

Indian Opinion

ઇન્ડિયન ઓપિનિયન.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN ENGLISH AND GUJARATI

No. 35—VOL XI. SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 6TH, 1913.

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper
PRICE THREEPENCE

THE HOUSE OF LORDS DEBATE

WE have received the official report of the debate which took place in the House of Lords, on the 30th July, on the question of the British Indians in South Africa. We give the full text:—

LORD AMPHILL rose to call attention to the fact that the Immigrants Regulation Bill, which has passed through the Union Parliament of South Africa, has received the assent of the Governor-General and is to become law on August 1st, is not in accordance with the Provisional Settlement of 1911 or with the stipulations of His Majesty's Government; and to inquire whether His Majesty's Government will request the Government of the Union of South Africa to suspend the operation of the Act in order to give opportunity to such amendment thereof as will be more satisfactory to the Indian community in South Africa and less injurious to British prestige in India.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, I hope that your Lordships will not measure the importance of this question by the insignificance of the individual who has so often felt it his duty to address you on the subject. I hope also that your Lordships will not be misled by the fact that the Press of this country has given but scanty attention to the question. I will not venture upon any conjecture as to why this should be. I will only remark that this is not the only question of importance which has not received full and adequate attention from the newspapers. Of one thing I am certain, and it is this, that sooner or later, probably sooner, this question will compel widespread attention in every quarter unless it is very soon and satisfactorily settled. It is not I who say so. It has been said by all the responsible statesmen of this country at one time or another; and even the present Colonial Secretary has declared that it is a matter of "Imperial importance"—he could hardly have used a stronger term than that,—that the claim of the Indians, the just claim of the Indians, should be conceded. I refer your Lordships to Mr. Harcourt's telegram of May 8th, which you will find on page 17 of the Blue book. I say that this matter has received very little attention from the public in this country. If I had the arts of a Birrell or the resources of a Cocoa Press I could have made a great deal more of it than the Party opposite managed to make of the "Chinese slavery" business, for there can be no doubt that there is far more occasion for national shame and national indignation at the mismanagement which has kept Indians waiting ten long years for the justice which the British Government was bound to secure for them and which British statesmen again and again pledged themselves to secure.

Let us not forget that the South African War was fought ostensibly to secure redress of the grievances of our Indian fellow-subjects in the Transvaal. That

was one of the main causes of the war. The late Mr Alfred Lyttelton, whose loss we all so deeply deplore, stated very clearly in an important speech that it was part of our case against the South African Republic. I should also like to remind your Lordships of the memorable words used by the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition, who speaking at Sheffield in 1899, used the following language—

"A considerable number of the Queen's Indian subjects are to be found in the Transvaal, and among the many misdeeds of the South African Republic I do not know that any fills me with more indignation than its treatment of those Indians. And the harm is not confined to the sufferers on the spot, for what do you imagine would be the effect produced in India when these poor people return to their country and report to their friends that the Government of the Empress, so mighty and irresistible in India, with its population of 300,000,000, is powerless to secure redress at the hands of a small South African State."

Those were indeed prophetic words, for we now know what the people of India say of this lamentable impotence on the part of the Imperial Government. I see that my noble friend Lord Sydenham is here. He has arrived from India more recently than myself, and he can tell your Lordships, and I hope he will do so, of the deplorable and alarming effect which has been produced in India. I hope that he will tell your Lordships from his own experience how men who are not political agitators, leading men in Bombay and indeed all over India who usually refrain from taking part in public affairs, were impelled to hold public meetings in order to protest. The South African Republic has, since the noble Marquess, Lord Lansdowne, spoke, been under the British Flag, and surely it ought to be easier for the Imperial Government to get their way under the British Flag than when they have to deal with a foreign State, even though it is a small one.

Then I hope that the noble Marquess the Leader of the House will tell us what the Government of India have reported on this subject, and what he himself has been able to say. I could quote the sayings of many other leading men, but I will content myself with only repeating the words which my noble friend Lord Selborne used at Dumfries in the year 1899, and I quote them because he has a very special responsibility in the matter. Lord Selborne said—

"Was it, or was it not, our duty to see that our dusky fellow-subjects in the Transvaal should be treated as the Queen in our name had promised they should be treated?"

He was, of course, referring to the celebrated Proclamation of Her Majesty Queen Victoria.

"We were trustees for our brothers all over the world . . . trustees also for our fellow-subjects of different races and different colours. Was the British Government going to make its name respected and to have the pledges given by it faithfully observed? Was it going to see that the British subject wherever he went all over the world, whether he were

white or black, was to have the rights which his Queen had secured for him?"

My Lords, that was true Imperial doctrine, and it is to me incomprehensible that, after language of that kind had been used by the responsible statesmen of the day and by Ministers of the Crown, ten years should have elapsed without the wrong having been righted. Surely His Majesty's present Ministers are not going to say that they are not bound by the pledges of their predecessors in a matter of this kind, a matter affecting the Governments of the Empire, affecting our rule, our honour, and our good faith in India. They cannot say so. Indeed, His Majesty's Ministers have renewed those pledges. I have only to refer your Lordships to a Despatch written by the noble Marquess the Leader of the House, in October, 1910, in which he very clearly stated the position and took up an altogether unexceptionable attitude on behalf of His Majesty's Government.

Yes; but ten years have passed away, and those grievances which were referred to in such emphatic language have not yet been redressed, and those rights which were due to our Indian fellow-subjects have not yet been secured. On the contrary, the position of Indians has undoubtedly been worse during that period than it was under the old South African Republic. I have often given your Lordships proof of that, and I am not going to take up time by doing so again. I will only point to the fact that the Indians were obliged to resort to passive resistance and to voluntarily undergo untold suffering for the sake of these principles for which they were contending, and that a feeling has arisen in India for which there has been no parallel before. Well, my Lords, what have we to say to India? How are we to justify this long delay? And what does India say to us? The Imperial Government obtained power to settle this question eleven years ago by the arbitrament of war. They obtained the power which they had had by Convention before, but which had been muddled away. Why have they not exercised that power? Again and again they have had special opportunities of settling this question, opportunities when they were in the position of being able to make the settlement of the question a part of some bargain which our friends in South Africa were obliged to make with them. Why have those opportunities not been used? My Lords, the whole thing is a chapter in the history of the Empire over which, perhaps, it is best to draw a veil.

On this occasion we had better confine our attention to the actual present situation. The position is this. The British Government have declared that certain things must be done, and those things have not been done. The Government have accepted this Immigrants Regulation Act which does not fulfil the conditions without which they said that no solution of the problem would be acceptable. I beg your Lordships' attention to the facts, which I will state as briefly as possible. Let us once more go back to the noble Marquess's Despatch of October 7, 1910, which is to be found in Cd. 5579, and which, as I just said, clearly defined the position of His Majesty's Government. The noble Marquess, after expressing the opinion that it would be best to treat the whole of the Union as one immigration area, wrote as follows—

"I ought to add that any solution that prejudices or weakens the present position of Indians in the Cape Colony and Natal would not be acceptable to His Majesty's Government."

Those are the words on which I pin my faith. Nothing could be more explicit. Those words embody the policy which the Indian community in South Africa have been contending for and which their friends in this country are advocating. It may be briefly summarised as the removal of a racial bar and the maintenance of existing rights. That is all they have been asking for. They are not asking for votes or political rights, or for any things which it is not possible in the circumstances of South Africa to give them. They are

merely asking that they should not be treated as an inferior race, and that the rights which they have hitherto enjoyed for many years past should be preserved to them and not taken away. That is the policy to which my noble friend Lord Selborne committed himself. He said very clearly that while he felt obliged to advocate the restricting of immigration into South Africa—and the Indians themselves have never wavered in their opinion that that is necessary and that they must acquiesce in it—he was determined that the Indians in South Africa should be treated as well as possible and should not be deprived of any of their rights.

The next point is what is called the Provisional Settlement of 1911. This miserable passive resistance movement had gone on for very nearly four years. It had become a scandal which the South African Government could not ignore. It had aroused the bitterest indignation in India, and it was a disgrace to the whole Empire. A Bill to remedy the grievances and to fulfil the former pledges of the South African Government had been introduced, but it proved to be unsatisfactory and was withdrawn. It then became necessary to bring about an armistice with the Indian leaders, and a correspondence took place between Mr. Gandhi, the devoted patriot who is at the head of the Indian community in South Africa, and General Smuts, the Minister of the Interior. I should like to call your Lordships' attention incidentally to the fact that the whole of that correspondence—indeed very essential parts of it—has not been published in the former Blue-book No. 6283. Anyhow, in this correspondence a provisional settlement was arrived at, and the terms were as follows—(1) that legislation should be passed in the next session repealing Act 2 of 1907, subject to the reservation of the rights of minor children; (2) that there should be no racial bar in any future legislation for the whole of the Union; (3) that existing rights should be maintained; and (4) that there should be an amnesty for passive resisters. The two essential points are the removal of a racial bar and the maintenance of existing rights. Passive resistance was accordingly suspended, and a second Bill was introduced into the Union Parliament, but it was not passed in the next session, nor did it fulfil the essential conditions. The Bill was eventually withdrawn.

A third Bill was introduced this year under the title of the Immigrants Regulation Bill, the Bill to which this Blue-book refers. It was introduced on April 14, passed on June 13, and received the assent of the Governor-General on the following day. This Act comes into force on August 1, but under the South Africa Act, Section 65 (a), the King may disallow any law within one year after it has been assented to by the Governor-General. This Act, which will come into force the day after to-morrow, fails to carry out the agreement which was made in the Provisional Settlement, and fails to fulfil those conditions which His Majesty's Government have repeatedly and explicitly declared to be essential. What I want to know is: Why have His Majesty's Government given way? Why have they not stuck to the conditions which they declared to be essential? Why was the Governor-General allowed to assent to this Bill the very moment it passed through its final stage without any opportunity being given to the Imperial Government, who are equally concerned, to make sure that the provisions were satisfactory? Why was the Bill not reserved, as it might well have been under the South Africa Act, for the consent of the King? And what have His Majesty's Government got to say to India in order to explain the fact which they themselves admit, that the Act cannot be entirely satisfactory to the Indian community? Those are the questions which I hope the noble Marquess will be able to answer. But I regret very much that the answer is to come from the Leader of the House. He is, of course, not personally responsible in this matter. On the contrary, the Blue-book reveals that the noble Marquess has much anxious concern for a fair settlement of this question from his

position as Secretary of State for India. I wish, therefore, it did not fall to his lot to apologise for the other Department.

My Lords, what will His Majesty's Government do if passive resistance is renewed, for that is a contingency which must certainly be taken into account? How are you going to meet the untold scandal which will be created if there should be a renewal of passive resistance? The answer which the noble Marquess will give me cannot possibly be that the conditions have been fulfilled and that the grievances have been redressed, for all the proofs are to the contrary. I certainly cannot get that answer from the noble Marquess, who, if I read the correspondence aright, has himself entertained grave doubts as to whether the settlement was satisfactory or not. But let me give your Lordships proof of what I have just asserted. I say a racial bar is still maintained in regard to the Free State, for under Section 7 of the Act Asiatics alone, not any other people but only Asiatics, will be required to make a declaration on entering the Free State which is humiliating to them, absolutely unnecessary for the purpose which the Free-Staters have in view, and, in fact, an entirely wanton imposition. It may be replied that this is a small matter, that it is a mere handful who ever wish to enter the Free State. But, my Lords, it does not matter how small the evasion of a principle may be if the principle is evaded at all. It is exactly analogous to any crime or offence. The theft of two-pence is just as reprehensible as a theft of £5, and if you once concede that it is not an absolute principle that there is to be no racial bar, you have no security that a racial bar will not be introduced in future legislation. And there is further legislation in prospect in the near future in which there will be every temptation to widen the rent which has been made by the small wedge of the Free State, and once more introduce this racial bar in respect of which our Indian fellow-subjects have contended so long and suffered so deeply.

I say, further, that existing rights have not been maintained, and I say so because in the first place the right of South African-born Indians to enter the Cape, a right they have always enjoyed without question, has been taken away. This will be seen if Section 5 (c) is compared with the proviso at the end of the same clause. I do not think there can be any question about it. Secondly, the right of domicile after three years' residence without indenture, which has hitherto been enjoyed by the Indians of Natal, has also been taken away. This has been effected by the definition of the term "domicile" in Section 30 of the Act. Thirdly, the right of appeal to the Supreme Court has been "prejudiced and weakened"—to use the language of the noble Marquess, Lord Crewe—so far as Cape Indians are concerned. The Indians of the Cape have hitherto enjoyed an appeal on facts as well as on law, but this right has been lowered to the standard of Natal and has been reduced to an appeal on law only. So much for the two essential conditions.

(To be continued)

Immigration Appeal Board

A further sitting of the Board took place on the 26th ultimo, Mr. Percy Binns, chief magistrate, being in the chair, Messrs. Maurice Evans, C.M.G., and G. W. Dick constituting the Board.

Three appeals were proceeded with. In each Mr. R. L. Goulding (Messrs. C. P. Robinson and Goulding) appeared for the appellant.

In the case of Khana Heera evidence was led by the agent of the British East India Shipping Company to the effect that the appellant left the Province by the s.s. *Pentakota* on Oct. 3, 1912, and the appellant explained that, although he had had his certificate of domicile for some two or three years, there were good reasons for him not leaving the Province at the time he obtained the certificate.

After hearing the evidence the Board was unanimously of opinion that the appellant was entitled to remain in the Province, and the appeal was therefore upheld.

In the case of Jamal Valli the Board intimated that it would require further evidence, and the matter was ordered to stand adjourned until Tuesday next, so that the witnesses might be subpoenaed.

In the case of Ratanjee Bhoola witnesses were called to corroborate the evidence of the appellant, and at the conclusion of the hearing and after the addresses of counsel and the Immigration Officer, the Board considered that this was one of the cases in which the judgment should be deferred until the questions of law which had been raised in the other cases which were applicable to this particular case had been argued before the Supreme Court.

The appellant was informed that he could remain in the Province until the hearing of the special case by the Supreme Court after which his case would be brought on for decision.

This concluded the whole of the appeals which were lodged from the first vessel arriving after the coming into force of the new Act.—*Natal Mercury*.

From the Editor's Chair

THE DEBATE IN THE LORDS

WE have now the full text of the debate initiated by Lord Amphil in the House of Lords on the Immigration Act of the Union. The debate is memorable for more than one reason. Most weighty contributions were made to it by an *ex-Governor* of Madras and one time acting Viceroy of India in the person of Lord Amphil, by an *ex-Governor* of Bombay in the person of Lord Sydenham who has only just returned from India and who, therefore, knows the pulse of India on this question, and by an *ex-Viceroy* of India in the person of Lord Curzon. All these noblemen spoke fervently in our behalf and admitted the full justice of our demands. They did not satisfy themselves with general statements but each of them showed a mastery of details of the question which one is not accustomed to in such debates. Of Lord Amphil's great pains, care and attention we have now known for a number of years. His Lordship has made our question his own. But it is most consoling and refreshing to find Lords Curzon and Sydenham also possessing a wonderful grasp of the subject. Their interest in our question is a happy augury for the future and it considerably strengthens Lord Amphil's hands in his advocacy of a cause he has found to be just and of such Imperial importance as to warrant, in the midst of his many other activities, his constant and personal attention.

The debate shows, too, that Lord Crewe had no case. The attitude of *non possumus* that he took up is dangerous in the extreme. We venture to think that the doctrine of non-interference by the Imperial authority with the domestic affairs of self-governing Colonies is being carried too far and is reaching a point that endangers the very stability of the Empire. It is a mockery to describe self-governing Colonies as part of the British Dominions if they are to be so independent that they may defy Imperial traditions and Imperial considerations. They cannot, for any length of time and with safety to the Empire to which they pretend to belong, always take and never give. As has been pointed out by the great English newspapers which we have already quoted, the Union Government were ready enough to fall back upon Imperial troops in the hour of their need. May they not be expected to show equal readiness to help the Imperial Government out of a

serious situation facing them in their Government of the Indian Empire by doing a simple act of justice? India will certainly demand and have a satisfactory answer some day.

Sir Charles Bruce's Letter

To the *Scotsman* (Edinburgh) Sir Charles Bruce addressed the following letter, dated the 31st July last:—

"Will you allow me to say a few words on the debate in the House of Lords on the position of British Indians in South Africa? This day five years ago, on July 31, 1908, I had the honour, in the absence of Lord Amthill, of introducing to Lord Crewe at the Colonial Office a very influential deputation, who submitted the grievances of His Majesty's Indian subjects in the Transvaal. No exaggerated claims were made on their behalf, but it was urged that their position had been declared by the Government of India to be worse than it had been under the South African Republic. The Transvaal was at that time under responsible Government, the Lyttelton Constitution having been abrogated by the Letters Patent of 1906. The underlying principle of the Lyttelton Constitution was that all questions of native rights should be discussed and a settlement arrived at as a condition of the grant of self-government. Lord Crewe received us with expressions of sympathy, of the sincerity of which there could be no doubt, but we had to be satisfied with the plea that it was impossible for the Imperial Government to interfere with the domestic affairs of a self-governing colony. Exactly similar assurances were given by Colonel Seely in the course of debate in the House of Commons on the same day. However, there still remained the hope that the Union of South Africa, then in prospect, might give an opportunity for a settlement of the position of British Indians throughout the Union. Unfortunately, the result of the Union of Africa Act was to extend the area of grievances of Indians of the Transvaal over the whole of South Africa, and to focus in South Africa the difficulties and dangers arising out of the conflict of colour in all the self-governing colonies.

"This was clearly demonstrated in a memorandum of the India Office, submitted to the last Imperial Conference by Lord Crewe, who made a strong appeal in support of it, speaking, as he did yesterday, with the advantage of having studied the subject from the two points of view of the Colonial Office and the India Office.

"The failure of Lord Crewe to secure from the representatives of the Dominions at the Conference any effective response was reflected in his speech of yesterday. He could only modify by expressions of sympathy what Lord Amthill is reported to have called "the rotten answer" that the Imperial Government cannot interfere with the domestic affairs of a self-governing colony. The events of the last few days have given the answer a fresh significance. The treatment of British Indians has not only had the effect of uniting in one common sentiment and purpose the whole Asiatic community in South Africa, it has united in indignant protest large and influential sections of the most loyal supporters of British rule in India, Hindus and Moslems alike. At a meeting of the Viceroy's Council, Mr. Gokhale declared that no single question of our time has evoked more bitter feelings throughout India than the continued ill-treatment of Indians in South Africa. At Bombay, a meeting presided over by the Aga Khan advocated a general agitation throughout India on the subject.

"The policy of the Union Government in the matter of the treatment of British Indians is part of a policy which has had its logical consequence in the events of the last few days, and they prove that in the pursuance of this policy the Government is unable to maintain order in the domestic affairs without the assistance of

Imperial troops. I do not for a moment dispute that in the circumstances the use of the Imperial troops was justified, but it is clear from Lord Gladstone's dispatches that the necessity was due to the peril of a native rising, and we are brought face to face with the results of two years' operation of the Union of Africa Act. We see the Imperial troops employed to render the Government of Africa immune from the consequences of a policy hateful to the Imperial Government, which has excited indignant protest among His Majesty's loyal subjects in India, and is driving to revolt His Majesty's native subjects in Africa."

Under the Gold Law

The case in which the Government brought an action against Messrs. Chotabhai and Dadoo, of Krugersdorp, in respect of the occupation of certain stands, was before the Krugersdorp Court on the 19th ultimo.

The charge (says the local paper) involves the right of Asiatics to occupy business premises in the Dorp.

The case will determine the right of the firm known as Chotabhai and Dadoo to continue in occupation of the premises in Commissioner Street they now hold. The owner of these premises is Mr. James Henry Smit, a clerk in the Post Office, and he is charged with the contravention of Article 130 of the Gold Law. That law provides that "no holder of a right acquired under the Gold Law, or any prior law, shall be allowed to transfer, or sub-let, or permit to be transferred, or sub-let, any portion of such right to a coloured person; or permit any coloured person, other than his *bona-fide* servant, to reside on, or occupy, such ground held under such right." Very heavy penalties are provided for an infringement of this article.

The contention of the prosecution is that Stands 375 and 376, Commissioner Street, are in illegal occupation by Asiatics. The lease of the property stands in the name of A. E. Chotabhai, who died last year. He had a partner, M. M. Dadoo, who carries on the business under the title of Chotabhai and Dadoo. It appears there was no cession of the lease from Chotabhai to the firm. Nor has there been any cession to Dadoo. The latter contends that by becoming a partner of Chotabhai he acquired a vested interest in the firm's assets, of which the lease formed a part. Chotabhai does not appear to have appointed executors; and Dadoo does not seem to hold any written authority from Chotabhai's estate to carry on the business, or to remain in possession. These are all matters that tend to increase the difficulties of the legal position.

The charge against James Henry Smit was based on Article 130, referred to.

Mr. Pullen appeared for the Crown, assisted by Mr. G. van Blommestein, who was retained by the Chamber of Commerce, and Advocate S. S. Taylor, instructed by Messrs. Wannenburg and Retief, for the defence.

Detective Pro. Martell stated that at 10.15 p.m. on the evening of July 17, accompanied by the Assistant Sanitary Inspector, Krugersdorp, he visited the premises occupied by Messrs. Chotabhai and Dadoo, Asiatics, at the corner of Commissioner and Rissik Streets. They were carrying on the business of drapers and general merchants. Witness examined the premises, and found nine adult Asiatics and three children in the sleeping compartments. None of these persons were the *bona fide* servants of the accused, and he had known that they had resided on the premises for some considerable time.

Mr. Taylor: They are Dadoo's servants?—Yes.

Mr. J. E. Whittaker, Assistant Sanitary Inspector, corroborated.

Formal evidence, of a technical kind, having been led as to the proclamation of Krugersdorp as township,

Mr. W. G. Turner, clerk in the Mining Commissioner's Office, Krugersdorp, produced records of Mr. Smit's titles to the stands in question.

Mohammed Dadoo stated that he was a member of the firm of Chotabhai and Dadoo, and traded on the stands in question. They entered into a lease with Mr. Smit on August 16, 1907, and again on November 6th, 1912. Witness was one of the lessees of the property.

Mr. Pullen: Can you explain why your name is not mentioned in the lease?—From the very beginning the lease was in the name of Chotabhai.

Where is Chotabhai at present?—He is dead; he died, I believe, in Arabia about November 30 last.

Witness further stated that he was an Asiatic, and resided on the premises. The store assistants, who were also Asiatics, slept there, and they were employed by him, not by Mr. Smit. He was the sole partner in the business, the old deed of partnership being entered into in 1906.

Mr. Taylor: Did you become a partner in the lease, too?—Yes; that is one of the most important assets in the business.

After 1906 did you make application for trading licences for 1907, 1908, and 1909?—Yes: I mentioned that Chotabhai and I were partners, and the licence was in his name. From 1906 we carried on business under the name of Chotabhai. I was with Mr. Chotabhai before 1906, and have in my possession the old leases granted to him. The first one is dated September 23, 1902. In 1903 three rooms were built on Stand 375, with Mr. Smit's consent, and in 1908 more rooms were erected there. The people found in the rooms by the detective were his store assistants, including a bookkeeper and a cook. Three men in one of the rooms were acting as caretakers since the recent burglary.

At this stage Mr. Pullen stated that he was unable to proceed any further until he had examined Mr. Dadoo's books, and a remand was granted until the 20th ultimo.

The case was concluded on the 19th ultimo.

Mr. Van Blommestein, who was retained by the Chamber of Commerce, assisted the Public Prosecutor, and Advocate Taylor defended.

After evidence had been led as to leases and partnership, Mr. Pullen (Public Prosecutor) argued that the case had been proved, and asked for a conviction.

Advocate Taylor argued that it was an extraordinary thing that throughout the whole of the Gold Law up to 1898 there was no mention at all of a stand township. What had really happened in Krugersdorp Township was that the Government in 1887, having acquired a piece of ground in the Dorp, took it upon itself to divide that ground into stands, and sell them under the Gold Law. Subsequently, some ten years later, it was considered necessary to ratify the laying out of stand townships, and the Second Volksraad passed a besluit which was supposed to meet the case, but they all knew that a besluit of the Second Volksraad did not have the force of law. He contended that a man who bought one of those stands in 1887, and had held his title ever since, could not be considered to hold his title under the Gold Law, and that being so, the Crown had failed to make out the case. He also dealt with the question of the renewal of the leases, and the present occupation by the partnership.

The Court eventually reserved judgment.

He (Lord Crewe) had nothing better to offer than "a policy of patience and moderation." We are afraid he does not realise that human beings possess these qualities in a strictly limited degree. As Lord Amphill said, Indians have been for ten years waiting for the justice which the British Government was bound to secure for them and which British statesmen have again and again pledged themselves to secure.

Pertinent Questions

Whilst the Native legislation of the last Parliament is occupying public attention, the following letter, as being of intrinsic importance and published by the *Rand Daily Mail*, may not be devoid of interest for our readers:—

The following points appeared in a report recently read at the General Conference Church Meeting held at Takoma Park, Washington, D.C.: In 1863 there were 4,500,000 coloured people in the United States; at present over 10,000,000, which is a larger population than the South African Union or Australia. Fifty years ago practically all the coloured people tilled the soil. At present 3,000,000 work at trades requiring skill. There are 24 physicians, 20,000 graduated nurses, 21,000 teachers, 15,000 clergymen, 14,000 masons, 24,000 dressmakers, 10,000 engineers and firemen, 10,000 blacksmiths, and 21,000 carpenters. A few years ago it was unlawful for a coloured man to hold any United States Government position. To-day 22,400 are employed, of which 3,900 are in the Post Office. Over 1,000 patents have been granted them, such as telephone registers, hydraulic brush, motor machinery, aeroplanes, cars, switches and many others. Fifty years ago the coloured people had no lands. To-day they own 20,000,000 acres of land, equal to 31,000 square miles; they cultivate 890,140 farms of 100,000,000 acres, and own cattle worth 177,273,975 dollars; poultry worth 5,113,756 dollars; implements, 36,861,418 dollars; land and buildings worth 273,501,665 dollars. They own 300 drug stores, 400 newspapers and periodicals, 100 insurance companies, 64 banks capitalised at 1,600,000 dollars, and do an annual business of 20,000,000 dollars. Their total wealth is 700,000,000 dollars. Fifty years ago their education only began; 95 per cent. could not read or write. They now own 50 colleges, 13 institutions for the higher education of women, 26 theological schools and departments, 3 schools of law, 5 of medicine, 4 of pharmacy, 17 State agricultural and normal colleges, and over 400 normal and industrial schools. The value of school property is 17,000,000 dollars. In 1812 4,000,000 dollars was spent on higher and industrial education, and 8,600,000 dollars in their public schools. From 1866 to 1870 they raised 700,000 dollars for school buildings and support of teachers. They now raise 1,000,000 dollars annually for education. Of 6,000,000 dollars spent for public schools by the United States the coloured race get 15 per cent. They own 57,000,000 dollars' worth of church property. Fifty years ago there was no national organisation. There are now the American Negro Academy, National Association of Teachers, the Negro Educational Congress, and the National Bankers' Association. For their professional advancement there are the National Association of Coloured Graduated Nurses, the National Bar Association, the National Negro Press Association, the National Association of Coloured Music and Art. The coloured women have the National Christian Temperance Union, and the National Association of Coloured Women's Club; also 26 theological schools to train ministers, also 35,000 well-organised Sunday schools with 1,750,000 pupils, and their own literature and song-books. They own four large publishing houses, devoting all their output for church literature; one establishment in Nashville, Tenn., is valued at 350,000 dollars, and employs 150 people with a pay sheet of 200,000 dollars. Nearly all denominations maintain home and foreign missions; they contribute annually 100,000 dollars for home and 50,000 for foreign missions.

Question 1 is: What will be the position of the South African coloured race in fifty years' time, with their present start? Fifty years ago these negroes were slaves, sold like cattle, and only 45,000 could read. To-day nearly 1,000,000 coloured people are

educated, and the Kaffirs want the vote and are determined to get land. And who will stop them?

Question 2: Where will the poor white of to-day be in fifty years?

The £3 Tax

The South African Agricultural Union has passed the following resolution:—

"That this Conference is of opinion that the abolition of the £3 licence on time-expired Indians in Natal would be detrimental to the labour supply of the Province and contrary to the best interests of South Africa."

Sir Thomas Hyslop moved, and said the effect of the licence was to prevent Indians from settling in the country. It is extended to Colonial-born Indians now, and if the licence were abolished Indians would have the choice of remaining in the country as free men. They wanted them as labourers, but not as free men. The farmer's labour supply would suffer if the tax were removed, and it would be disadvantageous to the whole of the country.

Mr. Townsend, in seconding, said the twaddle about the Indians suffering under hardships was all nonsense. The motion was approved unanimously.—*Natal Mercury.*

News in Brief

In reply to "Reader," no licence is required to sell unmanufactured produce of South Africa only, such as fruit and vegetables.

At a meeting of waitresses held in Johannesburg to voice the grievances of their occupation, one waitress spoke of "coolie" competition, and said that if they could get all "coolies" turned out of the country she thought it might be possible to establish a women's association.

On the 23rd ultimo, Mr. Bhikhabhai K. Patel, the Hon. Secretary of the Transvaal Patidar Association, left Johannesburg on a visit to India and was seen off at the station by a large number of friends and well-wishers. Prior to his departure, he was presented by his Society with a gold medal in recognition of his valuable services during his term of office.

Reuter's Capetown correspondent telegraphs that a singular immigration case came before the Magistrate's Court on the 20th ultimo, when an Indian named Camrodien Mahomed Sharief was charged with contravening the Immigration Act. Accused was originally committed for trial, but the case had been remitted. It appeared that Sharief was refused permission to return after a trip to India in 1908, but nevertheless came back by way of the Transvaal. Being unable to pass the education test, he was ordered to leave the country, but obtained permission to settle his affairs first. The time for this expired, but he remained, and was consequently arrested. The Magistrate said it was clear that the case came within a recent ruling of Judges Hopley and Lange, who laid down that anyone could enter the Province overland.

The following curious item of news appears in the *Winnipeg Telegram* of the 17th July last:—

Vancouver, B.C., July 16.—With the distinct stipulation that the special concession is to be regarded as a special "act of grace," and not as a precedent, permission has been granted by the Hon. W. J. Roche, Minister of the Interior, for the admission of the mother and the four children of a Vancouver Hindu named Hakam Singh. The relatives of Hakam Singh have been at Hong Kong for twelve months endeavouring to obtain the special permission referred to. The fact that the Hindu is not supposed to be in sympathy with

the members of the colony who have been responsible for the agitation raised to let down the bars against the wives and children of their countrymen, is understood to have been a favourable and determining factor in the granting of the privilege.

Brazilians (says an exchange) are great coffee-drinkers. Numerous cups are drunk each day by the average man and woman. The beverage is made very strong and very sweet. It produces an exhilaration of a more intense and lasting kind than beer. Those addicted to this habit become very restless, and are scarcely able to sit still, even for a moment. This nervousness increases until it resembles St. Vitus's dance.

The only way to put an end to these [Native] rebellions (says the Native paper *Abantu*) and to the present position of non-confidence, in so far as the natives of this country are concerned, is not, as General Botha told his backveld supporters the other day, namely, that his Government would take no nonsense from the Kaffirs, but rather that his Government should take the Kafir and bear his nonsense."

Narayansamy-Nagappan Scholarships

The Secretary of the Indian Women's Association advises us that the memorial for the late passive resisters, Narayansamy and Nagappan, is to take the shape of scholarships, tenable at least for four years, at the rate of £15 per year, for education in India of South Africa-born Tamil youths. The conditions attached to these scholarships are that the scholars should be over the age of 12 years and up to or under 18 years; secondly their qualification should be tested by a Committee to be appointed by the Indian Women's Association; thirdly the scholar or scholars that might be selected by the Committee shall remain during their educational course in India under the guidance of those whom the Committee may appoint, and that any independent action on the part of the scholar shall forthwith disentitle him to any payment after the exercise of such independence. The fare for the outward and return passage shall be paid out of the Memorial Fund. The scholars shall be selected out of the children of parents who are unable to find the expenses of the education in India of their children. The character of the children will be the final test. The number of scholarships will be announced in due course. Application should be made, with full particulars, to the Secretary of the Indian Women's Association, Box 6522, Johannesburg, on or before the 30th September next. Parents are requested to supply all the particulars available regarding the boys whose names they wish to submit as Narayansamy and Nagappan scholars.

Notice.

MANUFACTURED S. A. PRODUCE.

Applications for licences required under the provisions of Natal Ordinance No 5 of 1913 must be forwarded to the LICENSING OFFICER FOR THE PROVINCE OF NATAL, PIETERMARITZBURG, and not to the Receivers of Revenue or Magistrates, as stated in a previous advertisement.

JOHN H. HERSHENSOHN,

Acting Provincial Secretary.

Pietermaritzburg, 21st August, 1913.