0	or 2 - -
Yokes and fastenings, per month	5	50	or 1 2 -
\$.	110	0	or 22 - -

4022. *Chairman.*] Sir Edward Buxton examined you upon the subject of the losses you wrote off in 1845, which you state you had incurred between 1838 and 1844; you said you wrote off 95,000 l.; is not a great portion of that loss to be laid to the account of the harassing regulations of the Colonial Office in regard to the immigration of labourers and the contracts of the labourers?—I should say that the greatest part of the loss is to be attributed to the prohibition to import Coolies in 1838, to the cessation of apprenticeship in 1839, and to the inadequate supply of labour till the alteration by the Order in Council in 1842; that, in point of fact, to keep our estates from being over-run by tropical vegetation, we had a small production of sugar and an immense expenditure, and the result was a loss to the extent I have mentioned, or something approaching to it, with perhaps the additional charges which I have mentioned of commission and interest, which ought never to have been charged, because they were never earned.

4023. The effect of those harassing regulations was, that there was a decrease of produce, of your sugar, of 219 tons in 1839 as compared with 1838; of 200 tons in 1840; of 188 tons in 1841; of 70 tons in 1842; of 287 tons in 1843; and of 285 in 1844; making a sum total of 1,249 tons, or an average of 208 tons a year; which you ascribe to the annoyance and interference that was made with your labourers?—I do not think that is quite a fair way of calculating it, because the result became very inadequate to the capital expended upon it. At the same time, I should in fairness say that the figures which have been read may be partially influenced by drought and the circum-

Sir
G. G. de H. Larpent,
Bart.

26 February 1848.

stances of the seasons, which accurate investigation only can show; but I am prepared to say, that if we had had what we expected when we commenced, namely, a free introduction of Coolies, we should have been able to have had an adequate return of produce from our estates, but that we did not get such a sufficient supply of sugar as to pay us; and that the falling off was at one time down to 350 tons; whereas under a different set of circumstances, having adequate labour, we got up to 800 tons, and last year to 1,100 tons of sugar. I do not attribute the whole to the Bill of 1846; there were a variety of concurring circumstances which depressed the price here in 1847 and 1848; but if we had had adequate prices, that quantity was so large that we should have had a fair return for our capital.

4024. Were not the taxes gradually increased during the time you speak of?—The taxes were increased, and there is an export duty of 1*l.* a ton which falls very heavy. The statements of the colonial revenue will show the Committee that the whole revenue, as I stated in a part of my evidence, has been absorbed by the expenditure of the colony; instead of leaving, as it did before, a surplus, shows a deficiency which all falls upon the staple production of the island.

4025. You were also asked whether Government and Parliament had not agreed in those restrictions upon immigration, and upon the length of contracts; is not it the more fitting way of putting it, that the Colonial Office initiated that policy, and that Parliament sanctioned it?—I think it hardly becomes me to state under what concurring authorities it was done; all I can state is simply the effect which was produced upon our property, such as I have mentioned, and that we were prohibited obtaining an adequate supply of labour by regulations which, whether they were wise or foolish, is not for me to state.

4026. They were regulations of the Colonial Office, were not they?—I think the prohibition of the importation of Coolies was by Act of Parliament.

4027. You were asked whether if slavery had continued, the British colonies would have been able to compete with the slavery of Cuba and Brazil; is it the fact, that so long as slavery continued, the British colonies did produce 50,000 tons of sugar a year more than Great Britain could consume, and successfully met the competition of foreign slave-labour sugar in the Continental market, and actually kept down the cultivation of sugar by the slaves of Cuba and Brazil?—I can only speak of what came under my own immediate knowledge. We did not obtain those estates during the period of slavery; it was just at the period when slavery was turned into apprenticeship, therefore I can give no opinion upon it. We know very well that a very considerable diminution took place in the return from the West Indies at the period I have mentioned between the year 1830 and the year 1840, from 200,000 tons to 110,000 tons.

4028. It is your opinion that India only requires cherishing and the protection of a good price, to stimulate a boundless production of sugar?—I think India, under those circumstances I have mentioned in a former answer, would do so.

4029. Sir *Edward Buxton*.] A boundless quantity, but not at a very low price?—I think the price which India is willing to pay for sugar is shown by the steady price of sugar, both in the Mofussil and in Calcutta, for shipment, nine or ten rupees a maund, which it has been at for a series of years.

4030. Nine rupees a maund is equal to 24*s.* per cwt.?—Yes, without freight and charges.

4031. You said that taxes had increased since 1835; can you state how much has been spent upon immigration by Government since that time?—No, I cannot.

4032. Should you say that it is a million or half a million?—I do not know.

4033. Mr. *M. Gibson*.] The importation of Coolies from the East Indies to the Mauritius has been attended with considerable expense in shipping, has not it?—We consider the object fully compensated the expense.

4034. Do you happen to know whether any Coolies have been imported in country ships, manned by natives of British India?—I do not know the fact, but I should think they might have been if the regulations would have permitted it, but I do not know whether they would have permitted it.

4035. Would not it have been an advantage if Coolies could have been imported into the Mauritius in country ships manned by the natives of British India?—

India?—The cheapest mode of introducing them would be the best, provided the regulations were such as to insure what was proper with respect to the persons who are so brought. I am not certain whether the regulations allow it in country shipping, but I should say that such is the intercourse between India and the Mauritius, that Coolies might be brought down and their food might be brought also; a great part of the population of the Mauritius is supported by rice obtained from India.

4036. Supposing a country ship from India manned by the natives of British India could bring Coolies from India to the Mauritius, and could proceed on to England with a cargo of sugar, and back again to Calcutta with a return freight, would not that upon the whole perhaps be a profitable transaction?—Sugar requires a very good ship to bring it home without damage, but of course, upon general principles, the cheaper the mode in which the Cooly is brought down and the sugar shipped, the greater will be the benefit obtained by the trader. As far as my experience goes, there is no complaint to be made of the want of tonnage for the shipment of sugar, or of the high price of freight in the Mauritius; it is not one of those charges which has at all been considered as oppressive to the Mauritius; at the same time every charge is of importance, and the cheaper you can bring it the better. Let every vessel enter into competition for the purpose of reducing the price, that I am perfectly ready to say; but at the same time I cannot consistently state that I believe the charge of freight is a grievance in the Mauritius.

Sir
G. G. de H. Larpent,
Bart.

26 February 1848.

Mr. David Charles Guthrie, called in; and Examined.

4037. *Chairman.*] YOU have been a few years connected with the Mauritius cultivation of sugar, have you not?—Rather acting for Mauritius parties.

Mr. D. C. Guthrie.

4038. For how many parties do you act?—Directly, and indirectly, I think about 20.

4039. You are not able to go into the details of cultivation, but only into the general results; is not that so?—I have never been in the Mauritius, and have no knowledge of the details, therefore anything I may say upon the subject must be considered as second or third hand.

4040. As the representative in this country of those interests?—Exactly so.

4041. Have you a statement upon which, though you do not like to give the names of the estates, you will number them, and give the result which, in your opinion, will be produced by the present reduced prices of sugar?—I cannot state the precise profit and loss upon those estates, but upon those estates, and under present circumstances, I come to certain conclusions as to whether I may or may not continue to be in a material point an administrator to those estates; it would be unpleasant to me, under the circumstances of the present time, to detail the names of the estates, or the names of the parties; but I should have no objection to state to the Committee what my general policy is with respect to Mauritius business.

4042. The Committee understand you have numbered the estates, and by describing them in that manner, you can tell the Committee your purpose as respects those estates?—I think it will answer your Lordship's purpose, if I tell you the number of the estates, and, under the present circumstances, upon what number of the estates I am disposed to go on; secondly, what number of estates are in abeyance; and thirdly, what number of estates I have already desired that no advances should be made on.

4043. Will you also state the produce of those estates?—I can do that; the first class of estates which we propose to carry on are five estates; they produce 8,600,000 lbs.

4044. Was that last year?—That is the whole crop of the five estates. The second class involves six estates, computed to produce 10,600,000 lbs. The third class in Schedule (D.), comprises nine estates, producing 6,500,000 lbs., upon which I have desired that no further advances upon my account should be allowed.

4045. The first class you will endeavour to carry on?—I will endeavour to carry them on; I think those are estates which, under the circumstances of my account, and the state of the finances of those estates, and of their produce, we

Mr. D. C. Guthrie. may be able to fight a little longer. With respect to the second class, they are those which will depend entirely upon the question of the result, very possibly, of this Committee, or the steps of the British Government.

26 February 1848.

4046. If no relief is afforded, you will make no further advances upon those either?—That is my present view.

4047. Without being able to enter into a detail of the cost of cultivating sugar, do you reckon that the average cost ranges from 12 s. as a minimum up to 25 s. as a maximum?—That was my statement to Lord John Russell, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Lord Grey.

4048. You made a statement of that kind, did you?—A verbal statement.

4049. Will you communicate to the Committee the statement which you made to those gentlemen?—What I stated followed the remarks which had been made by other members of the deputation; in reference to this, I stated that I feared the Mauritius parties could not supply their statistics with that precision that distinguished Mr. Green's statement, *quoad* the West India estates.

4050. The reason of that was, that the Mauritius planters kept their accounts in the Mauritius, while the West India planters had their accounts in England?—They are differently situated; the West India estates are chiefly held by Englishmen; the Mauritius estates are held by residents at the Mauritius, or by Frenchmen; the Mauritius accounts, therefore, do not come home, unless in such cases as the Committee have heard Sir George Larpent state, that he was a proprietor in fee; I am not a proprietor in fee.

4051. You have advanced money upon the estates of French residents, have you?—Through the medium of my correspondents there.

4052. In point of fact are the French residents the majority of the planters in the Mauritius?—The great proportion, I believe.

4053. Are they nine-tenths?—I am not able to answer that.

4054. Something of that kind?—I believe a very large proportion are of the Mauritian interest. The system, I believe, in respect of money is, that an English house, such as Mr. Hunter's house, or Mr. Chapman's house, will take a share in an estate; the estate becomes a joint one, the proprietor perhaps having half, and Mr. Hunter and Mr. Chapman, or whoever he may be, holding the other half; but these are points upon which I am not an authority; it is merely my belief. I believe that to be the case, but for direct evidence it would be better to resort to the immediate parties. What I stated upon the occasion referred to was as follows: "I believe the cost varies in Mauritius, as rents do in this country, from various causes, ranging from 12 s. as the minimum, up to 25 s., which is stated by some other parties;" that was Mr. Blyth, I think; "perhaps 18 s. to 19 s. may be stated as the average cost of the island."

4055. Mr. M. Gibson.] Twelve shillings is the minimum cost, is it?—Twelve shillings is the lowest I have ever heard; I believe I was informed by the parties that it is rather what they anticipate doing than what they actually are doing.

4056. Chairman.] Did you receive any encouragement to proceed with the cultivation of those estates from Lord John Russell and the other members of the Government?—I think it was rather the reverse, but your Lordship may be aware that it is not customary on receiving deputations of parties in that way for Her Majesty's Government to communicate anything; it is rather the intention of those audiences, if I may so call them, that we should communicate information; to tell the truth I have never had any conclusive statement at any of those audiences; we have had a great deal of sympathy and a great deal of kind expression of feeling, but I am not able to acknowledge that we have had anything more.

4057. Sir E. Buxton.] You do not expect to receive information, do you, but to give information?—No; there is satisfaction in communicating one's grievances, and we trust to the discretion of the parties. I will state to the Committee if they please what I stated upon that occasion: "The present conference with Her Majesty's Ministers is fully known to the public, and creates some excitement; I am sorry to add, not much hope or relief is anticipated. I have consulted one friend who stands in rather a high position; he remarked, 'that Her Majesty's Ministers stood so lately committed to the free trade movement, that they would rather let the city and the colonies go down *en masse* than infringe to the extent of one hair on their principles of free trade;'

trade;’ another friend, well known to me as a public writer, says, that ‘not one leading statesman will be found willing to disturb the Sugar Act of 1846;’ a third friend, who heard of my having taken up a Mauritius connexion, and as he termed it ‘put my foot in it;’ on asking his opinion of how to draw it out, replied, ‘Cut off the limb; better lose the limb than the whole body.’ These remarks are intended to show to Her Majesty’s Ministers, first, how little relief is expected at their hands; secondly, what discredit now pursues any man connected with colonial interests.”

Mr. D. C. Guthrie.

26 February 1848.

4058. *Chairman.*] Is it not the discredit into which the planters of the Mauritius are thrown now, that, in point of fact, makes it impossible for them to obtain advances of money to carry on their cultivation?—That seems to be the fact: if a man grows a crop, and loses that crop, it may be a loss to him, as we may suppose, of 5,000 *l.*; but that would not hurt his credit; but if the fact which causes that loss of 5,000 *l.* goes to this extent, that the land or the capital which you had the expectation of deriving that 5,000 *l.* from every succeeding year is rendered totally valueless, when that comes to be the case, a man’s credit becomes entirely gone.

4059. The loss virtually is, then, not a loss of 5,000 *l.*, but of 50,000 *l.*?—Of the 50,000 *l.*, or 60,000 *l.*, or 100,000 *l.* which you anticipated should produce you 5,000 *l.*, therefore it is the credit of those parties, as I have stated, that was virtually demolished.

4060. Will you proceed with the statement you made to Lord John Russell?—I stated further, “These remarks are intended to show to Her Majesty’s Ministers, first, how little of relief is expected at their hands; secondly, what discredit now pursues any man connected with colonial interests. Notwithstanding these unpromising auspices, I do cling to a more charitable view of humanity. I cannot bring myself to believe that Her Majesty’s Ministers will usurp to themselves the idea of their infallibility. The works of man are not expected to be perfect, and whatever we venture to do, we must submit to the test of experience. Thus if the application of free trade principles be found actually injurious to the great interests of the country, either in whole or in part, or if these have been hastily applied, or the proper precautions or arrangements have been omitted, it would be a scandal on humanity to suppose that Her Majesty’s Ministers will be so wedded, so bigoted to their opinion or to party, that they will not hasten to remedy or remove the evil and repair the mischief that they have done. The Act of 1846 was under the influence of a popular excitement; that it was passed with barely one-fifth of a House is upon record.” A noble Lord remarked to me that it was the grouse shooting season, and that that had had a great influence upon it. “That no statesman would move for its revival can hardly be supposed, if we only look to the protest in the House of Peers.” The protest of the House of Peers is subscribed as dissentients by Lords Stanhope, Holland, Gage, Denman, and the Bishop of Oxford, and is dated the 13th of August 1846. “The first article of the protest propounds the great principle of the previous 40 years, ‘That the importation of sugar, the produce of slave labour, was encouraging and promoting the slave trade, with all its atrocities, and inconsistent with the principles upon which this country has so long acted, and for which it has made, and still continues to make such enormous sacrifices.’” The second point of the dissent was, “Because there is no reason to apprehend a deficiency of sugar from other sources; the quantity produced in the East Indies and other British possessions was rapidly increasing, which would also be the case in the British colonies in the West Indies, if they received due protection and encouragement.” The third ground of dissent was, “Because the proposed measure would be most unjust to those colonies, and ruinous to their interests, which have already been grievously injured by reducing the prices of their produce without a corresponding reduction of the taxation to which it is subject, and by the want of sufficient labourers for their cultivation.” Fourthly, “Because the consequences of the proposed measure might be very calamitous, and might occasion such distress and discontent as would ultimately lead to the separation of these important colonies, which, when deprived of the protection which is justly due to them, might lose also their allegiance.” The first objection leads back to the recollection of the great work of emancipation, and to remind Her Majesty’s Ministers that they, their fathers, the Greys, Russells, Aucklands, with all their party, nine-tenths of both Houses of Parliament, and

Mr. D. C. Guthrie.

26 February 1848.

with the voice of the people, all joined to seal the consummation of the labours of Wilberforce, Clarkson, Buxton, &c. against slavery. Look again at 1846. All your great works are sold, sacrificed, and lost, because of an outcry for cheap sugar. Cheap sugar you have, and so also cheap now is all our vaunted virtue and philanthropy; they are all like bankrupt stock, to be had at the buyers' own price. The second objection bespeaks the increasing supplies from our own colonies sufficient for our consumption. The third and fourth foretel in 1846 the events of 1847; that with taxation beyond bearing (equal to 6*l.* per ton on the produce of the Mauritius), low prices, consequent on the opposition and competition of foreign slave-labour sugars, have reduced the Mauritius to almost universal bankruptcy." I believe that at this moment there is hardly a planter in the island of the Mauritius who would not be very glad, under the prospects of the law of 1846, to find himself a French colonist, or to remove his position to the adjoining island, which is in sight from the Mauritius on a fine day.

4061. That is the fact, is not it; of the large firms, your firm is the only one that remains?—There were five large importers; out of that five, four unhappily have gone. That I maintain my position may be ascribed to this, that I had not been so long engaged in it. "Such distress," these noble dissentients foretel, "leads to discontent, and to ultimate separation and loss of allegiance." "Do not despise this last prophecy; it may come to be, like the previous points, too truly fulfilled. Mauritius is a very small speck of land, but of very large importance as a post both for our army and navy examination."

4062. Mr. M. Gibson.] You stated that you were acting for 20 estates?—Directly or indirectly; that is, we are receiving the crops and supplying them with means. I am not mortgagee upon those estates, nor am I proprietor; I have mortgages upon certain properties, but it does not apply to those generally.

4063. You say you have mortgages upon some properties?—Yes.

4064. Have those securities ever been marketable securities?—A person can sell a mortgage.

4065. Were the mortgages you have had upon Mauritius estates deemed marketable securities at any time within your knowledge?—They were marketable, inasmuch as I took them on a consideration.

4066. You are engaged in making advances upon consignments of the crops. Would anybody be prepared, in any ordinary transaction of lending money on security, to take a Mauritius estate as a security?—In the Mauritius you will find a great many of the estates are mortgaged in that way. Many parties possessing money in the Mauritius, lend money upon estates.

4067. In this country have they been deemed marketable securities?—I know that considerable sums of money have been laid out upon them.

4068. By parties differently situated from yourself?—Yes.

4069. Do you know the number of acres?—No; I know nothing about the acres.

4070. Can you inform the Committee of the net income to the proprietors of any of those estates for which you have been agent, or on which you have mortgages?—I would not speak to any of them. You may speak of an estate in this country, that you get a certain income from the farmer for it; but with respect to a sugar estate, what is the income is not possible to define till we know how the law is to stand. We have the law one way to-day, and another way to-morrow. I can tell the Committee in what years the estates have been profitable, and in what years they have not; but to tell the Committee what the income is, it is impossible for any man, even the proprietor of the estate, to do.

4071. Can you state the actual income that has been received?—No; we have not the books in any way.

4072. Have you no knowledge of the income which the proprietors of Mauritius estates have ever received?—No.

4073. Not even those upon which you have lent money?—I have some knowledge of what the estates produce in point of quantity, nothing farther.

4074. The advances you mentioned as having been made by parties not in your line of business, must have been advances made in reference to the net income of the estates, must not they?—Not the income; that is not the way we should take it; we should rather take it upon the gross produce of those estates.

4075. Without

4075. Without any reference to the profits?—Certainly not; the way a man would proceed would be this: does the estate produce so much? is it a good or a bad estate? will it produce a good fair average crop, at a fair average expense? and according to the amount it produces, he would think the security good or bad. *Mr. D. C. Guthrie.*

4076. That is, according to the amount it produces in reference to the expense of producing it, is not it?—That is one of the ingredients.

4077. According to the net profit that is derived?—That had nothing to do with my security.

4078. It had with other advances, had not it?—A man going to lend his money upon a direct security, where he was looking only for interest, would calculate all those points; but that was not my case.

4079. How do you value a Mauritius estate, supposing it is sold in the market?—I never bought an estate nor sold one, therefore I cannot give an answer to the question; there are plenty of people to give evidence upon this point. I would not wish to involve myself in an answer in which I was very likely to be mistaken.

4080. Have you no knowledge of what has been the past value of the Mauritius estates?—No; I could give you no evidence that would be worth anything upon that point.

4081. Can you inform the Committee what became of the sum of 2,099,000*l.* which was received by the Mauritius in the year 1832, when the emancipation of the slaves took place?—I was not concerned in the emancipation; I received a great deal of emancipation money for the West Indies, but none for the Mauritius.

4082. Have you ever, in the course of your business, heard any estimate how far that compensation fell short of the value of the estates upon which the slaves were emancipated?—I have no information which you have not got in public documents; my impression is that the planters generally, upon the value of 70*l.*, got 28*l.* or 30*l.* I think; but those are matters of memory. The conviction in my mind is, that every man who had 70*l.* worth of property, had it taken from him, and he got 28*l.* in lieu of it.

4083. Does not it require less capital to commence the cultivation of an estate in the Mauritius now than it did when it was necessary to purchase slaves?—I think the probability is that it would be sold out like other bankrupt's stock; bankrupt's stock generally sells cheaper than any other.

4084. You said that you were going to continue your advances in the case of five estates, producing 8,000,000 lbs. of sugar?—Yes.

4085. There are five estates, according to your account, which could do without protection?—That is not at all the inference. I can explain to you pretty much what my principle is: I look upon it that the vessel is leaky, and you know what rats do when that is the case; I want to draw my foot out, but a man cannot draw it out all at once; therefore I get rid of what is decidedly bad. The other, which is in suspense, I carry on longer, and the best I will carry on the longest; but I should be very glad to get rid of the whole; I will give you a very large sum if you will take it.

4086. Did not you state that you were not proprietor yourself of any estate?—None.

4087. You merely advance money to the cultivators of those estates, taking a consignment of their crops as your security?—There is a party between us. The Mauritius house I act for is the mediating party.

4088. Why do you propose to continue those advances to those five estates producing 8,000,000 lbs. of sugar?—I dare say it is very wrong, but I would get rid of the whole if I could.

4089. Why do you propose to continue to make those advances to those five estates, if you consider that the withdrawal of protection renders the security for your advances uncertain?—They are less hazardous; they have less debt due to others. We have no mathematical rule upon which to proceed.

4090. You say it is because those estates have less debt; do you mean to say that an estate which is not mortgaged can do without protection?—Unquestionably a man that carries less weight will be able to run faster and to go longer.

4091. An estate that is free from charges and is tolerably productive in the Mauritius, may do without protection then?—That is an inference of your own. That estate has a much better chance.

Mr. D. C. Guthrie.

26 February 1848.

4092. You said you were going to make further advances to five estates; that you were going gradually to discontinue advances to six others; but that nine others you were going to give up altogether?—If I possibly can get rid of them; but it is very difficult to get rid of a bad bargain.

4093. Do you think the same amount of protection would be adequate to those three different classes of estates?—No doubt a man that has a good soil and a good estate has a better chance than a man who has a bad estate and bad opportunities.

4094. How would you regulate the protection which you think ought to be given?—You cannot regulate your protection to suit every case; you must give a fair and reasonable protection. If men cultivate very bad soils, the country is not called on to protect them; the country, on the other hand, is called on to protect a fair and reasonable estate in a fair and reasonable way.

4095. Does not every man consider his own case a fair and reasonable one?—I think a man will find out whether it is fair and reasonable, or not, by the result in his books. It will be found out only on experience. Many have embarked money on estates, and found they have not been profitable.

4096. According to your recommendation you would not protect those estates that had bad soils, and where the difficulties are greater which they have to contend with?—Those estates would be very glad to be protected. I am not the Legislature. I have stated in the petition I have signed what we gravely consider to be a fair and reasonable protection. We do not say that we seek 5 s. to one, and 10 s. to another, and 20 s. to a third; our request resolves itself into a neat round sum of 1 d.; that is all we ask.

4097. Is that with a view of raising the price of sugar in this country?—It is with a view of enabling us to pay our expenses, and to cultivate without loss.

4098. You would raise the price of sugar in this country, in order to enable persons on certain estates to pay their expenses?—Upon that penny a pound I think they would struggle on, and I hope ultimately succeed, depending very much on how labour is supplied, and how that labour is qualified. If you give a man a horse, and do not allow him to ride upon it, he is no better for the horse.

4099. You stated, as a reason for protecting sugar cultivation, that the Mauritius was a good station for the English army and navy?—It is considered politically very much so.

4100. Is not it your opinion that, with reference to locating troops and placing ships of war at the Mauritius, it would be more desirable to extend the cultivation of grain if it were possible, or to increase the number of cattle that are fed at the Mauritius, with a view of giving supplies and provisions to those fleets and armies?—That is entirely a political question; you have got Madagascar for cattle, and as long as you retain your fleets you can command your supplies. If you give up your shipping, possibly you had better grow what you want yourselves; but as long as you command ships, you would be able to command provisions.

4101. How would the Mauritius be a better station for the army and navy by making sugar a penny a pound dearer in England? you say it is very important that the sugar cultivation in the Mauritius should be encouraged, because you say the Mauritius is a good station for the army and navy?—I have not said anything of the kind; I did not combine the two subjects. The plantation interest is mine, and the Government troops is the interest of Government.

4102. Is it of importance to the position of the Mauritius, as a military or naval station, that the sugar cultivation should be encouraged there by protection?—I think it has been given in evidence before, that the French Government, when the island was in their possession, made various attempts to raise grain and to raise food for the garrison in case of necessity, and that they had been at very considerable expense, but had entirely failed; but that was at a period when the British fleets were blockading them.

4103. The result of your deliberations upon what is necessary to be done for the Mauritius is, that we must raise the price of sugar a penny a pound?—That you must give us a protection of a penny a pound. Instead of raising, we hope that it will ultimately tend to reduce the price of sugar.

4104. If the price of sugar falls, how will that benefit you?—I cannot help it if

if it does, except that if we now grow too much, we must grow less. I think protection is perfectly essential at this moment; they are entirely prostrated; they have neither money nor credit, and I think the very fact of your giving them protection at this moment is needful on both points. If you put them in credit they will get money.

Mr. D. C. Guthrie.

26 February 1848.

4105. Is not it because you believe that this protection would give them better prices than they now have?—Certainly, that is our object; that we shall have a better result.

4106. Then I do not understand what you mean by saying, that after all it may lower the price of sugar?—I look upon it that if the system you have been advocating for a number of years is worth anything, and I believe it is worth a good deal, if you give them free labour in abundance, and allow them afterwards to make use of those labourers, it is the only possible way in the world of doing away with slave labour, and thus enable the British colonist to produce sugar at lower prices.

4107. You stated that the minimum you had heard mentioned as the cost of a hundredweight of sugar, was 12 s.?—That is the least I have ever heard of, and I believe it was more in expectation than reality.

4108. You have heard it named?—I have heard it pointed out; but there are a great many differences in the circumstances.

4109. What would you sell a cwt. of that sugar for in the market now; the long price?—The short price is 24 s., and 14 s. added, would be 38 s.

4110. What are the freight and charges from the Mauritius?—I have not an account of the sale, but you must deduct 22 s. to 23 s., according to the rate of freight, from 38 s.

4111. You say that 24 s. is the short price of a cwt. of sugar?—That is the bonded price.

4112. What are the freight and charges of bringing a cwt. of sugar from the Mauritius to England?—The charges in bringing it to England are, first, the freight, which is now high; 8 s. would cover the charges.

4113. That leaves you 16 s. in the Mauritius, does not it?—Yes; it varies from 22 s. to 23 s. altogether; deduct that from 38 s. and you have it.

4114. At that rate you will not deny that 16 s. is not a bad price to get for a thing that has only cost 12 s., taking the minimum upon a cwt. of sugar?—The whole drift of the question as to the cost, was the cost of making the sugar only.

4115. You stated that the minimum you had heard named, was 12 s. on the cost of the sugar?—As the cost of labour and provisions only.

4116. What do you mean by cost?—What is the actual cost for the planter to make the sugar.

4117. Do you mean that it costs 12 s. to make sugar as a minimum, in addition to all the expenses of culture?—Twelve shillings is the cost of provisions, the cost of wages, and the cost of all the wear and tear of the plantation for the time being.

4118. Does it include rent?—It includes no rent; it includes no value of capital in any way, nor interest of money, nor the export duty, nor shipping charges.

4119. Does not it include the interest of money that has been laid out in machinery?—Not a farthing. Suppose you set yourself down upon your plantation with every thing found that you can possibly imagine, it is the expense of manufacture from the day you so set yourself down, laying nothing out beyond what you had previously found: it is what is the cost of making cotton yarn in a spinning mill; it is merely the cost of the labourers' wages in making.

4120. How much must be added to the 12 s. in order to give the cost of the sugar?—The cost of making the sugar is 12 s.; and the profit is whatever you can get over it, after paying export duty and commercial charges.

4121. Can you give the minimum cost of a hundredweight of sugar on board ship at the Mauritius?—I cannot. I stated in the first place that I was not a planter, and that I had not been in the Mauritius; and what I read here, as the first part of my address to the Government, was in some degree simply an explanation upon the evidence that the other parties had given.

4122. Mr. Miles.] You do not care about the cost of the sugar at sea-board when you advance money at so much a ton?—That is not my business; I have to look at what is to be my security.

Mr. D. C. Guthrie.

26 February 1848.

4123. Mr. M. Gibson.] Has the amount of protection been fixed on at 10 l. a ton?—Many parties wanted a difference of 10 l., and we asked for 10 l. by our letter to the Government; but we afterwards came to the conclusion, that it would be so much more intelligible to put it at a penny a pound, and we fixed to ask for that in our petition to the House of Commons.

4124. Mr. Miles.] You think that a penny a pound is required as a protection at the present moment, to enable the planter to get out of his present difficulty?—Yes.

4125. Would a penny a pound, given by the consumer in this country now, be likely to save him 2 d. by-and-by?—If we come to be in the hands of the Spaniards and Portuguese ultimately, you must speculate upon their tender mercies.

4126. Do not you think it is very probable that the supply of sugar from our own colonies will be very much diminished if this protection be not given?—I am quite certain of it; it will be less from every English colony next year.

4127. Is not it a question with them now, whether they should cease cultivation or not?—I can read to the Committee a letter I have had within the last day or two on the subject; and in reference to it, I must say *ex uno disce omnes*. “Your letter of the 24th of November conveyed to us a report of Simpson, Scott, & Company’s, on sugar, which we read with interest. At present rates in London, there is a ruinous result to sugar shipment, so that you may be convinced we shall induce no one to ship any under advances. We have caused to be closed the sugar factories at Gondalour, which are entrusted to the management of our Pondicherry house, and will wait before we open them again until a favourable change in London takes place.”

4128. Do you know how much that house is in the habit of sending to this country?—Yes.

4129. Was it a large supply?—Yes; they are very considerable shippers, and every body who has had letters from the West Indies by the packet yesterday, as I had, would be able to report to the Committee without exception their very bad position.

4130. Mr. Moffatt.] You stated that you had no practical knowledge of the Mauritius?—No, none at all.

4131. You know nothing of the state of labour there?—No.

4132. Nor of the cost of the production of sugar?—Mine is mere general information.

4133. In what year did you first become connected with the Mauritius?—I was connected with the Mauritius a great many years ago, and gave it up, and I think I resumed my occupation when things began to revive a little. I looked upon it that things were beginning to get better.

4134. In what year?—I think it was in 1844 we began to think that things would do well.

4135. Your business since then in connexion with the Mauritius has been to make advances upon estates?—Upon the sugar rather.

4136. Not upon the estates?—No.

4137. Can you explain to the Committee in what manner those advances were made?—After the first crop, as soon as one crop is off, we begin our advances.

4138. Those advances are made upon the faith of this sugar being consigned to your house in London?—Yes.

4139. You have no mortgages upon the estates?—I have a general security in mortgages, but not specially upon the estates.

4140. The nature of your advances then has been governed always by the prospect of the crop of sugar you would get from year to year?—Pretty much.

4141. You stated, did you not, to an honourable Member, that you were under very large advances, and that you would give him a large sum if he would relieve you of them?—Yes.

4142. Have not the advances been increasing from year to year?—There would be a deficiency last year.

4143. Is last year the only year in which there would be a deficiency?—There was no deficiency the previous year; the previous year, I think, was a good year.

4144. Your complaint is only against the results of last year?—My complaint is against the Bill of 1846.

4145. Then you are, in point of fact, speaking upon an experience of 12 months; prior to the 1st of January 1847, your experience in the Mauritius

tius was satisfactory to you in a commercial point of view?—Up to the Bill of 1846, my experience was satisfactory to me; it commenced from that period to be otherwise. The Committee are aware that we expected a great deal from the consumption in breweries and distilleries; we were completely disappointed, which I think was a great fault of the Ministers, for I think they might have saved a great consumption of grain and prevented this dilemma to the sugar colonies.

4146. What do you reckon to have been the loss upon your consignments?—That is a question I would decline answering.

4147. Can you tell the Committee what was the difference in price on the consignments of sugar you had from the Mauritius in 1846 and 1847?—The price in 1846 was 36s.; this day it is 24s.

4148. Are you aware that the Gazette average price in 1846 was 34s. 4d., and in 1847, 28s. 5d.?—The price in May 1846 was 36s. for that quality of sugar which I have laid before you; it is a difference of 12s.

4149. What was the price of a similar quality of sugar in 1845?—That I have not got.

4150. Are you aware that the prices prior to 1846 were very much stimulated by the large reduction in the duty which Government made?—You are putting upon my memory a thing it cannot possibly pretend to carry; any price current will show that.

4151. It is a very important fact?—It is not fair to ask me the price; my head will not carry the prices current of two or three years.

4152. Then you are scarcely aware of the fact that the average price of three years, ending with 1844, exhibits only a difference from the average price on the three years ending 1847 of 2s. 4d. per cwt.?—All I state to you is, that my account would be very good now, if it had not been for that Act of 1846.

4153. You say your account would be very good; what do you mean by your account?—I mean that my advances would have been covered had not it been for that Act of 1846.

4154. That Act depreciated the price of sugar, how much?—In May 1846 it was 36s.; it is now 24s.; the fall is 12s. per cwt.

4155. According to your evidence, it depreciated the price of sugar 12s. per cwt.?—Yes.

4156. Mr. Villiers.] Were you to be understood to say that you had been connected some years before with the Mauritius?—Yes.

4157. Will you tell the Committee in what year that was?—I think; if you refer to Mr. Hunter's evidence, he commenced business under my auspices in the Mauritius; you will find from his evidence the year he went to the Mauritius; I think it was about 1830.

4158. What was the state of the colony then; had slavery been abolished?—I think it followed a year or two afterwards.

4159. You stated that you did not do well at that time, and that you gave up your connexion with the Mauritius?—I did not say anything of the kind.

4160. You found things did not go right, you said?—I was the correspondent of Mr. Hunter, and he chose to remove his account; he took another partner, and I ceased to be his agent.

4161. You ceased to have any connexion with the Mauritius, then, not because things did not go right?—It was by mutual consent we parted, each party fancying he could do better for himself.

4162. You did not think it prudent to have any further connexion with the Mauritius at that time?—My connexion was not a plantation connexion at all. I sailed a couple of ships at that period, which I abandoned; but Mr. Hunter has gone into all those concerns, who was my great leader.

4163. The fact is, that you ceased to have connexion with the Mauritius in 1830, and did not think it profitable to connect yourself again with that island till 1844?—It was not my act which separated our connexion altogether.

4164. When did you resume your connexion with that island?—In 1844, I think it was.

4165. You stated that you never had any property in the island; have you never been there?—Never.

4166. You have no acquaintance with the sentiments of the inhabitants?—Yes, I hear a great deal of them.

Mr. D. C. Guthrie.

26 February 1848.

4167. Not from personal communication?—I see Mauritius papers, and see a great many Mauritius people; I know they are French, and we know that where Frenchmen exist French feeling exists.

4168. The fact is, that you have never had any personal acquaintance with the Mauritians in the island?—Not in the island, but plenty of acquaintance with them here.

4169. There was some evidence of your's which was received by the Committee, as to which, I think you have stated since, that it was not an opinion founded upon your own knowledge, but founded upon the evidence you have read, or the opinions you had heard of other people?—That was in regard to the charges of making sugar.

4170. You were stating opinions that were founded upon the evidence of others?—Upon what had been said at the audience which we had with Her Majesty's Ministers.

4171. In this advocacy of protection, you were giving the opinions of other people?—And my own opinions too.

4172. Not founded upon any acquaintance with the manufacture of sugar in the Mauritius, or with the cultivation of estates there, or what is necessary to enable them to proceed with the cultivation there in future?—I stated that I did not pretend to have an intimate knowledge of the expense of the cultivation of sugar, nor of carrying on the estates. I found my opinion upon the perfect concurrence of all parties, that they cannot produce sugar at the present prices; I have not been able to find one man who can produce sugar to meet the present price.

4173. You state to the Committee what you have heard other people say?—And what my own conviction is.

4174. You have also heard, you say, that the estates are under very different circumstances in the Mauritius?—I believe so.

4175. Some are mortgaged; some are not; some have good soil; some have bad soil?—No doubt of it.

4176. Then this amount of protection of a penny a pound would operate upon those estates, according to the difference in their circumstances, very differently?—It will operate to the benefit of all; good estates would be benefited; middling estates I hope would make a profit, and on the worst estates it would help them.

4177. How do you know that, if you are not acquainted with the estates?—Can you deny the position?

4178. I am asking you as to your knowledge of the different character of those estates?—I know the character of them in my own books.

4179. The character of the different estates in the island of Mauritius?—There is their character in my books.

4180. I am asking you whether there are any that would not be benefited at all by this peculiar protection which you recommend?—There are none that would not be benefited; because I look upon it that saving a loss is something parallel to making a benefit.

4181. You do not know yourself the precise difference between the estates in the Mauritius; do you?—I know this, that there are some that have been always profitable, almost even in bad times; others have not done much good in any times, and I suppose bad ones will go down hill.

4182. Those that have never done well in any times would not be benefited by protection?—Yes; till we produce sugar enough to supply our own wants, every one will be benefited.

4183. This protection is less than you used to have, is not it?—Yes.

4184. You have referred to the injustice done by Government, in not allowing sugar to be freely used in distilleries and breweries?—I think it would have been a great relief to the Government, and saved the present embarrassment, if they had encouraged the consumption of sugar, so as to have saved a great quantity of grain going into consumption. If you use a substitute, you save the principal.

4185. Are you acquainted with the restrictions that Government did impose upon the admission of sugar into distilleries?—We forwarded a request from the Mauritius Association that they would grant an Order in Council.

4186. Sugar was not allowed to be freely used in distilleries and breweries?
—Not

—Not in breweries, I think, at all. I think it was allowed in distilleries, provided you used sugar alone, but you could not work sugar and grain together.

Mr. D. C. Guthrie

26 February 1848

4187. Do you know why the sugar was not allowed to be used in breweries? —I suppose the Government had good reasons for it. I must assume that, or they would have permitted it.

4188. Did you ever hear that it was owing to the protection it afforded to the agricultural interest in England?—Very possibly that might partake in it, but at a period when you are in famine all that is forgotten. When you allow foreign grain of every sort to come into this country without duty at all, why not allow the produce of an integral part of this country to come in upon equal terms too. In common justice you ought to have taken off the duty from sugar entirely.

4189. Now that we are not in a state of famine, would it be of advantage to use sugar in breweries?—It may be used now.

4190. What is it you complain of?—I was not complaining of anything particularly.

4191. Did not you say it would be a great advantage to the Mauritius if sugar were allowed to be used in distilleries and breweries?—I spoke of the period when we addressed this letter to the Government. Our application for permission for it to be used was the 26th of October 1846. If it had been permitted in October 1846 by order of the Privy Council, my conviction is that you would have a very small stock of sugar, instead of a very large one.

4192. You consider that it would be a great advantage to allow sugar to be freely used in distilleries and breweries?—Yes.

4193. Would not it have been a great advantage to you to have been allowed for years past to have had this increased consumption?—It would have been quite fair. I should say upon general principles it ought to be so; and what would be an advantage to me now, probably if you had granted me that boon years back, would have been a boon then.

4194. Do you know upon what ground it was that sugar was excluded from being so consumed; do you know that it was the protection of the agricultural interest at home?—That no doubt would be involved in the case.

4195. Then the fact was, that protection to the agriculturists here did operate as an injury to the colonies?—That is drawing out of me an argument which every one would have their own reasoning on.

4196. It is the fact, is not it, that the exclusion of sugar from the breweries and distilleries operated injuriously to the colonies?—If it benefits us it may be imagined that it would perhaps injure them.

4197. You would not complain of it as injustice to the colonists if it benefited the agriculturists here?—I wish every man in the world to live; live and let live is the most glorious principle in the world.

4198. Does not it appear that universal protection is almost impossible?—My principle is to deal alike with all.

4199. Are you prepared to be injured yourself in order that the agricultural interests may be benefited here?—I do not wish them any injury; fair play is a jewel.

4200. How would you prevent fair play to the agricultural interests here being injurious to the colonists in the Mauritius?—We have laid it down as a principle which we have promulgated in the petition which we ventured to lay before the Houses of the Legislature, that the colonies are an integral part of the United Kingdom, and that they have a right to be dealt with *pari passu*, and no preference to be given to one over the other.

4201. The fact is, you have prayed that sugar might in future be allowed to be consumed in breweries and distilleries?—Yes, in common with the produce of Great Britain.

4202. Would you confine that to colonial sugar, or would you say that foreign sugar should always be allowed to be used in breweries or distilleries?—I am partial to my own family.

4203. You would exclude foreign sugar?—That is not the policy of this country. I should say, at all events, you should cherish your own family, and let the foreigner take the best chance he can. If your own family cannot supply you with what you want, it becomes a matter of necessity that you must get it from others.

Mr. D. C. Guthrie. 4204. If you can get the beer cheaper, that is, considering your own family? —You have the Lords dissentients here, who have described to you what would be the result.

26 February 1848.

4205. You are referring to the opinions of certain Peers, expressed in opposition to the Act of 1846?—Yes.

4206. You read the opinion of some person who had written a letter to you; did you give the name of the firm?—I did not. I have no objection to give you the name, though I do not like my correspondents' names to be published. If you wish it, I will state it; it is De Colons, of Madras.

4207. What are they?—They are merchants there.

4208. Mr. Matheson.] They are a French house, are not they?—Yes.

4209. Mr. Villiers.] Are they manufacturers of sugar?—They say that they have the management of a large factory.

4210. You do not know anything about the house yourself, do you?—I do not know them personally.

4211. Do you know anything of the circumstances of their conducting their business in Madras?—I think I know a good deal, because I have a good deal of connexion with them. I am in the habit of giving accommodation upon their consignments; my account is a very considerable one.

4212. Do you know any other house which has written the same description of the state of things in Madras?—I do not know. Mr. Arbuthnot has been examined. Arbuthnot & Co. have establishments upon their own account; they are in fact the parties interested; they cannot give them up, most likely; at all events they will give them up with great reluctance. The firm of De Colons rather represents what you would call the community of the country. I believe Scott, Bell, & Company's correspondents also have large factories at Madras.

4213. Is this protection which you say would be sufficient to be a protection against all foreign sugar, or against only slave-grown sugar?—I think slave sugar and other sugar comes so much together that I do not very well know how you are to make your distinction. I think Sir Robert Peel made that distinction, and I think the present Government denied that distinction.

4214. You have presented this as a formal request of the relief that you think would be necessary for the colonies?—We have named the lowest protection that I think we could get re-established on. My opinion is, that if we were re-established in credit, and if the Government here would issue orders to the Colonial Government to assist the colonists, and instead of neutralising the exertions of the labourers, would rather stimulate them, I look upon it that that would be one of the most important things that could be done. I think that free labourers should be made to labour, not under slavish coercion, but under reasonable restraint; that every man should perform a man's labour; that they should not be spoiled, nor be led to suppose that the laws of the country were made for them alone. My feeling is that the sentiment is general, that there has been very little inducement given by the public authorities to lead the labourers to work.

4215. Are you alluding to the local authorities?—Yes.

4216. Do you find any indisposition on the part of the Colonial Government to attend to any representations you have made?—I have been before the public authorities many times. We have always been treated with the highest consideration, and I never left them without supposing, something will come out of this meeting: but I have no hesitation in saying, that if you compare our hopes with the realization, the result has not been satisfactory.

4217. That applies chiefly to the protective duties, does not it, and to such regulations as you think would have been advisable?—With respect to everything. I have been with the Colonial Secretary, and my conviction is that I have never left the Colonial Secretary without feeling, Lord Grey wishes to do us justice if he had the bent of his own free will. My opinion is that Government is too often labouring under some abstract power, which deprives them of what I consider to be the deliberative power of a man. The Minister of this country is not an independent creature.

4218. You are not wishing to convey to the Committee that Lord Grey is acting under some compulsion or restraint, when he refuses to reimpose protective duties, which you have demanded of him to do?—You ask me my opinion, whether Lord Grey is a free agent. My impression is that Lord Grey has many impulses, and I look upon it that one of the impulses is this; that he

he

he stands committed by his Bill of 1846, as is stated in this letter, which I was permitted to read. A man of very considerable eminence in your House, says that Lord Grey and the Ministers, rather than abandon a line of action or of policy which they have adopted, or rather than hurt a hair of the head of free trade, would let the colonies and all of us go down *en masse*.

Mr. D. C. Guthrie.

26 February 1848.

4219. Has not Lord Grey been, ever since he has been in public life, an ardent free trader; and that, not because he has been a party to an Act of Parliament, but in consequence of his long convictions upon the subject?—What I complain of is, that when a man finds himself going the wrong road, he will not turn back again to what is right; that I hold to be your position just now.

4220. You have brought before the Committee your opinion upon the character and intentions of the Colonial Minister; you have conveyed to the Committee, that in consequence of his being a party to the Bill of 1846, he is unwilling to change his opinion. I ask you distinctly, whether you are not aware that Lord Grey has been one of the most ardent advocates for such a change as that involved in the Act of 1846, and free trade generally?—I really believe Lord Grey is a very honest man.

4221. Has not he always been the advocate of those very principles?—I stated my opinion that Lord Grey is an honest man; but the honestest man may be mistaken.

4222. Was not Lord Grey, before the passing of that Act, an advocate for those opinions?—I have no doubt of it. I may add, that Lord Grey gave very prompt attention to our letter of 15 October 1847, representing the probable prostration of the colony consequent on the failures in London. And for the measures of relief then adopted I have every reason to be thankful; and in our letter, addressed by the Mauritius Association, 28 October, we do thank him in as gentlemanly a way as you could do it yourself for any favour which has been conferred; at the same time, we have stated that the assistance that he had given to the Mauritius was only of a qualified nature, to supply the momentary difficulty; just in fact as a pauper, when he comes to the overseer of the parish, you give him a loaf to carry him over to the next relieving day. I look upon it that he would sustain that pauper afterwards, and take him into the workhouse; if not, he had better not have given him the loaf, but left him to starve at once.

4223. Did you complain of the Act passed in Sir Robert Peel's time, in which there was a great reduction of the duty, and a distinction attempted between slave sugar and foreign free sugar?—Every man, when he has anything taken from him, will complain.

4224. Did you ever complain of that Act?—I do not remember it. I think we did pretty well during Sir Robert Peel's Act. The Mauritius did very fairly from 1834 to 1838; and then when you abolished the apprenticeship, and simultaneously prevented the importation of Coolies, it gave them their death blow.

4225. That was not the Act of 1844, passed by Sir Robert Peel?—No; in 1844 we were beginning to live in the Mauritius.

4226. Have you extended the cultivation of sugar in the Mauritius since 1844?—We did so at that period. After apprenticeship was introduced, we nearly doubled our production.

4227. Eighteen hundred and thirty-eight was the year you mentioned, was not it, when the Mauritius was so badly off?—The very bad years for the Mauritius were 1840, 1841, 1842. In 1843 and 1844 they did no good, but they were then getting up their power. When they got fresh immigration they got a fresh start. In those two years they were working up their power, and they went on and did very well in 1845; and then came the Act of 1846, which ruined all.

4228. Are you aware that many thousand acres were planted with the sugar cane between the time you said they were ruined and 1844?—I do not believe there has been any additional planting beyond perhaps 500 or 1,000 acres; but you have evidence as to that from men who were there. As it does not come within my province I cannot speak of it.

4229. You would be astonished to hear that in 1836 there were 57,000 acres in cultivation, and in 1844, 73,000?—That is a fact I have not any knowledge of; my idea was that there were very few acres of forest land taken in.

4230. You were not aware of such an increase as that?—I do not believe it now I hear it.

Mr. D. C. Guthrie.

26 February 1848.

4231. From 57,000 to 73,000?—I do not believe it.

4232. You have no acquaintance with the island as to facts?—No. I think if you ask men who know the facts, you will find that qualified and explained in some way or other. It was rather, I look upon it, the restoration of old plantations than taking in any new ones. When times are bad a great many would cease to work; as soon as there is anything like profit in prospect those men become able to work again, and that is what we want protection for. We were going on very well up to 1846; and in three or four years the possibility is that you would have had more sugar than you wanted, and you would have been an exporting country.

4233. Mr. M. Gibson.] In that case you would have had foreign prices?—Yes, and we should then have had no one to complain of. If you grow too much indigo, or too much tobacco, or anything beyond the proper consumption of the world, you must draw in.

4234. Are you aware that slave sugar goes into the markets of Europe without any distinction from free-labour sugar?—There is a great deal of distinction.

4235. Are you aware that slave sugar is sold on the Continent?—No doubt of it.

4236. Therefore this surplus which we must have had, would have come in competition with it in the markets of Europe?—Yes; but if we could make enough free sugar, we should exterminate the slave sugar, and so put down the slave colonies.

4237. Mr. Hope.] The Committee have heard a great deal about the principles of free trade, and the principles of protection; will you tell the Committee whether you consider, in order to carry out all the principles of free trade, it is fair that restrictions on production should exist?—Certainly we have many restrictions to complain of. For instance, one of our correspondents lately put up two stills; they had hardly been put up when there was a tax of 300 *l.* a year put upon each still; that is a restriction which I think is most infamous.

4238. You are not allowed to employ slave labour?—No, there is not a slave in the colony.

4239. Cuba is allowed to employ slave labour?—No doubt of it.

4240. Do not you think, as far as the principle of buying and selling is concerned, that the prohibition to employ slave labour takes you out of the category of free trade?—The great father of free trade was Mr. Deacon Hume, and he promulgates that doctrine; and I believe his has been considered a text-book. I think you have that in evidence, that he positively says that sugar ought not to be within the category of free trade.

4241. That very circumstance takes sugar out of the common arguments with respect to free trade?—That is Mr. Deacon Hume's argument.

4242. And that is your opinion?—Yes.

4243. In that way you think that many of the questions which have reference to the abstract principle of free trade and protection, do not apply to your case?—I quite concur with Mr. Deacon Hume upon that point, and Sir Robert Peel was of the same opinion.

4244. You have told us that in consequence of the recent failures in the Mauritius, many estates, including some of the best in the colony, require assistance to enable them to continue their cultivation; would you consent to furnish such assistance upon the security that those estates offer you?—I have stated before, that *quoad* the Mauritius, I am so thoroughly disgusted in consequence of this Act of 1846, that I feel very much that I should like to take my foot out of it altogether. At the same time I have no hesitation in saying, upon another point, that a gentleman who has accounts to settle has asked me whether I would make advances to his estate under certain circumstances; but I believe that man is a man of fortune, and will have plenty of money, and will have security beyond casualties, and in such a case as that I should look favourably upon it; but that is the exception, and not the rule.

4245. You would not take the security of his estate in the Mauritius as your guarantee for making that advance?—I should say, that I cannot tell what is to be the result of the present inquiry; if this inquiry ends in doing anything for the colonies, I think that the colony has a prospect of thriving, and upon that view I should entertain the account; but if nothing is done, unless some hurricane or

some

some earthquake, or something or other takes place, I look upon it that the Mauritius, the great bulk of it, is lost. Mr. D. C. Guthrie.

4246. The natural result of that is, that you think those estates will go out of cultivation?—I have stated that I have already refused to administer to the wants of those estates; and I think that will most likely be the course taken by many others. The natural inference is that those estates will have very great difficulty in finding the ways and means, and therefore that production will gradually dwindle away till we have nothing at all: as we state in our letter of 18 November 1848, to Lord Grey, you will have a very fine fortress, a very powerful station in a military or a political point of view; but as to planters, you will have none. 26 February 1848.

4247. Do you think it is likely that the cultivation of the island would be turned to growing supplies of grain or sheep, for the use of those troops?—It will be a very fine speculation for Government!

4248. *Chairman.*] You were asked some questions about mortgages; whether anybody would buy those securities; is it not the practice, as far as you understand, of the residents in the Mauritius, to lend money upon estates, just as money here is placed in the Three per Cent. Consols, or savings banks, or invested in railway shares?—I think you will find that in almost every estate in the Mauritius they have money borrowed; and according to the circumstances as between buyer and seller, they make the best bargain they can as to interest. The greater portion of the estates in the Mauritius, you will find, are under such engagements.

4249. *Mr. Wilson.*] What are the different duties charged upon sugar now, in point of quality, confining yourself to British plantation sugar?—I have here two samples (*producing the same*), which will give you the two extremes. The first duty is 14*s.* upon muscovado sugar; the second 16*s.* 4*d.* upon white clayed; upon single refined it is 18*s.* 8*d.*; upon double refined 21*s.*

4250. That statement comprises the duties at present charged upon sugar grown in the British dominions?—Exactly.

4251. Do you find any inconvenience from four classes of duties being charged upon different qualities?—There has been some very trifling quantity, I should say not above two per cent., brought in above 14*s.*; I should think it was not more than that.

4252. You are not in the habit of importing sugar from the East Indies, are you?—Not much; the Dhobah sugars are of a fine quality, but the quantity is so small that the amount would be quite trifling.

4253. If the amount is very small, the object to the revenue would be very trifling in maintaining the difference?—To the revenue it would certainly be no very great matter.

4254. Practically, in the importation of sugar has much inconvenience been experienced by the importers in consequence of those different duties?—I have in my own experience only had two instances in which there was a question made.

4255. From your knowledge, is it the fact that those who do import East India sugar have been exposed to inconvenience?—Those parties who bring in those very fine sugars may have suffered some inconvenience.

4256. Are you aware that, according to the law, the distinction now existing resolves itself into a difference in colour, in granulation, and in saccharine matter?—Yes.

4257. As far as colour is concerned, the only means of judging is, of course, by the eye?—The difficulties may be overcome; the quantity of saccharine is a difficult operation, and a tedious one to ascertain.

4258. You are aware that one of the tests has reference to colour; is it sometimes difficult to decide whether a particular sugar belongs to one class or the other, in consequence of its colour being a little better or a little worse?—That is pretty well regulated by the system at the Docks in London, which is very perfect; the course of the operation at the docks is, that a bag or box of sugar is carried up upon a barrow or truck and undergoes the supervision of a qualified person, who pronounces what pile it is to go into; he will place together all the sugars which he thinks sufficiently good for the higher duty, and put them in one pile.

4259. Does he open every package?—Yes.

4260. Are you aware that the difficulty of defining colour has been so great that the mere difference of the state of the atmosphere has caused a different

Mr. D. C. Guthrie. judgment on the part of the officers, between one or the other?—Yes; the distinction between the very next shade, either above or below, must be very trivial. But with respect to colour, I should say the eye was a much better test than the eye would give you in point of the actual saccharine matter in sugar. I think the degree of whiteness is not difficult to ascertain; but when you come to the degree of strength, that is very difficult to ascertain.

26 February 1848.

4261. The quantity of saccharine matter there is no distinct or accurate test for ascertaining?—It is very difficult to ascertain the actual saccharine quality in any quantity of sugar.

4262. Does not it happen that what you call coarse sugar contains more saccharine matter than the fine sugar?—No doubt of it.

4263. With respect to granulation, does that refer to the size of the crystal or the dryness of the sugar?—I do not see how that could be a test; some of the East India sugar is as soft as flour. In opposition to the crystallized sugar and the vacuum-pan sugar, which has very fine crystals, it would be very difficult to draw the line as to what is the actual strength in those sugars.

4264. Take the dry Java sugar; a pound of that sugar, from its dryness, will contain a larger quantity of pure saccharine matter than a pound of East India sugar, which is soft and damp?—No doubt of it.

4265. The Act of Parliament, in speaking of granulation, refers rather to the dryness of the crystal, does not it?—I cannot tell what it refers to.

4266. The whole three together, then, are not in your estimation a satisfactory test?—No.

4267. Have you ever considered what effect it would have upon the growers of sugar, provided sugar could be brought into this country in any stage or form that suited the planter's convenience; would that be beneficial to the interests of the planter?—As a general principle, I should say the Government ought to give every facility to the manufacturers, and let the manufacturers arrange among themselves. If the planter found it to his interest to send home his sugar either in a crude form or in an improved state, or in another state altogether, which is called concrete, which is proposed, and if it is convenient to the manufacturer that it should be sent in that way, Government should make no objection.

4268. You think it would be advantageous to the planter if he had the liberty of sending his sugar here in any form that best suited his convenience?—As a general question, I should say the Government were bound to permit it.

4269. Would not it, in your opinion, tend to remove part of the inconvenience at present felt in the colonies, of the want of labour, if the processes of manufacture could be shortened as much as possible there, and transferred to this country; suppose you could bring home your sugar in a concrete state, or in syrup, or in any other state that would tend to lessen the quantity of capital required for machinery, and to lessen the demand for labour in the colonies in manufacturing the sugar?—Mr. Hunter or such persons would tell you more about that than I can; I should say, as a general principle, the manufacturer should be allowed to pursue his own course, and that Government should make its arrangements with a fair consideration to the revenue, and a full consideration to what would be convenient for the colonies to do; it is only by the test of time that the colonist would know what was his interest.

4270. Are you aware that a great many applications have recently been made to the Government to admit, at a corresponding duty, the cane juice and concrete sugar?—I have heard of it; and I think the case is irresistible; I do not see how the Government can withstand it; it is not sugar, nor is it molasses.

4271. Do you think the Government should exclude it?—I think they are bound to admit it.

4272. At what duty?—That is a point to be decided. I have qualified my remarks by saying that they must have a due regard to the revenue, and a due and just regard to the convenience of the manufacturers.

4273. A practical inconvenience has been found in this way, that the tests to which those samples of syrup have been subjected, have brought out a corresponding duty at so high a rate that the parties who import say it will not answer their purpose to do so?—Then they will not do it.

4274. What

4274. What would you think, from your experience as a merchant, of the plan of allowing sugar to come into consumption only at one uniform duty, but accompanying that provision with an arrangement for refining sugars in bond; that instead of only having sugar refined in bond, as at present, for exportation, all the refiners should work in bond, purchasing their raw material from the importer in any shape in which he chose to bring it, and then that there should be one uniform duty upon all sugar introduced into consumption?—I should say the effect would be good in this respect; that the bonded refiner would get his raw material to work on at a low price, instead of at the duty-paid price; but then there may be difficulties which I not aware of; what is to become of the molasses, for instance?

4275. The refiner makes no molasses, he makes treacle?—Certainly.

4276. The residue from refining is treacle?—No doubt of it.

4277. The "crush" sugar is refined from Molasses, is not it; is not it so at Greenock?—They are very perfect there I think, and surpass London; they manufacture from molasses what is called brown bastards; it is a very low brown sugar. The Glasgow people carry it further; they wash their bastards white, and that is called pieces.

4278. Under the system of refining in bond, all difficulty would be got over which is experienced at present from the classification duties?—Yes, it would, *quoad* the amount taken for refining, but there is a large amount taken for home use in that raw state.

4279. Are there any means of arriving at the proportion of sugar that is taken in its raw state for grocery purposes?—I should think it was attainable, though I do not know how.

4280. Every year there is an increasing proportion of sugar used in a refined state, is not there?—I think it is increasing; my impression is that the refiners have a capital trade, and when they reduce their prices still lower there will be more refined.

4281. The good trade which the refiners have had these last two or three years, I suppose you refer chiefly to the fact that the number of refiners has been smaller in proportion than to be able to supply the increased demand?—If there is an increased supply, beyond the consumption, it will lower the prices; I have lived long enough to have seen refiners have a very bad trade. The amount of refining now is very small as compared to that period when we were a shipping country, because we always refined sugar very largely in former days. I should hazard an opinion that refineries are not above one-half of what they were when we were a shipping country.

4282. That was when we supplied the continent of Europe with 50,000 tons of sugar a year?—Which I am very desirous to do again.

4283. How much do the colonies produce now?—I think our colonies imported this last season within about 1,000 tons of the amount which we required for our consumption; I think it was 290,000 tons.

4284. What was the consumption last year?—I believe about 1,000 tons more than that.

4285. The importation from the colonies was about 290,000 tons, and the consumption was about the same?—Yes; in fact it is the 60,000 tons of foreign slave-grown sugar that has been imported that has injured us all.

4286. Supposing Parliament were to fix to-day to have a 14*s.* duty for seven years certain, and to take all the various modes which you suggest for the increase of labour in the Mauritius, and for the enforcement of contracts and other means, the production of sugar in the British colonies, in your opinion, would go on increasing as it has done?—That is my *beau ideal*.

4287. If the production is equal now to our consumption, it will very soon exceed it?—That was my hope, if it had not been for the Act of 1846.

4288. That has not yet operated as regards the amount of production we have received hitherto?—We had a very good crop last year, and we had a great stimulus to bring home this low sugar. The moment prices fell there would be an end of that. Those crude sugars would not be brought home; there would be many thousand tons less imported.

4289. In the course of two or three years, if we were to go on with a protective duty, and people gave their entire attention to the cultivation of the colonies, we might fairly look for increased production in all our colonies?—As long as trade is thriving they would go on increasing; as soon as it is baulked

Mr. D. C. Guthrie. and reduced from thriving to ruinous prices, it will go back, and you will see that the importation of 1848 will fall short of 1847; then we must take more slave sugar.

26 February 1848.

4290. Supposing you were to go on thriving, and to have a protection of 10*s.* secured to you, do you think it is at all unlikely that we should have 100,000 tons of sugar more within the next two or three years?—It would take longer than that. In speaking of the West Indies, it might help them more; but it is not only the price, that is not the sole ingredient; unless the colonies get labour and effective labour, it is no good. In the Mauritius there are plenty of men to do the work; the difficulty is, that they do not work. We think it is the interference of the magistracy in the country which prevents the labour being effectual.

4291. I am assuming that you shall make contracts, that they shall be enforced, and that the Government shall be made in every respect as perfect as you please?—If you give us everything our own way, with 10*s.* protection, plenty of labour, and opportunity to use that labour fairly and properly, not to go to the extent of ill-using or forcing those men to do that which is contrary to their nature or beyond their power; the colonist requires no such thing; he will, if he is allowed, work his people just as you do your servants or your horses, so as to get good and effectual work from them; he will feed them and keep them in condition, and do them no injury. It is not the nature of a colonist, or a planter, or anybody else, to destroy a thing entrusted to him.

4292. Upon the same principle you would have no suspicion that a slave would be abused?—My own conviction is, that in the British colonies, during the intermediate period after the suppression of the slave trade, a slave in the West Indies was really very comfortable; he had every thing found for him from the day he was born to the day he died; and there was nothing required from him but a fair and reasonable amount of work.

4293. Are you aware that three years ago the consumption of sugar in this country very little exceeded 200,000 tons annually?—Yes.

4294. It varied from 200,000 to 207,000 a year, and during the last three years from 1844, the consumption of sugar has increased from 207,000 tons to 290,000 tons?—My conviction is that that arose from two causes; I think that one of the causes is this, that the duty was reduced 10*s.*; and also that there was a great stimulant given in the shape of railways to the consumption of exciseable and customs' commodities.

4295. Do you refer it chiefly to the reduction of price?—I have no doubt that that assisted very much, with the combining circumstance of railways going on with such an immense expenditure.

4296. Have you noticed, or has it been noticed by others, that the consumption of sugar increases and diminishes very much according to the rise and fall of the price?—I look upon it that the low price of sugar brings in a new class of consumers; when a man gets into the habit of indulging in the luxuries of this world, he sticks by them as long as he can get money or credit.

4297. Sugar is used for so many culinary or other purposes, that when it is very cheap a very much larger quantity is used?—Certainly. When I was in Scotland, a practice was adopted which I should think was likely to become very general; it was adopted by Lord Fanmure, who ordered me to send him a large quantity of molasses, which he is fattening his cattle on; and I believe in fact, that there is more nourishment in a pound of sugar than in two or three pounds of beef.

4298. Your impression is that the price of sugar has a great effect upon the quantity consumed?—Certainly; and the more people consume, the more duty you will get.

4299. Supposing we were to impose 10*s.* duty upon sugar, in order to improve the condition of the colonies at the present time, it would be necessary that the price of sugar should be raised?—The raising of the price of sugar is necessary to help the manufacturer to exist. It is a matter of question whether that colony shall live or die: protection is not desirable; I would not advocate protection as a general principle; it is only when you require to bring into existence, or keep in existence, or to restore an injury which you have committed. It is the injury which we have been submitted to we complain of particularly.

4300. In your opinion a 10*s.* duty is required in order to give what you call a fair

a fair price to the colonial producer?—Yes, my impression is, that we should require that not very long. If we could make 50,000 tons more, protection would, for the time, become a dead letter.

Mr. D. C. Guthrie.

26 February 1848.

4301. In the course of two years, then, protection, though it stood upon the statute book, would not be operative?—The Ministers would not be blamed for that.

4302. It is the simple fact, that in the course of two years that would be the case?—The moment we become a shipping country the prices will rise and fall just as water finds its level.

4303. And then you imagine you would be on a level with Cuba and Brazil?—Yes, in the continental markets, we should be so.

4304. Do you think that it would be prudent for any person to increase his expenditure materially at the present moment, with the certainty, under the circumstances, that the outlay of capital would, in the course of two or three years, have to compete with the same prices as sugar from Cuba and Brazil?—That is a very difficult question; prudent and conservative men would say, "We will rather wait and see what the issue will be." Others would say, "If we have a prospect of two or three good years, we can bear the rub afterwards;" but the matter is not what is to take place five years hence, but are you to kill us, or leave us alive now.

4305. The position rather in which you place the question is, are you to be killed now with the quantity of capital you have already sunk, or are you to be killed two years hence, after you have sunk a much larger quantity?—My speculation would be, that in those three or four years I might get out something that I had sunk.

4306. But somebody else would get in?—That is their affair. Those parties who take that view will not advance any more money.

4306*. With that view, you would not advance any more money, whatever the production was?—I should be very glad to be out on any terms. I have got in, and I want to be out.

4307. Do not you think it is possible that if the Mauritius find they are growing too much, they will afterwards grow a little less?—If they find that they are not having a profitable market, it will be as in other articles; a man will not bake more loaves, nor print more newspapers, nor do a single thing beyond the natural consumption of the public; you would not print 1,000 copies more of a paper than you think you would consume; neither shall we. If we find that we are making too much sugar, we shall reduce our quantity.

4308. Supposing you in the Mauritius, and the people in India and in Trinidad, are not of the same opinion at the same time; suppose the people in Trinidad, or in Guiana, or other parts of the world, are not of the same opinion as you are, you might be diminishing your quantity, and they might be increasing theirs?—They have the same opportunity of judging that we have.

4309. It comes to this; you are clearly of opinion, that as a permanent advantage to the colonies, protection would be of no use?—That is not my opinion. I look upon it the question is, whether we shall exist or not; it is not a permanent advantage, but shall we live or die?

Mr. Nathaniel Jones Kelsey, called in; and Examined.

4310. *Chairman.*] YOU were Auditor of Accounts in the island of the Mauritius?—Yes. Mr. N. J. Kelsey.

4311. Can you tell the Committee, at what period it was that the island became enabled to pay the expenses of its own government?—Since the year 1828; up to that time very large sums had been paid by the Home Treasury.

4312. Have you any account of the sums paid by the Home Treasury antecedent to 1828?—Yes; by chance among some papers of my own, I have a memorandum which shows the amount paid in each year, since 1822.

4313. Will you state the amount?—The whole charge incurred by Great Britain on account of the colony, in aid of the revenues (exclusive of the King's pay, &c. to the troops, issued by the Military Commissariat), is shown by the bills drawn in each year on Her Majesty's Treasury since 1822. Up to that period we received large supplies of specie and rice from India, and raised

Mr. N. J. Kelsey.

26 February 1848.

funds, by the sale in the colony, of bills of exchange, drawn on the different Presidencies of India. In 1822 the Home Government and the Honourable Company came to a settlement, and all outstanding accounts up to that time were terminated, and we commenced a fresh account from that date of all our transactions with India. We have since sent the Indian Government bills on the Home Treasury in repayment of all supplies received from India, consequently those bills show the entire amount paid by the Home Treasury from that date. In 1823, 15,500*l.* were thus drawn. In 1824, the very large sum of 103,441*l.* 1*s.* 11*d.* (of which 93,750*l.* were to pay off Government notes; it was at that time we changed from a paper to a specie circulation). In 1825, 48,689*l.* 1*s.* 11*d.* (of which 25,908*l.* 18*s.* 11*d.* were on account of government securities, or "recipisses," as they were called, bearing interest at the rate of five per cent. per annum, paid off this year). In 1826, 51,637*l.* 2*s.* 5*d.* In 1827, 4,306*l.* 6*s.* 11*d.*; and in 1828, for the first year, nothing was drawn. We then went on till the year 1832, when, in consequence of great pecuniary distress, the taxes were unpaid and fell into arrear, and in that year 30,000*l.* were drawn. From that time the colony has ceased to be a burden on the mother country, except for the Queen's pay to the troops.

4314. Mr. *Wilson.*] Were those notes which you say were paid off convertible notes?—Not until paid off. The Government servants were paid in those notes, and for several years before they were paid off they received the difference between the value of those notes and sterling.

4315. In addition to their value?—Yes; it varied monthly, and was as much at one time as 40 per cent.; we were paid in dollars, and for 100 dollars we then received 140 dollars in those notes.

4316. Then the notes were depreciated?—Yes; after they were paid off we changed to a convertible currency, and these notes were always paid on demand.

4317. When they were payable on demand, there was no difference?—No.

4318. Mr. *Moffatt.*] You have been for several years resident in the island of Mauritius?—Yes.

4319. Are you able to inform the Committee whether the planting and mercantile interests are fairly represented in the Legislative Council of the island?—The members are elected by Government, but I must say with great impartiality; they are selected from their talents, standing, and consideration in the colony.

4320. The result of your observation is, that the men most efficient for representing the interests of the colony have been always chosen?—To the best of my recollection they were. It has sometimes occurred that gentlemen have declined the offer of a seat in the Council.

4321. Has not the Council always been party to the various tax ordinances under which the revenues of the island have been raised?—Yes; since the establishment of the Council.

4322. Do you think that there is any reason to complain of undue government influence in the Council in biassing the votes?—Not in the least; they are perfectly free; the government officers are just as free as the unofficial members. I remember one instance only of the governor having signified his desire to the official members that they should vote with him.

4323. Are you aware whether any considerable sum of money which has been raised under those tax ordinances has been applied to immigration?—Yes.

4324. What proportion?—I left the colony on the 18th January 1845; up to that time a very large sum had been advanced from the colonial treasury for immigration, and comparatively but a small portion had been recovered by the special taxes levied for that purpose.

4325. That of course is exclusively to the benefit of the planters?—I believe so; but the entire island indirectly derives benefit from immigration; every person resident there and having property there, derives benefit from the labourers.

4326. Mr. *M. Gibson.*] What was the reason of the pecuniary distress in 1832, which you spoke of?—At this distant period I do not remember. I believe it arose in part from a great many failures which took place when we changed from a paper currency to a specie circulation, and subsequently a great many mercantile houses failed.

4327. When

4327. When Mauritius sugars were admitted to the markets of this country at the same rate of duty as West India sugar, that was found to be a benefit, was not it?—Yes, it was a great stimulus; from 1826 up to the present time a very great increase of cultivation took place; up to 1826 there was, I believe, a very inconsiderable quantity of sugar cultivated, but after that, from the lowering of the duty, a very great extension took place, and capital to a very large amount came to the colony.

4328. The extension of cultivation has gone on regularly from 1826 to the present time?—I think so.

4329. Did the compensation money, which amounted to something more than 2,000,000 *l.*, paid by this country to the Mauritius planters, pass in any way through your hands?—No.

4330. Was its effect apparent in placing the proprietary body in a better position than they had been before?—That is a difficult question for me to answer.

4331. You are aware that there was 2,000,000 *l.* sterling given?—I do not remember the precise amount; it did not come into the Government accounts in any way.

4332. Mr. *Villiers*.] Has not a large amount of public money in the Mauritius, originally intended for public works, been appropriated to immigration?—Not that I am aware of.

4333. Was not there a sum of money which had been appropriated to public works there?—Yes; there was a large sum of money voted for this service, but they were not enabled to complete those public works for want of labourers; sums had been voted by the Council to a large amount, yet from the scarcity of labourers they were not carried out. I think 25,000 *l.*, forming part of the balance in the treasury, was ordered to be placed to the credit of the immigration account.

4334. That money was appropriated in that way?—Yes; I think that was the amount.

4335. On what authority was that so appropriated?—By the authority of the Home Government, on the recommendation of the Legislative Council.

4336. Have you any official means of knowing what the sum is?—As to that one particular sum I am almost confident; but if it be of any importance I can ascertain.

4337. You say, that particular sum; you mean a sum of 25,000 *l.* at one time?—Yes; and this is the only sum that I recollect so transferred to the immigration account.

4338. Are you to be understood that the immigration was simply to complete the public works?—No; the Government wanted labourers as well as private individuals; there is a large civil engineer and surveyor-general's establishment there for the purpose of constructing and repairing the public works, roads, and bridges; the labourers' work was chiefly done by Indian convicts when I left the colony.

4339. Not by Coolies?—No; but the Government wanted Coolies as well.

4340. Did you ever hear that 300,000 *l.* had been appropriated for the purpose of immigration?—Up to the time of my coming to England it was, I think, about 240,000 *l.*; that amount was advanced by Government from the colonial treasury, which was afterwards to be recovered by special taxes levied for the purpose.

4341. When did you leave Mauritius?—On the 18th January 1845. What I state is merely from recollection. I know it was a very large sum indeed, and that a very small sum comparatively had been recovered by taxes; as a set-off against that sum, 25,000 *l.*, forming part of the balance in the treasury were placed to the credit of the account, as already stated.

4342. The whole of this money came out of the public funds?—Yes; there was a large balance in the treasury at that time.

4343. There was also a sum equal to 25,000 *l.*, that had been set apart for public works especially?—So far set apart that the votes had been taken and sanctioned by the Government; but I do not remember the amount so voted.

4344. It had been set apart for public works?—So far set apart that whenever Government had the means of getting works done, there was money voted by the Council for the purpose; but from the want of labourers those works stood over.

Mr. N. J. Kelsey.
26 February 1848.

4345. Has any part of this amount been repaid at all?—Yes; the sums advanced for immigration have been partly repaid by the collection of the taxes.

4346. Can you give the Committee any idea of what proportion has been repaid?—There was a very large balance still outstanding when I left the colony, to be recovered by those taxes.

4347. Did you say it was advanced to persons on an arrangement that it should be repaid?—No: when the labourers arrive, their passage is paid; tenders were received to bring down Coolies at a certain rate; the parties who made the tenders, and whose tenders were accepted, were paid out of the funds in the treasury; those funds were to be afterwards recovered by the special taxes.

4348. There was an arrangement made between those parties who had made the tenders, and Government, to repay the money?—Government repaid themselves by the collection of the special taxes. The master of the vessel received so much a head for bringing labourers into the colony, and that advance, made from the colonial treasury, was recovered by the special taxes for immigration purposes; but the persons engaging the labourers did not pay it.

4349. Are you to be understood that it was at the expense of the colony?—So far at the expense of the colony that it was to be repaid by the immigration tax levied on the colony.

4350. How were those immigrants disposed of?—By application from the different planters who required them; I believe they were so distributed as the cargoes arrived.

4351. Were those persons engaged in any way to pay part of the expense of bringing them there?—I think not; formerly the planters paid it entirely, I believe.

4352. You say the planters are not indebted to the Government for this large sum for immigration?—No.

4353. In what way were the labourers distributed among the planters?—On the principle of their general wants.

4354. There must have been some discrimination?—I am not aware what it was; I really do not know how the distribution was made. I believe each individual wanting labourers furnished a statement of the number required, and that on arrival, the cargoes were apportioned to each applicant, according to the wants of all.

4355. Have you heard any complaint in the colony of this manner of appropriating the public funds of the island?—Not to my recollection.

4356. Diverting a sum set apart for public works to the purpose of importing Coolies?—No, I do not remember any, nor do I recollect any such diversion.

Mr. George William Laing, called in; and Examined.

Mr. G. W. Laing.

4357. *Chairman.*] YOU were a Police Magistrate for many years in the Mauritius?—I was Deputy-commissary of Police in the Mauritius many years; from 1828 to 1846.

4358. Do you remember the first period of Coolie immigration, when they came under five years' contracts?—I do.

4359. What was the behaviour of those Coolies during that period?—They were not under the control of the police in any way, except when they first arrived. They were brought into the police-yard, and distributed among the different planters according to the tickets which they brought down. They were a very improper class of men, in my opinion, having been in Bengal myself five years before; they were men, I conceive, picked out of the bazaars, what we call Coolies in India, not physically strong for work, and a bad class altogether.

4360. They were Bengalese?—Yes; they came from Calcutta.

4361. You were in the King's service at that time?—I was in the King's service then.

4362. What was the conduct of those Coolies upon the plantations; though they were weak, were they industrious?—I am taking them generally, during the whole time of immigration: we used to have a frequent attendance of
Indians

Indians coming up to the police to make their complaints; we always summarily took their complaint, and sent them back under escort to the special magistrate to enter into their complaint; very often they were very headstrong, and would not go back; we used to coax them; they said they should be punished by the master; we assured them they should not, but that they should be sent to the magistrate, and not to the planter. I have often read them the letter I have written, to assure them, and they were allowed to take the letter in their own hands.

Mr. G. W. Laing.

26 February 1848.

4363. In that first period from 1834 to 1839 was there a general complaint on the part of the planters that those Coolies deserted from the plantations and would not work?—Not more so, I believe, than at any other period; there was a general complaint of their desertion; they used to desert in large bands.

4364. At what period was that?—At the time of Sir Lionel Smith's government there were a great many; and anterior to that also, in Sir Charles Calvert's time.

4365. Was that before immigration was stopped?—Prior to that, and subsequently also the desertion was.

4366. Do you reckon that they were a very bad class of labourers?—The first were much worse than those that afterwards came down.

4367. When did they become a better class?—Within these last six or seven years they were a much better class than they were at first.

4368. When did you return from the colony?—In 1846.

4369. Do you think in the last few years they were a better class of labourers?—Certainly they were a much better class.

4370. Were there fewer vagabonds in latter years than in earlier periods?—I do not know that there were; it is the habit of those people, it requires to know them; they are guided by one man perhaps, and he carries off half the band with him; if he has a complaint to make, his influence over them is such that he takes away 30 or 40 men with him, who perhaps do not know what he is going to complain of; you may call in three or four to make their complaints, and they will tell you different tales altogether.

4371. You think the planters had less cause to complain of the Coolies in the last year of your stay in the Mauritius than they had in the earlier period; is that so?—Desertion was general all the time of immigration; I do not know whether there was more cause to complain of desertion, but they certainly had a better class of men in point of physical power to work.

4372. The class of men they got in the latter period was better than the first in physical power?—Yes.

4373. As far as their sticking to their employments under the same master went, were the masters in a better position in the later period than in the earlier period?—I do not think they were.

4374. During the first period the contracts were for five years, you are aware?—Yes.

4375. And in the last period they were but for one year; which of those two systems would be the best?—The most advantageous to the planter was the five years.

4376. That was the first period?—Yes, in point of time.

4377. Were the planters better able in the first period, that is to say, during the five years' contracts, to keep those Coolies to their work on the plantations, than they were in the last period?—I am not aware that they were.

4378. You are not able to say whether the system worked the better with the five years' contracts or the one year's contracts?—No; I should say the more advantageous system to the planter was having five years, than having one year. The men are so fond of changing. An Indian will change without knowing why or wherefore. It is not that he has any cause to complain of the planter, but he will go without having any fault to find.

4379. Do you reckon that there is a great deal of vagabondage in the island of Mauritius?—A great deal among the Indians.

4380. What number of Indians live a vagabond life?—It is impossible to tell. Returns had been sent in before I came away to the Governor, but he complained continually of the returns not being correct, or not being sent in as they ought. I have seen them in the town, and we used to take them up

Mr. G. W. Laing. and send them off to a special magistrate to have their complaint heard; they were lying about the streets in bands.

26 February 1848.

4381. Are they a drunken set or a thieving set?—They do drink very much in the Mauritius, but in India they do not; the facility of getting liquor is so great in the Mauritius.

4382. How do those vagabonds gain their livelihood?—Heaven only knows; they may have some little money in their pockets; they eat very little, or go days without food very often.

4383. Do they become squatters?—In different parts of the island they do; in Port Louis we used to pick them up by ones and twos and threes and half dozens.

4384. Drunk?—No, lying down; they had deserted their estates without any complaint, and were lying about in the streets.

4385. What cure would you suggest to the Committee for that idleness and squatting?—I am not able to suggest any; it is the character of the people; after they have done a little work they become idle.

4386. Do you consider that wages are too high in the island?—They are very high; a great deal too high.

4387. Do you think, if wages were less high, people would become more industrious?—One would hardly suppose that. They would not have the means of spending so much money on dissipation.

4388. What are the wages?—They run from five to eight dollars a month, besides food and clothing.

4389. How do they spend that cash?—By drinking and dissipation with women, or anything they can; and they have also a trick of borrowing money from the sirdars, for which they pay cent. per cent.; if a man gets rid of all his money, he will borrow a rupee from the sirdar, who takes two for it a week or two hence.

4390. Can you form an estimate of the number of vagabonds in the island?—No, I have no return; nothing coming under our notice that would allow us to form any opinion upon it.

4391. Do you think that if the system of five years' contracts were restored, the people would be made more industrious?—It would be to the advantage of the planter to have it so; whether they would become industrious I cannot say; it is a voluntary act on their part entering into the contract; they perfectly understand what they are about.

4392. Are they a shrewd people?—A great many of them are, and a great many of them very stupid; they are all clever enough to understand the nature of the contract.

4393. What is the state of the old negro population?—After emancipation they disliked working, and particularly field labour; very few, I believe, are employed upon estates.

4394. How do they gain their livelihood?—As servants or artizans; some have bought a little plot of land, and do what they can with it.

4395. Are they a moral set of people or otherwise?—Marriage has been very much introduced among them since emancipation; it was not known before; they cohabited.

4596. They are more moral?—They are much better than they were.

4397. You cannot suggest any improvement of the laws, by which those Coolies could be forced to labour with more industry upon the estates of the planters?—No; they are bound to labour now so many hours a day, but it is a different soil altogether to what they have been accustomed to; the land of Bengal is very light; you never meet with a stone in it scarcely, whereas this is all rock, and the labour is very hard.

4398. *Mr. M. Gibson.*] Were there any representations made from the Mauritius which led the British Legislature to suspend the immigration of the Coolies you have alluded to?—Not to my knowledge.

4399. Were there any complaints in the Mauritius within your knowledge of the results of the immigration, up to the time when Government stopped it?—I am not aware of any; I had quite enough to do in my own office, without concerning myself with the immigration of Indians.

4400. What was your office?—I was in the police.

4401. You

4401. You mentioned that the Coolies were very changeable in their habits, and that they would leave one service to go to another. Can you state that they were not often tempted to go from one service to another, by the planters bidding against one another for them?—I know nothing of it myself, but I am fearful that that has been the case. I was not in the habit of going into the country; I was compelled to live in town, and my duties kept me there continually. Except three times a year, I was not out of the town.

4402. You think it may be said to be so?—Yes; I have heard complaints made that their men were seduced from them.

4403. By other planters?—Yes.

4404. The planters themselves may be said to be quite as open to blame as the Indians?—Most undoubtedly, if one planter tries to seduce a man away from another, it is very reprehensible.

4405. Have there been any complaints within your knowledge that those Coolies have been allowed to be in arrear of their wages by their employers?—Not to my knowledge; we have nothing to do with them; but I know it has been the case, as far as common report goes; they have come to our office to say they were in arrears, but we never examined into the thing; they were sent to the special magistrate.

4406. May not the non-payment of wages with punctuality have been one cause of the tendency to desertion on the part of the Coolies?—I think it is very likely to have an influence over any person who did not get his wages paid regularly.

4407. Is it your opinion that if the planters were to observe better faith to one another, not to try to seduce labourers away by overreaching one another, and to pay the hands in their employ with punctuality, it would have a good effect in attaching labourers to their employ?—It would be much more to their interest than to try and seduce men away, by offering higher wages than they were receiving. Naturally enough the men went away, fond of money as they are.

4408. The fondness of money is a proof that there is a mode of tempting them to work?—If the labourer gets seven or eight dollars with me, and you send and offer him eight or nine, it is most likely he will go from me; the money tempts him.

4409. Is not it your opinion that it was an injudicious mode of immigration, bringing in so large a number of men without a due proportion of women?—In the first instance no women whatever came; latterly there was a proportion of women; but I am aware of the dislike that the Indians have to bring their women away; it would have been advantageous had there been women.

4410. Do you know anything about Madagascar?—No, nothing.

4411. There are laws now in force to regulate contracts and to prevent vagabondage more strictly than formerly, are there not?—There were some published latterly, before I came away, that were more strict.

4412. Sir E. Buxton.] Do you know whether the moral state of the Coolies was very bad, whether they were addicted to very gross practices?—I am not aware of it.

4413. You never heard that the men were addicted to very abominable crimes?—I do not call to my recollection anything of the kind. I think there has been a case brought before the courts, but that is a solitary instance.

4414. Those cases are not frequent?—I believe not.

4415. How many years were you deputy police commissary there?—From 1828 to 1846.

4416. Did you know a Mr. Raymond in the island?—No, I do not know any person of that name.

4417. You have said that five years' contracts would be beneficial; do you think that they would be agreeable or irksome to the labourers?—I think the extension of the contracts would be of great advantage to the planter.

4418. Would it be so to the labourer?—I should say equally so to the labourer; it would prevent his going away at the end of the year, vagabondising; they are not perfect at that time in their work.

4419. Do you think they would feel it a great hardship if they were forced to take five years' services?—No, because they would know what they were about;

Mr. G. W. Laing. about; they are perfectly capable of understanding the contracts they enter into.

26 February 1848.

4420. As regards those who are now in the colony, do you think they would be inclined to take those services?—No, the time would be too long for them; after they have passed already their three years, they would wish for a shorter contract, and to return home to their families.

4421. Do you know anything of the education of the population?—No, I am not aware that there is any among the immigrant population.

A P P E N D I X.

Appendix.

AN ACCOUNT of the Quantity of FOREIGN UNREFINED SUGAR entered for Home Consumption in the United Kingdom, in the Year 1847.

Imported from countries the produce of which, during the operation of the Act 7 & 8 Vict. c. 28, now repealed, was admitted by Orders in Council to entry for home consumption at the distinctive rates of duty then applicable to sugar not the produce of slave-labour; viz.—	Cwt.	Cwt.
Java - - - - -	113,944	
Philippine Islands - - - - -	63,388	
China - - - - -	41,790	
Siam - - - - -	8,724	
British Possessions in the East Indies - - - - -	6,540	
United States of America - - - - -	162	
Venezuela - - - - -	1,928	
New Grenada - - - - -	765	
		237,241
Imported from other countries or colonies; viz.—		
Brazil - - - - -	202,411	
Cuba - - - - -	350,057	
Porto Rico - - - - -	120,242	
St. Croix - - - - -	58,808	
St. John - - - - -	50	
St. Eustatius - - - - -	1,010	
British Possessions in America - - - - -	4,002	
Europe - - - - -	1,102	
Other parts - - - - -	532	
		738,214
	Cwt.	975,455

Office of the Inspector-General of
Imports and Exports, Custom House, London, }
25 February 1848.

(signed) *W. Irving.*