MANIFESTATION OF RECRUITMENT PATTERNS
1800-1856
Before the introduction of the Indenture system at Mauritius other forms of recruitment were tried, in induction of Indians. As such "the introduction of Indian coolies was to proceed and prosper in Mauritius at such a rate as to constitute an 'absolutely novel phenomenon." The French, who had succeeded the Dutch in Mauritius, introduced in the island, Indian labourers recruited from their factories established in South India. The British Government, after its accession, affirmed that convict labour was a cheap and convenient way of obtaining fresh labour for the exploitation of their colonies. However when they found it unsuitable and the slave population too declined, the planters looked for an alternative system which would be viable for the Government of Mauritius, India and to themselves.

Originally, the Emancipation Act, had some provision for a system of apprenticeship. Under this apprenticeship, the ex-slaves had to work under new conditions laid down for a period of ten years if they were agricultural workers, and six years if they were non-agricultural workers. However, the apprentices fared very badly under the new system; some waited patiently for the day of liberation while others continued to desert the plantations. On the whole, the apprenticeship system proved no different than slavery. Under these circumstances India had been looked upon for
tractable unskilled labour force. Hereby "the experiment which the imperial government set in motion in 1834 of testing whether free labour was cheaper than slave labour ultimately became confused in a multitude of sugar colonies." It was this confusion later on that led to the manifestation of recruitment pattern in Mauritius.

Ever since the apprenticeship was tried, simultaneously the Indenture system followed. G.C. Arbuthnot, representing Hunter, Arbuthnot and company of Mauritius, appears to be the first person to initiate the free labour system. It was on September 9, 1834 he signed an agreement in the presence of the chief magistrate at Calcutta police office, with 36 men of Dhangur or hill caste. According to this agreement, the coolies were to work for five years on a sugar estate. Both their onward and return passages were to be paid by the employer. They were to receive rupees five a month, and six months' pay being given them as advance. One rupee a month was to be retained from their pay to provide a return passage for each to Calcutta; and this sum would be restored, by the planter, if the labour failed to fulfill his five year contract. Food and clothing were to be provided for the labourer, according to a fixed scale. The contract would be simply read through to the coolies, and it was supposed to be explained by the chief magistrate. This
contract was to be signed both by the labourer and the planter or his agent, in the presence of the magistrate. This was the system that later on had evolved as the indenture system.

Regarding contemporary emigration from Madras, there is no similar traceable evidence as proof. But, this may not be applied to emigration from the Madras Presidency, since at the dawn of the 19th Century, before it engaged the attention of the British government, extensive emigration had gone through the French settlement at Pondichery to Mauritius.9 "The Archives of Pondichery list 4453 emigrants as having embarked for Mauritius between 7th August, 1837 and 20th July 1838.10

When slavery was abolished in Mauritius in 1835 the British Parliament voted 20 million pounds to the Mauritian planters as compensation, especially to the slave owners. However they received only a little over two million pounds. According to the apprenticeship, the slaves had to remain with the former master as paid labourers for the first four years after emancipation.11 But the slaves could not comprehend the difference between their new state and that of slavery.12 Thereby they triggered the planters to look out for other group of labourers, not only after the termination of the apprenticeship, but during its existence,
since the scarcity of labourers began to be a priority of deep concern to the proprietors.\textsuperscript{13} To remedy this growing need, early in 1836 the permission of the local government of Mauritius was obtained under certain regulations for the introduction of free labourers from India.\textsuperscript{14} The vested interests' were quick to act in making arrangement for the procurement of labourers from the Madras Presidency. Dick, the colonial secretary at Mauritius in his letter of December 1836 to the Madras Government suspected, the arrival of British subjects of Madras Presidency.\textsuperscript{15}

During the early years of labour traffic the French merchants and agents at Pondichery, were more involved. They also appointed sub-agents throughout the Madras Presidency, even before the passing of the Act XXXII of 1837. Indeed it was this Act which for the first time regulated emigration from this presidency.\textsuperscript{16} Vinay, a French merchant at Pondichery, Vaulking, a Mauritius merchant at Calicut, Tyack a French merchant, at Travancore, were identifiable figures who indulged in labour traffic. The successive incidents that had taken place, and recorded by Government officials of this period substantiates certain hypothesis. Chavarimootoo, native of Tanjore,\textsuperscript{17} Hufan Sahib, a native of Trichinopoly,\textsuperscript{18} Periyaperumal Naikan of Mayavaram\textsuperscript{19} were some good examples.
Another labourer, Periyaperumal Naikan an inhabitant of Mayavaram stated that "about five and half years ago, I left my village and went to Tranquebar, where I requested one Appoopillay to get one service as a labourer at the Mauritius. He took me and ten other individuals,\textsuperscript{20} who belonged to Mayavaram and other adjacent villages to Pondichery. There we entered into an agreement with one Mr. Vinay on certain terms."\textsuperscript{21} Iyasamy Naik, inhabitant of Coranadoo (Mayavaram), Ramasawmy, of Tinnavely District belonged to this group.\textsuperscript{22} There were some non-Madrasis with these return emigrants.\textsuperscript{23}

The evidence, gleaned from these government records, reveal that coolies who embarked\textsuperscript{24} from December 1836 onwards to Mauritius were natives of British India, not French subjects of Pondichery. Yet the authorities preferred the British Indian subjects. The ships that engaged the labourer neither had any medical assistance nor enough space to travel. Above all they embarked at Pondichery in view of evading the regulations in force at ports (after passing of the Act XXXII of 1837) within the limits of British India.\textsuperscript{25}

At the western coast, also the same labour traffic was done by the French merchants. D. White, the joint magistrate of Cochin had reported to the Government of Madras that "daily applications are made to me for permits to proceed"
to Mauritius. He had also stated that "one French merchant, Tyack was procuring labourers from Travancore, Cochin and Alleppy region. It was by him alone that coolies were exported from Cochin.\(^26\)

**TABLE I**

**STATEMENT SHOWING THE NUMBER OF COOLIES EXPORTED FROM COCHIN FROM 1ST JUNE 1837 TO 22ND JUNE 1838\(^27\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of shipment</th>
<th>Name of the Vessel</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>No. of Coolies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th April to 24th May 1838</td>
<td>'PORCUPINE'</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th June to 19th June 1838</td>
<td>'SCHOONER NIMBLE'</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE II**

**STATEMENT SHOWING THE NUMBER OF EMIGRANTS REACHED MAURITIUS FROM CORINGA BETWEEN 1ST JUNE 1837 AND NOVEMBER 1838**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Vessel</th>
<th>Name of the Commander</th>
<th>Date of Arrival at Mauritius</th>
<th>No. of Coolies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'LORD ELPHINSTONE'</td>
<td>A.N.JOWLE</td>
<td>20th June 1837</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'LORD ELPHINSTONE'</td>
<td>A.N.JOWLE</td>
<td>11th May 1838</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'GANGES'</td>
<td>Capt. BURGES</td>
<td>15th July 1838</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'MARIAL'</td>
<td>Capt. LOULIE</td>
<td>4th September 1838</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'LORD ELPHINSTONE'</td>
<td>A.H.D. JOWLE</td>
<td>2nd October 1838</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When information about the illegal emigration through the French Ports attracted the attention of the company Government at Madras, the Governor in council did make some efforts to get more details. In response, a circular was sent to all the district collectors to send a report "on the means resorted to procure labourers and to suggest measures for remedying any abuses that are found to exist". The return of the district collectors, reveals that "methods followed in procuring labourers were the same all over the presidency, but their suggestions for measures to remedying abuses seems to differ. The joint magistrate at Cochin in his report declared that "the agent personally visited the towns on the coast from Anjengo to Calicut for purpose of procuring coolies. He explained to them the terms and conditions of their engagement and defrayed the expenses of such as were willing to accompany him to cochin. Then he appears before me to obtain permits. He advances an amount of three months wages to them after their engagement". The joint magistrate's report stated that the coolies embarked from those regions were at the subsistence level and as such most of the labourers gladly accepted the terms and conditions to avail an opportunity of obtaining livelihood.

The collector of Malabar while informing the government on this matter stated that "the agents were procuring the
coolies through the agency of mercenary natives, and their payment was of a fixed sum per head and it was not free from abuses.\textsuperscript{31} Number of free men and slaves of the soil had been enticed away from this presidency much to the injury of the land-holders. So it had proved a drain in the revenues of the Government. It was further noted that in the process of recruitment much freedom was not given to the people. Once they entered into contract, no opportunity was given to them to get back out of their engagement.\textsuperscript{32} From the collector's report it is revealed that one Mauritius merchant, Vaulking residing at calicut expected daily a vessel from Mauritius for the purpose of embarking coolies from that region.\textsuperscript{33}

At South Arcot, the labourers themselves had stated that the "Maistries in the service of the agent at pondichery travelled about the country and engaged them, fairly by offering the same terms as were afterwards confirmed by agents".\textsuperscript{34} Most of the emigrants of this area were from poorer class and some of these labourers were, for the first time clothed,\textsuperscript{35} after their engagement. In fact only after the engagement, and the ship was ready, the memorandum of the contract was read to them and explained, in the presence of the principal collector or before a covenanted assistant.
However, the Collectors of Vizagapatam, Rajamundry, Masulipatnam, the sub-collectors at Mangalore and Tinnavely had reported that "no coolies have ever been exported from their zillah", but in reality it was not so. The Tanjore collector on his letter conveyed that "no coolies had been exported from his district, but it has been going through the french settlement." While a few Collectors stated that there was no emigration from their districts, the Collector of South Arcot had reported that "the day on which the legislative enactment No.V of 1837 came into operation, the practice of granting permission to British subjects embarking from pondichery or other Tanjore settlements has been discontinued." Yet Pycroft, the Collector of the South Arcot on 10th July 1838 requested the chief secretary, "to grant permit to Vinay and company to allow 480 coolies to board on ship to proceed to Mauritius", in violation of the Act XXXII of 1837. Again in his letter of 20th July 1838 he requested "to grant permission to the same merchants at pondichery to embark coolies from Cuddalore itself for the same cause. The official records of this period clearly shows that the Collector of South Arcot had a special interest in Vinay and company. He had not only written letters to the chief secretary in favour of the said company, but had granted permission violating the emigration law."
Implicit in his suspicious role Pycroft, the collector of South Arcot granted permission for admission into embarkation to nearly 35,000 labourers at the close of the year 1837. But out of which only 15,000 had been received for embarkation at Pondichery till 29th January 1838. The rest being during the year 1838 was (as stated in the Table III) 1668 coolies. The post master of Pondichery was authorised to issue certificates to the labourers who were about to embark for Mauritius. The post master of Pondichery enjoyed the right to authorise emigration till 10th July 1838, and since then the authority granted to him was withdrawn. 39

TABLE III

STATEMENT SHOWING THE NUMBER OF COOLIES EMBARKED AT PONDICHERY TO MAURITIUS BETWEEN 15TH JANUARY 1838 AND 30TH APRIL 1838

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMBARKATION DATE AT PONDICHERY</th>
<th>NAME OF THE VESSEL</th>
<th>NUMBER OF COOLIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15th January 1838</td>
<td>'George Mary'</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st January 1838</td>
<td>'Janet'</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st February 1838</td>
<td>'Herefordshire'</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th February 1838</td>
<td>'Edward Robinson'</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th March 1838</td>
<td>'Dorothy Gales'</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G.M. Ogilvie, the magistrate of Palmanair, North Arcot District, in his letter of 30th June 1838, reported an incident, in which two servants of a commercial house of Pondichery tried to kidnap a crowd of 62 coolies. One servant, a sort of peon, and another a interior servant wearing a belt engaged 62 natives of Mysore in the pretext that they were to work upon the western road-repair work on the Bangalore-Madras road. But they had instructions from their employers to hire the persons as labourers and to ship them from Pondichery to Mauritius. On their way 10 of the labourers went off calmly without the knowledge of the said servants. But, when the rest of them were taken from Ranipet to Arcot, (to take diversion towards Pondichery) via Arnee, (sic) the public felt uneasy as were the labourers. Thereby with the exception of one boy (aged 15 or 16) others persisted in breaking the agreement and expressed their wish to return immediately to their homes, a few repaid the money advanced to them, a few others having done so in part and the rest refunding nothing. After some time, "the government of the princely state of Mysore prosecuted Rungaswamy and Venkatsutty for enticing away those sixty-two
ryots to be taken to Pondichery on the way to Mauritius as labourers and they were imprisoned with hard labour in irons for six months and a heavy fine."\textsuperscript{44}

Magistrate, Ogilvie, also had mentioned about another incident, in which, the head police of Chittoor had found a person, who was engaged in the kidnapping of children. The person involved in the case was a Muslim. On enquiry he had stated that "he was an employee of vinay of Pondichery. On this occasion he was directed to engage as many coolies as he could find and convey them to Pondichery. However, he could not get many adults, so he seemed to have kidnapped children. He had in possession an identity paper which was signed by vinay, which stated that;

"the bearer of (this memorandum) Mohamed Khasim is authorised to hire labourers for transmission to the Mauritius".\textsuperscript{45}

Whereby in the concluding part of his report the magistrate supported the view that "the statement of people from various quarters who perceived to state that several thousand British subjects had been embarked for Mauritius from Pondichery-most of them apparently, before the passing of the enactment of the Act XXXII of 1837.\textsuperscript{46} For deviating from the Government orders, W.Ashton, the Collector of south
Arcot district of this time stood as a classic example at least in the event of emigration. Ashton, in his letter to the chief secretary had made a request as follows.

"Sir,

With reference to the notice published in the Fort St. George dated the 25th instant that no more permits would be issued until further order for the embarkation of Indian labourers. I have the honour to state for the information of Government that an application was made some days back by messrs. Vinay and company of Pondichery that a day might be fixed for passing a number of labourers engaged to proceed by the 'Ganges' to Mauritius. Circumstances have prevented them embarkation previous to the receipt of the prohibition, but as the ship is now ready to receive them and the labourers are engaged, I have taken upon myself the responsibility of granting permits which will be issued tomorrow.

I trust under these circumstances I shall be excused for deviating from the published order."

The chief secretary and the Governor in council, without verifying the fact granted permission to Ashton. The secretary in the memorandum stated that "under the circumstances mentioned, the right honourable the Governor
in council approves the proceeding reported in the above letter". 48

But the Government at Fort William transmitted a letter of 19th December 1838 to Madras Government that emigration from this presidency to be stopped.

To,

H. Chamier Esq.,
The chief secretary to Government,
Fort St. George.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No.1270 dated 28th Ultimo, I am directed to transmit to you for the information of the right honourable Governor in council the accompanying copy of a further resolution this day passed by its honourable president in council and to request that orders be immediately issued to make the suspension of the grant of permits to Indian labourers in general, in respect of all colonies or settlements, British or Foreign not belonging to East India Company.

Fort William

19th December 1838

H. J. Prinsep

Secretary to Government of India. 49

Though the Government was prompt in giving publicity to the order 50 they received, they were negligent in enforcing it in action. It appears from the records letters that, the
authorities at Madras and at Cuddalore had violated the order in force, and thereby made money in this French transaction. The question however, remains as to why all of a sudden emigration was stopped? When emigration was permitted from India through the indenture system in June 1837, many complaints were made at India, England and at Mauritius against this system by the public and anti-slavery society. It was questioned in English Parliament also. Messrs. Fowell Buxton, Lord Brougham denounced this system in the Parliament. Slowly the agitation reached India and stirred the minds of both Lord Auckland (1836-1842) the Governor General at Simla, and his council members at Calcutta. On the 11th of July 1838, Bombay, Bengal and Madras governments were directed to withhold permits for vessels carrying emigrants to the West Indies and to appoint committees to consider the whole question of emigration, its abuses, and to find out remedies. On the 28th of November, the prohibition of the issue of permits were extended to all colonies including Mauritius. Thereby emigration was suspended, and a committee was appointed in Calcutta to enquire into the whole matter. At Madras, Campbell, a civil servant was appointed as the head of the committee to investigate, whether the labourers were contented with their lot and satisfied with the manner in which the contract with them had in general been fulfilled by the parties to whom
they were consigned and for whom their services were engaged. To assist him, captain Horbes and J.Hugon were appointed as members of the committee. Unfortunatly there is no trace about this committees report.

In retrospect, the condition of the early emigrants of 1800-1839, evidenced through various sources could be summed-up as follows. The Report on emigrants submitted by the Mauritius Government in 1836, described that "The introduction of free labour from India to Mauritius, as an experiment had been attended with very complete success. The labourers and employers were mutually satisfied with each other. The care for the welfare of the cooly became a recent thing at Mauritius." But, a few civil servants at Mauritius, Messrs. Parry Woodcock and T.C.Scott pointed out that the system required regulation in certain respects. Yet there was a need "to frame laws to appoint magistrate, within the jurisdiction of the port or place of embarkation.

Upon these suggestions, Act V of 1837 was passed as law on 1st May, which applied only to Bengal presidency. But when the Bombay and Madras Governments subsequently urged the extension of the measures to their territories also, the Act XXXII of 1837 was passed (which repealed Act of 1837) on the 20th of November, to extend to these territories.
spite of the legislative measures, emigration was found to be faulty. So the government was forced to stop emigration especially to Mauritius. The causes that alluded for the stoppage of emigration were many; the emigrants were found to have been duped in the first instance, as "they were going to a place a few days sail from their own country". In some cases advance money, as it had been provided in the contract were not given to the emigrants. The emigrants on their voyage were not entitled to more than rice and salt. They were confined in a limited space during the passage, and on many occasions they were illtreated.\textsuperscript{60}

Upon their arrival, the habit of receiving daily allowance of rum or arrack affected the labourer as well encouraged men to spend their wages in spirit shops, where any kind of liquor was to be purchased at a very low rate. It was found to be not an uncommon occurrence especially on sundays, to see bands of drunken Indians parading the high roads in every part of the Island. In order to do justice to both employer and the employee there was no good interpreters from India.\textsuperscript{61} The public health of that colony continued to have been endangered from the extreme prevalence of small pox in a very malignant form among the Indians on the board the vessel.\textsuperscript{62}
The coolies embarked from December 1836 onwards to Mauritius, were both the subjects of the British and the French. However, the colonial government at Mauritius preferred British subjects. Till 1839, there is no official record available to prove the embarkation from Madras. Hence, the emigration Agent and the Protector of emigrants at Madras, who were appointed in the later years, could not give any details to the Calcutta government. Yet, the coolies of Madras presidency had emigrated through the French ports especially from Pondichery, so as to evade the regulations in force at ports within the limits of British East India Company.  

In spite of the suspension of emigration from India, various bodies at Mauritius, especially the planters brought pressure on the crown in England. At the end of the year 1839, the planters at Mauritius formed an 'emigration committee' to petition the Governor and the Crown. "Justice Charles Anderson, one of the officials sympathetic to the plight of the immigrants, was despatched to London by the planters to convince the authorities of the necessity to re-open emigration from India. In May 1840, he presented his credentials to Lord John Russel, secretary of state for the colonies at London, and pleaded by saying that "unless Indian labourers can be legally introduced at Mauritius by the month of December next, the colony will not
only become a burthensome (sic) appendage to the British crown, but all who are immediately connected with its commercial and agricultural resources must be involved in the general ruin, from which labourers alone can protect them." 67

Earlier in April 1840, Major Edward Archer, the fourth member of Calcutta committee 68 in his letter to John Russel, alluded to the various benefits for the labourers, the colony and to the crown through emigration. He contented that Mauritius "is the only point upon the surface of the great Indian Ocean we could establish a post to afford protection to our communications with India; It is the only island within the above circle which possess a safe and commodious port accessible at all periods of the year and to which ships can run to avoid the terrible hurricane of this regions, or in which they can procure the means to repair the disastrous effects of the tempest; the climate is remarkably healthy; the soil is fruitful; and all that is required is a population to bring, by fitting cultivation, the whole surface to yield to the fullest extent." 69

Though the revoking of suspension of emigration was sought through a bill, it failed in the parliament on many occasions. 70 "The situation however was not to endure for long. The coming of the conservatives in power (England)
under Sir Robert Peel created greater possibilities for a resumption and the climate of opinion seemed favourable.\textsuperscript{71} In India Lord Auckland too was in favour of reopening emigration on new conditions. His opinion was informed by September 1841 to the court of Directors.\textsuperscript{72} Later, Lord Ellenborough, (1842-44) before taking up the Governor Generalship of India, had drafted a memorandum on the conditions for the reopening of emigration. Yet the abolitionist again wanted to defeat the plan. But, the government of the day was too strong and thereby the proposal was voted on 26th July 1842 by a majority of 118 to 24. Hence, the Act XIV of 1839 was repealed.\textsuperscript{73}

The year 1842 was considered important in the history of Mauritius immigration owing to the removal of the prohibition imposed upon the exportation of Indians by the Indian Act of 1839.\textsuperscript{74} This commencement of that stream of emigration continued till the end of the 19th century, of course, with some slight modifications. Early in the year 1841, a sum of L 14,000 was allocated by the Mauritius Government for the procurement of labourers from India. In February 1842 a draft Ordinance was prepared\textsuperscript{75} and presented. The ordinance contained rules and regulations for the carrying-out of Indian emigration. "For some reasons, this most important ordinance never received the Majesty's
confirmation"\textsuperscript{76} and therefore lapsed at the end of three years. Consequently after some years when irregularities occurred the Government was unable to implement changes which the ordinance intended to provide.\textsuperscript{77}

Meanwhile at Mauritius on the 27th February 1842 an Ordinance was passed on the report of the committee upon immigration, raising the bounty upon each immigrant from £ 6 to £ 7 and by article 3 allowing increase of bounty of five per cent for every adult male labourer, whenever the number of females were in the proportion of five to every hundred male labourers brought. If in the same ship over and above the number of 10 females for every 100 males were brought, a sum amounting to double bounty upon the women were to be provided. Between 23rd January and 31st July about 7,951 men and 868 women and 183 children arrived at Mauritius from India.

Simultaneously, demands were made at Mauritius for the allotment of funds; for attending the introduction of Indian labourers; to afford additional encouragement; to the introduction of females; and to simplify the rules and regulations for the introduction of Indian labour.\textsuperscript{78} In order to request the Governor of Calcutta to use his influence with Government of India for the reopening of Madras and Bombay for emigration, the Governor of Mauritius,
Sir William Gomm, sent Mr. Anderson, the then acting Protector of Immigrants to Calcutta on 16th September 1843.79

Before the arrival of Anderson to Calcutta, Captain Chris Biden, a master attendant was appointed as Emigration Agent for the Port of Madras80 and an Emigration office was established at Madras Beach in response to the Ordinance 2 of 1842 of the Mauritius Government. Hardly a year passed, and again emigration to Mauritius was suspended at Madras from 31st of December 1843. The causes for the stoppage was that; (a) the annual supply of labour was then calculated between 1,500 to 2,000 and Calcutta was considered to be able to meet that amount for export, (b) that the majority of the women emigrants were already obtained from Bengal, so there was no need for Madras women, (c) as the cost of the maintenance of the three protectorates and three agencies were high. It was felt that the other two agencies (Madras and Bombay) were not necessary, (d) while comparing with other two ports Calcutta and Mauritius had a constant direct communication than the other two ports, (e) many irregularities were reported, one such was from William Gomm about "the individuals obtruding themselves on board the ships and personating others who had gone through all forms and obtaining licences.81 So an Act was passed (XXI of 1843) on 11th November 1843 to limit emigration to the port of
Calcutta only. Based on this the officiating Secretary to the Government of India suggested to the Governor-in-Council that "the Emigration Agent and his establishment at Madras be dispensed with from 1st January 1844".

Ever since the Act XV of 1842 came into operation the number of emigrants that sailed to Mauritius from Madras between 27th February 1843 and 30th December 1843 were 16,879 and the returned emigrants of the same period were 4,320. However, Captain Biden, the Protector of Emigrants at Madras reported that,"even before the establishment of emigration agency, labourers returned to Madras after the completion of 5 years contract period". 83

Again sometime in December 1845, the colonial secretary at Mauritius, G.I.Dick requested the authorities in India to allow emigration from Madras on the ground that "between November and March much inconvenience will be faced by the agricultural body at Mauritius and the annual supply of labourers required by them would be not less than 6,000 men exclusive of women and children". He further pleaded with the Government that "since the wages were already increased to Rs.7 per month it is absolutely necessary to maintain a open labour market". The other reason alluded for the immediate reopening for emigration form Madras was, the increase of labourers at Mauritius due to return of
immigrants in large numbers to India. Due to the continued pressure upon the Indian Government, emigration was legalised from Madras. However, the Act VIII of 1847 which allowed emigration from Madras could not be made useful because of the unwillingness of the West Indies Emigration Agent, to serve also as an agent to Mauritius. So, only in 1850 the first shipload of labourers left for Mauritius after 6 years. 84

In the meantime, rules and regulations were drawn up with every attention to the protection and welfare of coolies throughout the voyage, and all those were in conformity of the provisions contained in the emigration Act No.XV of 1842. According to this, the Emigration Agent was to ascertain by personal communication the willingness of every emigrant previous to his or her embarkation. He had to make sure that such emigrant had not been induced to emigrate by any fraud, false or unreasonable expectation and was aware of the distance of Mauritius from Madras. He was also to explain the available benefits at Mauritius and also to caution them against unexpected happenings on the voyage and stay over there. 85

Provisions, water, medicines and medical attendance were to be provided according to the scales established and the same to be examined and certified by the Agent and
marine surgeon. A medical attendant for the voyage was to be provided and paid by the owner of the ship. Every person applying for emigration certificate from the marine surgeon had to be certified that he was fit and proper subject, has been vaccinated, of sound mind and free from disease. Every emigrant embarking for Mauritius would be permitted to take his wife and children with him, whatever may be the number of the latter.

The protector of Emigrants had to forward to the Government of Madras, a monthly report of business transacted by the agency. He was to forward an application to secure licence from the Government, with the following particulars:

Name of the vessel
The Registered tonnage
The Name of her master
Name of the owner
Capacity of the vessel to carry emigrants

A list duplicate specifying names, ages and occupation of all the emigrants and also a certificate granted by the Agent that all the rules and regulations had been compiled with.
In spite of the many efforts taken by the Government, there were complaints from the public, the protector of emigrants at Madras and the protector of immigrants Mauritius, that "the emigrants were not informed fully about their destination, terms and conditions of his contract. This necessitated the notification of the same in different languages in different part of Madras presidency.

"NOTICE TO THE NATIVES OF EVERY CASTE

who may desirous to emigrate to the Mauritius an island at the distance of 2,500 miles or four weeks sail from Madras, at which place with their wives and families, they will find employment in the sugar-cane plantation under the following rules and regulations.

1. Emigrants embarking for the Mauritius will be expected to reside in the colony for a period not less than five years.

2. An industrial or labouring residence of 5 years will be counted from the date of arrival in the colony.

3. Each emigrant will be allowed wages at the rate of 5 rupees per month and 4 rupees for food, clothing and lodging.

4. Emigrants after 5 years industrial or labouring residence, will be entitled to a free passage to their country at the expense of the Mauritius Government.
5. Should they leave the colony before the expiration of 5 years, the expense of the passage to be borne by themselves.

6. The passage money of the coolie emigrants will be recovered from their wages at Mauritius, if the employment of emigrants fall short of the period of 5 years. A tax at the rate of 4 shillings per month, is payable for the deficiency. In the same manner an emigrant is not entitled to return to Madras or any other part in India at his own expense, unless a payment at the rate £1 per annum, for any period short of 5 years of industrial or labouring residence.

7. An emigrant shall within three months after his arrival at the Mauritius, provide himself with a Ticket.

8. Emigrants before leaving the Mauritius must obtain a passport.

9. An emigrant on arriving at the Mauritius will or may be liberated on refunding the cost of his passage from India". 

Women played a very vital role in the society, no doubt, this has been substantiated by their deeds in the process of procuring emigrants. Maistries, who found themselves unable to collect the required number of emigrants in this presidency, found a way out, to appoint females to entice induce and trap men of useful category.
Since the Emigration Agent himself had given his approval to appoint females, the maistries were able to earn a large sum through them. The North Arcot Magistrate had complained to the authorities in Madras, that "the use of females generally comprehends the sort of means and inducements in the use of which females would be the most appropriate instruments for the practice of 'crimping'."\(^8^9\) (sic-1840's).

The second half of the 19th century was not beneficial to the emigrants. A committee which was constituted at Mauritius by the Governor to report on various points connected with immigration of Indians, adversely disturbed some of the privileges already enjoyed by the emigrants. The report showed the establishment charges as a total of Rs.46,693-12-0 of which Rs.10,000 was spent on the return passage of emigrants.\(^9^0\) According to the committee the return passage after the completion of five year period was unwarranted on the ground that "of the 75,935 adult Indian immigrants introduced under the order in Council of January 1842 upto the end of 1849 there have returned to India as follows".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All their own expense</td>
<td>6,804</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>7,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the Government expense</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the Government expense after</td>
<td>4,507</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>5,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed their five year residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,747</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>13,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of emigrants returning after the completion of five years constitute about seven percent. So, by far the greater portion of the emigrants had left Mauritius merely because of a free passage. Whereas they failed to understand that the sentiments attached to their soil was more vital than the free passage.

The committee also declared that "this obligation on the part of government to provide gratuitous passage is very objectionable, burdensome to the colony, ... prejudicial effects to the permanent settlement of Indian immigrants in the colony ... and are in the opinion of the committee a far more serious consequence." Even the committee went to the extent of declaring that "it is not the servant, but the master (at Mauritius) who really is now wanting protection, that the former not only enjoys liberty, but indulged with impunity in licence, while the latter pays high wages and is served with continual negligence."^91
The committee recommended for the reduction of height (space) between the decks as 5.50 feet, instead of 6 feet hitherto provided to the emigrants in the voyage saying "the immigrant should have space for health and due comfort. What is beyond this is costly and yet without necessity". It also gave direction to warn the emigrants that they will not be entitled to a return passage on the public expense in future. The authorities in India, by sensing that it would have an adverse effect on coolie emigration from India, very politely ordered to print and circulate the following information in different languages in the Madras Presidency.

"The passage money including provisions for a returned emigrant is usually from 15 to 18 rupees. If he is in distress and can get no work at the Mauritius, the Government of that colony will still send him to this country free of expense as before. Emigrants return from Mauritius generally bring with them from Rs.100/- to Rs.200/-, and some even Rs.1000/-. They can therefore afford to pay their passage back when the time arises for their return to India."

Yet the problem of deciding the issue of emigration from India, whether to stop it or allow it was a continuous issue! The authorities in the districts were not happy about the way in which it was operated, the Governor in council
was also not satisfied with the way in which it was streamlined. The Governor-General in Council was under constant pressure of the Board of Directors of the East India Company and had to dilly-dally. But after a long course of correspondence option was given to "the Governor-General in Council, by notification in the Gazette, to suspend emigration to any British Colony, when he has reason to do, and also to revoke the same".  

Having secured power to act on the issue of emigration, the Governor-General-in Council decided to suspend emigration to Mauritius. In his telegraphic message to the Secretary, Fort St.George, Cecil Beaden, Secretary to the Government of India stated that,

"The Governor-General of India in Council having reason to believe that in the Mauritius to which Colony the emigration of natives of India is allowed, proper measures have not been taken for the protection of such emigrants immediately upon their arrival in the colony. It is hereby decided that the emigration of natives of India to the said colony of Mauritius shall cease, and be prohibited from this Twenty Fourth day of October One Thousand Eight Hundred and Fifty Six."
By Order of the Right Honorable the Governor-General of India in Council.

Calcutta 24th October 1856

(Sd.) Cecil Beaden Secretary to the Government of India. 96

Perhaps there were reasons to suspend emigration as already stated. However, the immediate cause for the suspension of emigration to Mauritius could be attributed, for the death of 284 coolies out of 697 who left Calcutta in September 1856, by the ship 'Hyderee' and the 'Futteh Mobaraik' on the way to Mauritius. 97

While assessing the manifestation of Coolie recruitment during 1800-1856, the indenture system, among other systems, proved to be a successful and economically viable one for the planters as well as to the Governments of Mauritius and India. Yet another feature of Madras emigration was, that it had many embarkation ports, such as Vizagapatam, Coringa, Madras, Pondichery, Cuddalore, Karaikal, Nagapatnam, Cochin, etc. (legally and illegally). Whereas the Bengal and Bombay Presidencies had only one each, i.e., Calcutta and Bombay.

In South India, the Europeans irrespective of their country overlooked the company regulations on many occasions, and Indians irrespective of their nativity made money out of this transaction. As the planters and the
Government at Mauritius were making efforts to continue emigration, the public and the Government of Madras did not bother much on this subject. Ultimately the suspension of emigration and revoking of this suspension formed another phase pattern of emigration during the 19th century. Even then "the indenture system as a new kind of servitude and bondage, was fraught with problems which threatened to ruin it. But with collusion of authorities it survived the tensions and stresses, and having passed the test, it set the pattern for years to come and became a working model for other colonies". 98
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>£ 28,000- 0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return passage to Emigrants</td>
<td>£ 10,000- 0-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses at Mauritius</td>
<td>£ 1,091- 0-0</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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