

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, while taking note of the above statement of the Duke of Devonshire, desired to make plain that the recent Kenya decision could not be accepted as final by the people of India.

The Secretary of State for India, summarizing, as head of the Indian delegation, the results attained, pointed out that the discussion had demonstrated that it was a mistake to suppose that Indians throughout the Empire were given an inferior status, or that such disabilities as might be felt to exist were based on race or colour.

XV. CONTRIBUTION OF INDIA TO THE EXPENSES OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

The question of the contribution of India to the expenses of the League of Nations was raised by the representatives of India at the Conference, and was referred to a committee under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. It was there explained by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru that India was assessed far higher than any other part of the Empire, except Great Britain. In 1922 Lord Balfour had stated publicly at a meeting of the Assembly that the various parts of the Empire represented on the League would settle among themselves the exact amount which each would find. India desired to ascertain whether, in view of this statement, some relief could be afforded by the other parts of the Empire.

The members of the committee representing Great Britain and the Dominions, while expressing sympathy with the difficulties of India, explained that their Governments were not able to agree to any variation from the standard of contributions already laid down by the Assembly for 1923 and 1924.

In the circumstances, it was, of course, impossible for the committee as a whole to make any recommendation. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru intimated that India must necessarily reserve the right to raise the question of its contribution at the League Assembly of 1924, and the Secretary of State for India, as head of the Indian delegation, affirmed this attitude when the matter came up before the Conference.

The Conference took note of the position.

XVI. NATIONALITY QUESTIONS.

Certain questions connected with the law of British nationality were brought before the Conference at the instance of the Commonwealth Government, and were referred to a committee under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State for Home Affairs.* These questions were shortly as follows :—

(1.) *The Grant of Naturalization to Persons resident in Mandated Territories.*

Apart from certain special cases, there is under the existing law no power to grant an Imperial certificate of naturalization to a person who is not qualified by residence in His Majesty's dominions. The Commonwealth Government proposed an amendment of the law so as to provide for the grant of certificates on the basis of residence in " B " or " C " mandated territories—i.e., the territories administered under mandates in Africa and the southern Pacific. To this proposal (which accorded with certain recent decisions of the Council of the League of Nations) the British Government added the suggestion that similar provision should be made, generally speaking, in the case of persons resident in British protectorates.†

The Committee decided to recommend that the power of granting certificates of Imperial naturalization be extended so as to cover persons resident in " B " and " C " mandated territories and also in protectorates.

(2.) *The Appointment of Committees of Inquiry in connection with the Revocation of Certificates.*

A self-governing Dominion which has adopted Part II of the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, 1914, as amended, has power in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of that Act to revoke certificates of naturalization. Provision

* For the memorandum prepared by the Commonwealth Government, see Appendix VI, Part I. memorandum on this subject by the Home Office and the Colonial Office, see Appendix VI, Part II.

† For a joint