Indian Opinion

No. 6—Vol. XXIV. Friday, February 5th, 1926. Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper Price Fourpence

MR. PATRICK DUNCAN ON THE ASIATIC BILL

THE possibility of the Government's new Asiatic Bill being re-introduced this session in a slightly-amended form was suggested by the Hon. Patrick Duncan, M.L.A., in the course of an interview to the *Cape Times* on Jan. 26. In view of that possibility, he adopts the attitude that it would be wiser for those who are attacking the Bill to wait until the Bill is again before the House. Even if it comes forward in exactly the same form, Mr. Duncan thinks that the better chance of success for the opponents of the measure would come from attacking it purely on its merits or demerits. With the exception that the new Bill deals with the question of the ownership of land in Natal by Indians, the legislation it proposes does not differ from that introduced in 1924 by Mr. Duncan himself when Minister of the Interior.

Speaking on the question of whether or not the Asiatic Bill constitutes a breach of the Smuts-Gandhi Agreement of 1914, Mr. Duncan said :—

> "The present Asiatic Bill is exactly the same as the one I brought in, except that it deals with the question of the owning of land by Indians in Natal, and I do not think that is affected by the term 'vested rights' under the Smuts-Gandhi Agreement. It, no doubt, means a serious restriction of the rights of Indians in that Province. From that point of view there is justification for saying that we are introducing legislation which will seriously restrict the rights of Indians in a manner not contemplated at the time of the Agreement. It seems to me that the matter should be attacked by those who are opposed to it on its merits or demerits, and not on the ground that it is a breach of faith. I do not think that any agreement was ever made with the Indians that their rights would never be subject to any further restriction.
>
> "It is my opinion that they are far more likely to succeed by attacking it on the ground of its merits alone, because they will have considerable difficulty in proving that any definite agreement was made that their rights would never be less than they were in 1914. In any case, you cannot set up an agreement, even if there was one, that will blind the country for all time. Our outlooks change, and the main question is one of whether the legislation is just and reasonable.
>
> "Personally, I think that what we call the 'Asiatic menace' is not nearly so serious in South Africa as many people make it out to be. On the question of 'vested rights' I take up the same attitude exactly as I did when introducing my own Class Areas Bill in 1924.
>
> "It is unwise to express an opinion about the new Asiatic Bill until we see it, because it is possible that it might come in in a modified form. The so-called menace, I think, will grow less as time goes on—in fact, outside Natal, the numbers of Asiatics are trifling compared with the white population. The white population will have to grow if we are to hold South Africa, and as it grows the Asiatic danger gets less and less. We had better wait, however, until the Bill is introduced, and see if it comes in in the same form as when it was introduced last session."

Mr. Duncan's Speech in Parliament

The following is the full Hansard text of the Hon. Patrick Duncan's speech in so far as it relates to the question of "Indian vested rights" when he introduced the Class Areas Bill, second reading, on April 2, 1924 :—

I would like to mention one particular criticism which has been levelled against this Bill, and that is, in bringing forward this Bill the Government has been guilty of a breach of faith of the agreement between the Prime Minister and Mr. Gandhi when he was in the Transvaal. It has been objected that this Bill constitutes some breach of the agreement entered into at that time. I have examined very carefully the correspondence which passed at that time, and it was also examined by a Select Committee of this House in 1919. This charge of a breach of faith has been laid, as far as I am able to make out, on two grounds, one, it is alleged, and I think correctly alleged, that a general undertaking was given at that time on behalf of the Government that if and when the immigration of Indians in South Africa was stopped the Indians who were actually here should be treated with due consideration and with every regard to their rights. As far as that is concerned I do not regard this Bill as any breach whatever of that undertaking. This Bill, as I have said, is intended to apply, and will only succeed if it is applied with due regard to the rights of justice for the Indians who are already here. But the charge goes further and alleges that an undertaking was given on behalf of the Government of the Union at that time that vested rights would be respected and under the term "vested rights" are included the rights of Indians who are now trading here, or those who may succeed them as traders here to go on trading under the same conditions as they are trading now. I would like to make it quite clear that this term "vested rights" employed by Mr. Gandhi in his correspondence of that time was never intended by him, and never understood by anybody else, as carrying any implication of that sort at all. What Mr. Gandhi was dealing with at that time was the question of the rights of certain traders who had been allowed to trade on the goldfields against the strict terms of the law. He was dealing with the question of what should be done in regard to those men, whether the law should be applied to them strictly and they should be turned off, or whether the rights which they had built by acquiescence should be respected. When the Act of 1919 was under consideration that point was brought up, and the Act made careful provision to respect the rights of vested interests of traders which had been acquired in opposition to the law, merely owing to the fact that they had been so acquired and enjoyed, and the Act of 1919 made provision that those rights should be respected.

After that the Asiatic Commission went into this

particular question because the Government had been most careful to avoid any possible breach of faith in connection with the agreement which was made between Mr. Gandhi and the Government. The Asiatic Commission went into this matter and said :—

As we have seen up to 1908 the Asiatic had the right in accordance with judicial decisions to hire a stand on proclaimed land from the European licence-holder of it, and to carry on business upon it. There was nothing in the Gold Law of 1898 or any other law to prevent his doing so. Then by section 130 of the Gold Law of 1908 Asiatics were prohibited from acquiring leases under that law. Though no specific mention is made of trading rights, the effect of that section and of section 131 is to preclude Asiatics, amongst other coloured persons from exercising such rights by reason of their being prohibited from hiring such rights and occupying and residing on them. The provisions of the Gold Law and the Townships Act of 1908 were not strictly enforced, with the result that between 1908 and 1914 a considerable number of new businesses had been established by Indian traders in several places in spite of the law. These must have been the "vested rights" unlawfully acquired without interference from the Government, which General Smuts and Mr. Gandhi had in mind during the negotiations.

That is the report of the Asiatic Commission which sat in 1921. I think that shows quite clearly that those vested rights, which were referred to by Mr. Gandhi in his correspondence, referred only to the rights of those traders who had been allowed to establish their business without interference, although strictly against the law, and I should like to quote another testimony which may perhaps be regarded as impartial. That is the testimony of Sir Benjamin Robertson, who was allowed to come out here by the Indian Government to assist the Asiatic Inquiry Commission in South Africa, and he put before that Commission a memorandum setting forth his views of the condition of affairs in the Union of South Africa in regard to the relations of the European and Asiatic populations. In that memorandum he deals with the question of Mr. Gandhi's letter and the agreements which have been based on that. He says :

> Mr. Gandhi's letter, dated 7th July, 1914, relates only to a side issue of the settlement of 1914. As is clear from the opening sentences of Mr. Gandhi's letter his definition of "vested rights" refers to such rights only in connection with the Gold Law and the Townships Amendment Act. The Smuts-Gandhi Agreement, as reported to the Government of India, consists of two letters of the 30th June, 1914; and the letter of the 7th July was not made known to them until it was published in the report of the Select Committee of 1919. Its meaning, however, seems clear enough. The amendment of the Gold Law and the Townships Amendment Act was not the issue in the passive resistance movement. They fell within the category of the existing laws which the Union Government undertook to administer, "in a just manner and with a due regard to vested rights." General Smuts promised that he would endeavour to protect vested rights as defined by Mr. Gandhi, and Mr. Gandhi accordingly submitted in connection with these two particular laws in his letter of July 7.
>
> And this is the quotation from this letter :—
>
> By vested rights I understand the rights of an Indian and his successors to live and trade in the township in which he was living and trading, no matter how often he shifts his residence or business in the same township. The Government of India understood this to mean that any such trader who might be occupying land in contravention of the Gold Law or the Township Amendment Act, would not be evicted. Section 1 of the Act No. 37 of 1919, gives legal validity to General Smuts' promise, and by extending the period to July 1, 1919, more than fulfills the undertaking which was given in 1914.

I have gone into some length on that because this is a question which has raised a considerable amount of feeling which has been used both here and in India to excite resentment and feeling against this particular measure.—*Cape Times*.

India and South Africa

The *Cape Times* has the following leading article in its issue of Jan. 27 :—

The statement, which we publish to-day, by Mr. Patrick Duncan on the Asiatic Bill should go far to remove a confusion of thought which is having mischievous results, mainly in India, but in South Africa as well. Agitation in India against the Asiatic Bill has been, and is, very largely inspired and fomented by the belief that the Bill is a "breach of faith" on the part of the South African Government. The Bishop of Pretoria, whose courage in saying what he thinks about this "breach of faith" all must respect, declares bluntly, too, that "South Africa will do a great wrong if it goes back on the main provisions of the Smuts-Gandhi agreement (of 1914) and treats it as a scrap of paper." Mr. Duncan, on the other hand, says, as he said when he introduced the Class Areas Bill in 1924, that he does not "think that any agreement was ever made with the Indians that their rights would never be subject to any further restriction." The view of the *Cape Times* on this matter has been stated in two considered articles which appeared on January 13 and 14. It is the view of Mr. Duncan, not of the Bishop of Pretoria and of the Indians who are agitating the matter in India. An agreement of the kind made between General Smuts and Mr. Gandhi in 1914 must be interpreted in the light of the words actually used between the two parties to it. The agreement gave Mr. Gandhi, in words first used by himself, "an assurance that the existing laws specially affecting Indians" would "be administered justly and with due regard to vested rights." And General Smuts added to this assurance, with the full assent of Mr. Gandhi, the statement that "it always has been and will continue to be the desire of the Government to see" that the existing laws were so administered.

The mention of "vested rights" in this assurance is the real source of all the trouble that has ensued. The Government of India has interpreted the assurance to mean "that the status which the Indian community had acquired in 1914 would at least be maintained." The Bishop of Pretoria says, quite rightly, that "to aggravate a racially-passionate question by bringing forward contentions which are untrue is worse than folly. The only hope of advance through these most thorny problems is the adherence no matter what the political drawbacks, to nothing but the truth." The Rev. C. F. Andrews, who was with Mr. Gandhi at the time when the agreement was made, now says that "it implied that those rights which the Indians had hitherto held would not be still further diminished." To all these the answer is that if the agreement meant what it is now said to have meant, Mr. Gandhi could hardly have omitted to make sure that it said so. Yet Mr. Gandhi never at the time suggested that a pledge as to the administration of existing laws involved a pledge that the existing laws should not be altered to the disadvantage of the Indians. No doubt he hoped that they would not be so altered, just as he hoped

that the other Indian grievances which he mentioned in his first letter would in time be removed. But he knew that General Smuts could not give him an assurance which went further than the administration of existing laws. He asked for that assurance and he received it. When he now says, as he said in a statement cabled on Friday, that "it is not to be supposed that after eight years of solid suffering, Indians would be satisfied with an agreement which might not lead to further amelioration of their status, but to further degradation, ultimately resulting in their extinction," he begs the whole question. Of course he and his compatriots hoped that the agreement would "lead to further amelioration of their status." Mr. Gandhi said so himself in his first letter to General Smuts. But he must have known, too, that General Smuts could not pledge the South African Legislature for all time not to alter the "existing laws," and the very fact that he asked from General Smuts no more—and received no more—than an assurance as to the administration of the "existing laws," shows that he himself, at the time, recognised that any assurance which General Smuts could give him could not go beyond the sphere of administration. The truth is that Mr. Gandhi has altered his view of the agreement *in toto*. He now reads into it a pledge which, if it had been suggested by him at the time, would have made any agreement impossible. His new interpretation of the agreement has been accepted—with an ignorance of the facts which can only be described as lamentable—by the Government of India. And it has been exploited by Indian opinion with a wholesale lack either of knowlege or of scruple.

Mr. Duncan puts his finger on the real point of all this controversy when he says that "the matter should be attacked by those who are opposed to it on its merits or demerits, and not on the ground that it is a breach of faith." Without doubt, as Mr. Duncan adds, the Bill in its draft form "means a serious restriction of the rights of Indians," so far as *owning land* in Natal goes; and "from that point of view there is justification for saying that we are introducing legislation which will seriously restrict the rights of Indians in a manner not contemplated at the time of the (Smuts-Gandhi) agreement." There the Indians have a case; but on the agreement itself, in our deliberate view, they have none. It is all very well to say, as the Bishop of Pretoria says, that "the legally-minded can find ways of interpreting what General Smuts meant by 'regard to vested rights.'" Plain men, "legally-minded" or not, will say that an agreement is an agreement and must be understood to mean what it says; no more and no less. They might be tempted to add that the Indian attempt, at this time of day, to read into the agreement a meaning which would have made its conclusion impossible at the time is an example of that combination of emotionalism and lack of scruple which is at the root of the dislike and distrust of many Europeans in South Africa for the Indian, and of their conviction that his presence in this country, regrettable as were its origins, is even more regrettable from the point of view of the present and future welfare of the Union. We are quite clear that such recriminations are inadvisable. But South Africa can hardly be expected to sit silent under the torrent of accusations of bad faith and trickery that has descended on her from India—and most offensively from Mr. Gandhi himself during the past week—without a word of reply in kind. That said, the wise course, as Mr. Duncan points out, is to wait for the actual form which the Asiatic Bill takes when the Government moves its Second Reading in Parliament. If the Government of India, and the Deputation which is now in the Union, will make an effort to get free from obsessions about the Smuts-Gandhi agreement—an obsolete document so far as new legislation goes; to understand the problem of the Indian in South Africa; and to formulate suggestions which may be helpful to the Prime Minister, there is little reason why that peace for which the Bishop of Pretoria longs, in company with all conscientious South Africans, should be beyond mortal wit to achieve.

Indian Accusations Against South Africa

The Charges Examined

III.—The Imperial Conferences

(Continued from page 34)

The following is the third of the series of articles appearing in the *Cape Times* on the above question :—

A charge of breach of faith is being brought against South Africa in respect of the Areas Reservation Bill, popularly known as the Asiatic Bill. There are three "counts" in the charge :

(1) That the segregation provisions of the measure constitute a breach of the Smuts-Gandhi agreement of 1914.

(2) That the Bill is inconsistent with the undertakings given by Union statesmen at Imperial Conferences since 1917.

(3) That the restrictions imposed by the Bill on the acquisition of land in Natal by Indians break the pledges given by the Natal Government to Indians brought into Natal under the indenture system.

In a short series of articles these "counts" are examined in the light of the available documentary evidence. The article printed below deals with the second of the three "counts."

The second charge brought against the Union by the Indians and their supporters, that the Areas Reservation Bill is a breach of undertakings given by various South African statesmen at Imperial Conferences, can be answered more simply and directly than the first charge. For, while the controversy over the Smuts-Gandhi agreement turns on quasi-legal questions of interpretation and on points involving the reconstruction of history, this second charge is an uncomplicated matter of fact.

What undertakings have been made by Union statesmen at Imperial Conferences since 1917 on the Indian question? In what way, precisely, can it be alleged that the Bill does not keep faith with any one or more of these undertakings?

It is characteristic of the hot-headed and prepossessed nature of the present Indian agitation that the accusations levelled against South Africa do not give clear answers to those two questions. Indeed, the indictment is so "vague and embarrassing" and so entirely lacking in definite particulars, that any attempt—such as is made in these articles—to meet it fairly and squarely is compelled to begin by seeking for possible particulars. To a vague affirmation no more is possible than a vague denial. We cannot be content with that. We must do what the Indians have failed to do—disinter the facts.

Two Ways

There are only two ways in which undertakings could have been given at the Imperial Confrences :

(1) In the formal resolutions passed by the Conferences.

(2) In the speeches made at the Conferences.

Neither form of understanding is, of course, binding on the nation unless accepted or ratified by Parliament tacitly or formally. There was, for instance, no breach of faith by England when the British Parliament failed to ratify Mr. Baldwin's Imperial Preference promises.

Strictly, then, to prove a breach of faith against

South Africa the Indians would have to substantiate:

(1) That a definite undertaking was made.
(2) That it was subsequently either ratified by the Union Parliament or tacitly accepted by it.
(3) That the Areas Reservation Bill is, either in principle or in some specific provision, a breach of that undertaking.

But as the Indians are evidently too excited to follow this proper and rational procedure, we must try to bring order and reason into their wild accusations as best as we can.

The Conferences

The simplest way to do that will be to pass briefly in review the proceedings of each of the Imperial Conferences since 1917, with a view to discovering what were the undertakings shouldered by South Africa either in the resolutions or in the speeches.

In the cases of the 1917 and 1918 Conferences there is some help from official sources. The memorandum presented by Sir Benjamin Robertson to the 1920 Asiatic Inquiry Commission mentioned certain "assurances given by General Smuts and Mr. Burton" upon which the Government of India placed "great reliance." In its report the Commission reviewed these "assurances."

Sir Benjamin Robertson's memorandum and the Commission's summing up of the "assurances" it mentioned are all the more valuable because they were printed and published years before the Class Areas Bill and the Areas Reservation Bill were thrown into the political arena.

General Smuts' Optimism

At the 1917 Imperial Conference no resolutions on the Indian question were passed. The question, indeed, was just then remarkably quiescent in both countries. The heat engendered by the pre-war conflict that Mr. Gandhi had led and evaporated. South Africa was content with the stoppage that had been effected then in the inflow of Indians into the country; India was still happy in the belief that Mr. Gandhi had won a great victory, backed by the powerful diplomatic pressure it was pathetically convinced Lord Hardinge had brought to bear on the Union Government through Whitehall; and the Conference was feeling its way towards Lord Hardinge's great principle of Reciprocity that was to settle for all time the vexed question of immigration.

It was in these promising circumstances that General Smuts at the Conference made a speech that has since been interpreted to mean far more than it did. As the Asiatic Inquiry Commission put it, "General Smuts took the somewhat optimistic view of the future. He regarded the Immigrants' Regulation Act of 1913 as having had the effect of removing the fear, by which many of the inhabitants were obsessed, that the country was going to be flooded by unlimited immigration from India; and he expressed the conviction that all the other questions that remained would be considered subsidiary, and would become easily soluble."

Clearly there was no binding undertaking in all this. Events have to some extent belied General Smuts' optimism. For those events the anti-Asiatics in the Union, the Provincial Council in Natal, and certain Transvaal municipalities are not free from blame. But then neither are the Transvaal Indians free from blame in arousing public feeling against them by the wholesale evasions of the law which led to the appointment of the 1919 Parliamentary Select Committee and to Act 37 of that year, to the setting up of the 1920 Inquiry Commission, and to much of the subsequent trouble. But misplaced optimism is one thing, and a breach of faith quite another.

Mr. Burton's Speech

At the 1918 Conference two resolutions were passed. The one was the Reciprocity resolution, whereby it was laid down that each separate part of the Empire, including India had the inherent right to control the composition of its own population by means of restrictions on immigration, subject to the grant of the right to visit or temporary residence in certain cases. This resolution was accepted by South Africa. Indeed, as the 1922 "Indian Year Book" put it, "in the case of South Africa the resolution was merely a re-statement of the policy embodied in the Immigrants (Restriction) Act of 1913 and the Indians Relief Act, No. 22 of 1914."

Needless to say, the Areas Reservation Bill is in no respect a breach of the reciprocity resolution, nor is it alleged to be by the Indians.

The other resolution passed by the 1918 Conference concerned a memorandum drawn up by Lord Sinha on behalf of the Indian Government and presented to the Conference. The memorandum asked for the abolition of disabilities on Indians throughout the Empire, and in particular urged the repeal of those laws which prevent Indians in the Transvaal from owning land. The resolution passed by the Conference recommended the Memorandum to the various Governments concerned for their early consideration.

In accepting the resolution on behalf of the Union, Mr. Burton said: "We will give it (the memorandum) the most sympathetic consideration we can, certainly." He referred to the difficulty and delicay of the issues raised, adding that he agreed that the Indians in the Union should be treated as "human beings, with feelings like our own, and in a proper manner."

The Action of Parliament

The undertaking that the memorandum should be given early consideration was carried out by the appointment early in the very next session of the Select Committee on Disabilities of British Indians in the Transvaal. The Committee's deliberations resulted in Act 37 of 1919; and during the debate on that measure it was very evident that so far from approving of any reduction of Indian disabilities, the majority of the House would have welcomed far more drastic action than that embodied in the Bill, which put an end to the acquisition of land and licences by Indians in the Transvaal in defiance of and by evading the law.

Thus even if Mr. Burton's speech at the 1918 Conference could be construed as an undertaking that the land-owning disabilities of Indians in the Transvaal would be removed—and it cannot be reasonably so construed—the very next session of Parliament most decidely failed to ratify any such undertaking. Instead, it passed an Act which denied to Asiatics even the right to in direct ownership of land by means of forming companies.

1921 and 1923

About the position taken up by South Africa at the 1921 and 1923 Imperial Conferences there can be no shadow of doubt. At the first a resolution was passed recognising "that there is an incongruity between the position of India, as an equal member of the Empire, and the existence of disabilities upon British Indians domiciled in some parts of the Empire," and declaring it advisable that "the rights of such Indians should be recognised."

The resolution continued: "The representatives of South Africa regret their inability to accept this resolution in view of the exceptional circumstances of the greater part of the Union."

At the 1923 Conference it was agreed that, in order to give effect to this resolution a Committee of the Government of India should go to various parts of the Empire to confer with the individual Governments concerned. Once again, South Africa was excepted, General Smuts declaring that no good purpose could be served by the reception in the Union of the Government of India's Committee.

A Promise Made and Kept

Where in all these Conferences is there any undertaking or assurance given on behalf of South Africa of which the Areas Reservation Bill could conceivably be a breach? At no time have our statesmen said in effect more than this, that the Indians in the Union would be treated justly and that the vested rights acquired by individual Indians would receive consideration. That undertaking—which is none other than our old friend the Smuts-Gandhi agreement—has repeatedly been made.

It has not only been made; it has been kept. The Act of 1919, for instance, that put a stop to the evasion of the law and to the unlawful acquisition of businesses in the Transvaal, actually left undisturbed those Indians who had acquired such businesses or land prior to May 1, 1919.

Referring to this fact the Asiatic Inquiry Commission said :

> "They '(the Indians) admit that as far as General Smuts' promise to Mr. Gandhi is concerned, it has, in view of Mr. Gandhi's own definition, been more than fulfilled by extending the protection to vested rights which had been acquired up to May 1, 1919."

In moving the second reading of the Class Areas Bill in 1924 Mr. Duncan claimed that the measure was no breach of this undertaking. He declared that the Bill, properly and sympathetically administered, as was the intention of the Government, was neither unjust nor repressive legislation, and that it very fully provided for the protection of the vested rights of Indians.

Doubtless the same claim will be made by Dr. Malan for his measure, which is to a large extent identical with Mr. Duncan's. And provided that the Government administers the Bill in the same spirit of justice and consideration for the Indians to which Mr. Duncan pledged his Government, it will be impossible for any fair and reasonable person to maintain that the Bill is a breach of any undertaking validly made by any Union statesman.

(To be Concluded.)

News From Bombay

[By C. F. Andrews]

The following letter which has just come from one who was my colleague in labour matters in India will be of interest here in South Africa. It gives something of the inner history of the great Labour Movement of India. It reads as follows :—

"You will have learnt by this time that the Bombay Textile strike has ended favourably to the strikers. The Government of India announced the suspension of the Cotton Excise Duty for the remainder of the year and following that the millowners withdrew the notice of wage cut. Over sixty thousand men have resumed work, others are returning to Bombay from the suburbs and the villages. In a few days' time work will become quite normal.

The Committee of Assistance to the Textile workers did very good service. Thanks to the very generous help of the British and other European Labour organisations, the Committee of Assistance was able to carry on effecient relief on a large scale. The strike on the whole was well-managed. There was no attempt at violence, although the situation was desperate and critical. The millowners tried their best to bring the workers back to work, but the workers ignorant, illiterate and timid though they were, stoutly refused even to listen to their masters. You would be pleased to know that though I was as a rule sceptical about the success of a labour movement in India, this one strike and its result, though it cannot be credited wholly to labour, has convinced me that provided there are proper organisers we can bring the Indian labour movement on a level with labour movements in other countries.

The All-India Trade Union Congress is now concentrating on the organisation of the cotton operatives. Several meetings have been held and membership has ostensibly increased.

Mr. Johnston, the Labour M.P. who is on tour in India is expected here on the 16th. He will address the workers in the different centres.

Mr. Joshi is away to preside over the annual gathering of the Bhil Seva Mandal. The Congress Session will be held at Madras on 9th and 10th, and Mr. V. V. Giri will preside. Mr. Joshi has asked me if I could accompany him to Madras.

I am afraid you are terribly busy and over-worked. I should be very fortunate if I hear from you about your health. I read in the papers that in an interview you said you were not well. I am very anxious to hear about it."

Indian Community's Tribute to Mr. C. F. Andrews

Capetown Meeting

A public meeting of the Indian and coloured communities was held in the City Hall on Sunday the 24th January. The meeting, which was under the auspices of the Cape British Indian Council, was called for the purpose of bidding farewell to Mr. Andrews, who was to have left for England on the 29th but at the request of the Indian community has consented to prolong his stay in this country for a few more weeks.

Mr. M. Y. Hawa, who presided, extended a cordial welcome to those of his fellow-citizens who had attended to hear the Indians' plea for justice and fair play and also to welcome the Rev. C. F. Andrews, who had truly upheld the great traditions of liberal-minded and democratic Englishmen. He (Mr. Andrews) had championed the cause of Indians in India and South Africa and in other parts of the world who were daily being denied the right to live as true and and sincere citizens of this or any other country.

They would never forget the way he had helped their brethren in Kenya, where he had suffered intolerable hardships at the hands of a minority of Europeans. "We hope and pray that his example and the sacrifices he has made for the Indians in South Africa may be followed by his fellow-Europeans, and thus bring harmony and co-operation to the building up of a contented and happy South Africa."

Several speakers followed and expressed the gratitude of the Indian and coloured and native communities for all that Mr. Andrews had done on their behalf.

Loyal Subjects

One speaker said the legislation against Asiatics merely disguised an attempt to oust the black races. It was just white against black. In the Great War England had been nobly assisted by the Indians, who where loyal subjects, and in return had been promised justice, equality and peace. These fair promises were now being denied them, and it behoved all the black races to stick together, as it was only by doing that they could hope to succeed in their campaign against aggression.

The Rev. C. F. Andrews spoke first in Hindustani, his remarks being punctuated with constant applause. Speaking in English he said he had one message to give from India, and it was that they believed in the righteousness of their cause, and they had full faith that God was with them in the struggle. He had spent 22 years of his life in India, but it had always been the wish of his heart to come to Africa, and

even as a child he had continuously expressed that desire. He was glad that he had been able to fulfil that desire four times over, and had travelled over East and South Africa. On these visits he had always done his utmost to bring about friendship and unity between the members of the Indian community and the members of the different African communities, and he had always found it a very easy and simple task.

Africans for India

It had been one of the great wishes of his life that Africans who were gaining so rapidly in education should come over to the great country of India to see its great poets and to behold their great and beautiful architecture. In Trinity College, Kandy, they had Africans from Uganda, and they were living in amity and peace with fellow-students from India and Ceylon. That College had been founded by the Rev. Alec Fraser, who was now in West Africa, and in the future he hoped there would be a possibility of Africans going to India there to learn of and to respect and love the Indian peoples. There was one other home in India whose doors were ever open to Africans, the home of the poet Rabindranath Tagore, or, as it was called, Shantiniketan.

He thanked them all for their kind words, and he assured them that he truly loved the people of his adopted land, India. He wished them success in their great struggle for the right, and he prayed to God that they would gain that success.

South African Indian Congress

Natal's Delegation to India

Mr. E. M. Ally acknowledges with thanks the following subscriptions. Further subscriptions are earnestly requested, all cheques to be made in name of Mr. E. M. Ally, and addressed to him at 109, Field Street, Durban.

	£	s.	d.
Amount previously acknowledged	796	11	0
Mr. M. A. Fazloodeen & Co.,	15	0	0
„ M. E. Paruk	2	2	0
„ Amod Osman Kapadia	2	2	0
„ M. H. Ismail	2	2	0
„ K. Haribhai	2	2	0
„ Karrim Khan	2	2	0
„ T. P. Pather	0	10	0
„ A. H. Moosa & Son	25	0	0
„ V. Devshee	10	10	0
„ S. Fakroodeen	10	0	0
„ Jeewa Essa	15	0	0
„ A. I. Vaid	2	2	0
„ M. B. Naik	3	3	0
„ Dayalal Henraj	2	2	0
„ Hassen Essop	5	5	0
„ Soni Ragavji	0	10	6
„ Thekerse Damodar	2	2	0
„ E. Akooji	1	1	0
„ M. Rawat & Co.	25	0	0
„ Adam Suleman	11	11	0
„ Haji Amod Osman	15	0	0
„ P. V. Sanghavee & Son	10	10	0
„ M. S. Timol	5	5	0
„ Amod Esak	3	3	0
„ P. G. Naiker & Sons	5	0	0
„ K. V. Patel	5	5	0
„ H. H. Moolla	1	1	0
„ K. N. Padia	1	0	0
„ M. K. Lodhia	2	2	0
„ Shaikh Dawood	2	2	0
„ M. E. Foolat	0	10	0
„ M. E. Lotpat	0	5	0
„ D. P. Patel	1	1	0
„ Amod Dawood & Co.	25	0	0
„ M. H. Moosa	10	10	0
„ Mahomed Ahmed & Co.	5	5	0
„ Naran Bhagwan	5	5	0
„ M. C. Ami	3	3	0
„ S. R. Sadek	5	0	0
„ S. E. Moolah	5	5	0
„ Ebrahim Mahomed	1	0	0
„ Lala Ramji	1	10	0
„ A. M. Haffoji	3	0	0
„ Odhav Raga	2	2	0
„ M. A. Motala	25	0	0
Verulam			
„ Talwantsing	5	5	0
„ M. Maiter Bros.	5	5	0
„ Amod Kathrada	5	5	0
„ C. E. Motala	5	5	0
„ M. E. Vawda & Son	3	3	0
„ Lal Behari & Son	4	4	0
„ I. A. Maiter	3	3	0
„ Soni Raghavji Rugnath	2	2	0
„ Vally Mahomed	1	1	0
Tongaat			
„ A. A. Gandhi	5	5	0
„ Habib Hassan	5	5	0
„ Arbee Amod	5	5	0
„ Moosa Cassim	2	2	0
„ Ram Fakir	1	1	0
„ R. Timol	1	1	0
„ Ayoob Saya	1	1	0
„ P. Naidoo	1	1	0
„ I. A. Amra	1	1	0
„ Abdoolla Khan	1	1	0
„ R. A. Padiachee	1	1	0
„ A. R. Singh	1	1	0
„ Raj Mahomed	1	1	0
„ Hoosen Saib	1	1	0
„ L. K. Gosai	1	1	0
„ A. L. Mitha	1	1	0
Total :	£1145	3	6

Natal Indian Congress

ROLL UP IN YOUR THOUSANDS!

RECORD YOUR PROTEST AGAINST INIQUITOUS LAWS!!

A Mass Meeting of Natal Indians will be held under the auspices of the Natal Indian Congress at Rawat's Bio Hall, Victoria Street, Durban, on Sunday the 7th day of February, 1926, at 3 p.m. sharp, to protest against :—

(a) Local Government (Provincial Powers) Act which validates the Public Health Ordinance and the European Committees formed thereunder.
(b) Colour Bar Bill.
(c) Liquor Bill.

P. R. PATHER,
Acting Secretary,
Natal Indian Congress.