

# Indian Opinion

No. 50—Vol. XXIII.

Friday, December 11th, 1925.

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

## MR. C. F. ANDREWS IN DURBAN

MR. C. F. ANDREWS who arrived at Durban from Pretoria and Johannesburg last Monday, at 11 a.m., was met at the Central Station by a large number of prominent members of the Indian community and by European friends. He was garlanded on behalf of the Natal Indian Congress by Mr. V. Lawrence, Vice-President of that body. Mr. Andrews was first taken to the late Mr. Parseo Rustomjee's premises in Field Street, where a crowd was anxiously waiting to greet him and to hear him speak. He looked very tired at the end of his journey, but at once rose and addressed those assembled as follows:—

"I have come to you, at this critical time, for two special reasons. The former is, that Mahatma Gandhi himself wished me to come out to you. He told me, that it was my duty, if possible, to leave India for that purpose. The second reason is, that the Poet, Rabindranath Tagore, whom I call my Gurudev, in spite of his very serious illness, has allowed me to come out and has not wished me to remain. Therefore I have come to you with the blessings of two Asrams,—the Asram at Sabarmati, and the Asram at Santiniketan. At both of these religious retreats, where prayer to God is offered daily by all the inmates of the Asram, I was sent out to you with their loving prayers and blessings. Mahatma Gandhi and the Poet, Rabindranath Tagore, the founders of these two Asrams, have also sent me with their own prayers and blessings. Therefore, I come to you with what I dare

to hope is the divine blessing to you all from India.

"I want to say one thing more. Mahatma Gandhi said to me, when he asked me to go,—“Do not go out till the divine voice within tells you that you *must* go out.” At that time, the Poet, Rabindranath Tagore was so ill, that I did not wish to leave him and I told Mahatmaji that I could not leave him. But later on, the inner voice became so clear, that I could resist it no longer. Then, when I went to my Gurudev and told him that the inner voice was so clear, that I could not resist it any longer, he said to me: “Now you *must* go; and you shall carry my blessings with you.” Later on, when I went to Sabarmati, to Mahatma Gandhi, he gave me his blessings also. Therefore, I do not come empty-handed. I feel that I come both with the divine voice leading me, and with the divine blessing to offer to you and to your children.

"The Poet, Rabindranath Tagore, gave me, on my first visit to Natal nearly twelve years ago,—when

I came out with my dearest friend, Willie Pearson,—he gave me then a *mantram* to carry with me, which we all, Hindus, Musalmans and Christians alike can repeat; for it speaks of God as One. Again, this time, he would wish me to carry the same *mantram*, which is the motto of our Asram at Santiniketan. It runs as follows:—

*“Shantam, Shivam, Advaitam.”*

Its meaning is, that God is the All Peace, the All Good, the One without a second.

"He told me to carry that message of divine peace, divine goodness, divine unity, to all South African Indians. He said, that we who were engaged in this critical struggle should be full of peace from God; we should also be full of goodness; we should also be united one with another in the Divine Unity.

"I have now told you the message of my Gurudev, and I have given you Mahatmaji's own love and

blessing. Through you, who are assembled here this morning from every province in South Africa, I would wish to send this message of my Gurudev and this love and blessing of Mahatmaji, to every single Indian, down to the tiniest Indian baby child, in South Africa. May God bless you all, and also bless the work which I have come out to do in His Name."

At the close of the gathering, it was decided to send at once cablegrams to the Poet, Rabindranath Tagore; to Mahatma Gandhi; and also to the Imperial Citizenship Association, Bombay, which had provided the steamer

passage and sent Mr. Andrews as its representative to South Africa.

### An Important Correction

An unfortunate mistake was made by the reporter of the Johannesburg *Star* which was repeated in the other papers. It was said, that Mr. C. F. Andrews had been 'delegated by the Government of India.' This is not the case. Mr. Andrews was sent by Mahatma Gandhi and by the Poet, Rabindranath Tagore, and his steamer passage was provided by the Imperial Citizenship Association, Bombay. He comes out at the unanimous wish of all the leaders of Indian public opinion and is in no way connected with the deputation of the Government of India, which is now on its way to South Africa, and is a purely official deputation.

Mr. Andrews has been asked by the S. A. Indian Congress Deputation, which is now on its way to India, to be present in Durban to welcome the

### Mr. C. F. Andrews' Message

On coming again the third time to South Africa, to help in the Indian cause, I have brought with me from the Poet, Rabindranath Tagore, the very same message which I brought with me on each previous occasion. The Poet bids us put all our trust in the

*“Shantam, Shivam, Advaitam”*

in 'God, the All-Peace, the All-Good, the One.'

In the midst of all our trials and difficulties, let that be our daily prayer and remembrance. We are not trusting in human strength to give us the victory, but in God. Mahatma Gandhi sends the same word of faith and hope and love. Let us therefore remember, day by day, the

*Shantam, Shivam, Advaitam.*

Government of India Deputation on its arrival, and to render them any necessary assistance. This has been confirmed by the Executive Committee of the S. A. Indian Congress at their meeting on December 6th. It is necessary to make quite clear that this reception of the official deputation in Durban in no way implies any previous connexion between Mr. C. F. Andrews and the Government of India Deputation. They are independent of one another and have come out independently—Mr. Andrews as representing the people of India and the Deputation under Mr. Paddison as representing the Indian Government.

In the same way on his two visits to South Africa Mr. C. F. Andrews came out quite independently of the Government of India while an official deputation under Sir Benjamin Robertson came out officially at the same time.

#### DR. MALAN AND THE DEPUTATION

DR. MALAN'S reply to the South African Indian Congress Deputation, which is reprinted in this issue, is a disappointing statement. It is nothing more than a piece of special pleading for his own Bill. Certainly it does him no credit. Indeed it is much less acceptable to us, as a community, than his blunt open hostility when he introduced the measure in its first reading before the Union Assembly. Then he frankly confessed that he wished to get as many Indians as possible out of the country. Now he defends himself, apologises, misleads, and utters statements which can easily be traversed.

Dr. Malan, in answering the Deputation, bases his whole argument for introducing the Bill on two grounds:—

- (i) He declares that it is not a departure from the Gandhi-Smuts Settlement of 1914;
- (ii) He states that it is merely the carrying out of the Recommendations of Lange Commission of 1920.

With the former point we have dealt so often, that we are tired of repeating the fact, that Mr. Gandhi, in his personal letter to Mr. Gorges, was simply defining 'vested rights' in connexion with certain township questions in the Transvaal. He was not dealing with all the vested rights which Indians possessed or all the existing laws which were to be justly observed. It is useless, however, to argue out this whole point again. Surely it will be enough to refer to Mr. Gandhi's own statement about the new Bill, in *Young India*, where he emphatically declares that the present Bill, and the Colour Bar Bill preceding it, are of such a character, that the carrying of them out into law would wreck the whole settlement of 1914 and leave nothing whatever untouched in the agreement that he then made with General Smuts. It is impossible, therefore, to believe that Dr. Malan is really serious, in his contention with regard to the Gandhi-Smuts Agreement, when he declares that his present Asiatic Bill is no breach of its terms. Unfortunately, it is equally impossible to believe that he is serious in his contention, when he declares that this Asiatic Bill is merely a faithful carrying out of the recommendations of the Lange Commission. For the Lange Commission's Recommendations have been flagrantly violated in every part of the Bill.

Let us here explain this matter in detail: for this issue is certain to come up again and again in the near future.

The Lange Commission's first Recommendation ran as follows:—

*'There should be no compulsory repatriation.'*

But this new Asiatic Bill has one whole chapter, whose only purpose is to repatriate by compulsion certain classes of Indians.

Dr. Malan, while introducing the Bill, is blunt enough to state that this compulsory repatriation was his main object. His words are as follows:—

*'I must say that the Bill frankly starts from the general supposition that the Indian, as a race in this country, is an alien element of the population, and that no solution of this question will be acceptable to the country unless it results in a very considerable reduction of the Indian population in this country.'*

It is true, he modifies his words by saying that his method "will not be the employment of any forcible means." But he goes on immediately to stultify himself by adding:

*"The method, which this Bill will propose, will be the application of pressure to supplement the inducement, which is held out to Indians to leave the country."*

We confess we cannot see even a shade of difference between the 'application of pressure' as a method and 'the employment of forcible means.' Yet the Commission, as we have stated, had as its first recommendation, *"There should be no compulsory repatriation."*

Let us go one step farther. The second main recommendation of the Lange Commission runs as follows:—

*"There should be no compulsory segregation."*

Dr. Malan states that he is carrying out the Recommendations of the Lange Commission. Yet he has one whole section of his new Bill, which compels Indians by law to be segregated, both for purposes of residence and trade. To us, it represents a shamelessness rarely founded among responsible Ministers of State, that this Minister should both directly and categorically repudiate the findings of the Government's own Commission, and yet at the same time openly declare to the public that this Bill is intended to carry out that Commission's findings.

It is true that with regard to the third point in the Bill,—the confining of Indian land ownership and immovable property to the 30 mile coastal belt,—Dr. Malan has some support from the majority of the Commissioners, including the Chairman himself.

But it should be noted (i) that the Commissioners dealt only with agricultural land and not with immovable property (ii) that they proposed to give Indians the compensation of long leases in return for the rights which were taken away (iii) that one out of the four Commissioners strongly dissented from this recommendation of the Majority Report on the ground that it would be 'a retrograde proposal inconsistent with other recommendations in the Report which are founded on the idea of voluntary and not compulsory separation.' 'It is also,' the Minority Report goes on, 'a restriction on existing rights of ownership and in the case of ex-indentured Indians and their descendants, a breach of the conditions of recruitment, which I think should be scrupulously adhered to in the interests of good feeling and the sense of fair-play so necessary in our relations with the Indians in South Africa and the Government of India.'

Therefore, even with regard to this third point, concerning the Natal coastal belt, the present Bill cannot strictly be said to 'carry out the recommendations of the Lange Commission,' because (i) this Bill deals with im-

movable property as well as agricultural land (ii) it proposes no compensation whatever for taking away from Indians existing rights (iii) it pays no attention to the Minority Report, in the Lange Commission itself, which is printed and published against the withdrawal of any existing rights of land-purchase from the Indian community, because it would be 'contrary to the interests of good feeling and the sense of fair-play.

Thus, the present Bill is no more a carrying out of the recommendations of the Lange Commission than it is a carrying out of the terms of the Gandhi-Smuts Agreement.

#### DR. MALAN'S PRONOUNCEMENT

**D**R. Malan has now publicly made his pronouncement concerning the Round Table Conference.

Speaking at Capetown, he stated that the Indian Government had asked for a Round Table Conference on the Asiatic Question, but the Union Government had decided that they could not agree; because a Round Table Conference would mean making concessions on the essential principles of the Bill, and the Government were not prepared to do that. They, however, welcomed the Deputation from the Government of India, which was coming to South Africa to investigate the Asiatic question. If the Bill were passed, it would be referred to a Select Committee. Then the Government of India's Deputation would have an opportunity of giving evidence before the Select Committee. He regretted the fact that an Indian Deputation had gone from South Africa to India because Indians knew nothing about South African conditions. Therefore it was only likely to create bad feeling and the Indians would use the South African question towards getting their own self-government.

This exceedingly important information has come at the time of our going to press and full comments on it must be reserved for next week's issue. For the moment, it appears as though our worst fears had been realised, and that the Union Government were now determined to force the Bill through, up to the Select Committee stage, in spite of declared Indian opinion against such an arbitrary course on so vital an imperial subject. Dr. Malan's closing reference to the South African Indian Congress Deputation which has been sent to India was gratuitously impertinent. While it may be true that Indians in India know very little about South Africa, the knowledge of India possessed by South Africans, (who regard India as a land of 'coolies') is so infinitesimal, as to be practically a negligible quantity. Indeed, it is just this abysmal ignorance about India, in South Africa, which is the most difficult thing of all to overcome. We would further like to ask Dr. Malan, the Nationalist, and General Hertzog and Mr. Tielman Roos, whether there is anything *wrong* in Indians using the South African Question towards getting their own self-government. Would not these gentlemen, if they were patriotic Indians do exactly the same? Do they really wish to keep India in strict subjection while South Africa becomes more and more independent.

The newspapers have further announced that Sir Harvad Hockary is coming out as the fourth member of the Government of Indian Deputation. We have no knowledge as to the identity of Sir Harvad Hockary and must await information from India on the subject.

## Report of Congress Deputation to the Minister

The following is an abbreviated report of the interview on the 16th November between the Minister of the interior Dr. Malan and the Congress Deputation. Dr. Malan's words have been given below almost verbatim :—

MR. GODFREY : First of all, Sir, we are very grateful that your health is restored and that you are able to carry out the duties entrusted to you.

The deputation has presented a statement which sets out the position. I will read it :

(Statement read and handed in.)

DR. MALAN : Do you want to add anything to the statement ?

MR. GODFREY : I have nothing further to say as I think the statement sets out the position fairly.

It is the view of this deputation that it would be far better for this Bill to be left alone for a while and the question of a Round Table Conference be gone into and that exchanges might be made, advice taken, suggestions introduced and considered, and if, therefore, representations were to be made from every possible view, I think that the very best results would be obtained and the Indian community would be bound honourably in respect of what might be arrived at at such a Conference.

DR. MALAN : You have made one statement and that is that the Bill is against the terms of the Smuts-Gandhi Agreement. Can you explain that to me ?

MR. GODFREY : The Smuts-Gandhi Agreement was perfectly clear. In the last paragraph of the letter that was written by Mr. Gorges dated 30th June is the following :—

"With regard to the administration of existing laws, the Minister desires me to say that it always has been and will continue to be the desire of the Government to see that they are administered in a just manner and with due regard to vested rights."

We do feel that in this Bill, in segregating us, in taking away the rights to possess land as you have done, and to practically debar us from purchasing land wherever we have purchased it, is in a large measure, an interference with those vested rights. You will see also that in the letter that Mr. Gandhi wrote dated 30th June, he says :—

"As the Minister is aware some of my countrymen have wished me to go further. They are dissatisfied that the trade licences laws of the different Provinces, the Transvaal Gold Law, the Transvaal Townships Act, the Transvaal Law 3 of 1885 have not been altered, so as to give them full rights of residence, trade and ownership of land. Some of them are dissatisfied that full inter-provincial migration is not permitted, and some are dissatisfied that on the marriage question the Relief Bill goes no further than it does. They have asked me that all the above matters might be included in the passive resistance struggle. I have been unable to comply with their wishes. Whilst, therefore, they have not been included in the programme of passive resistance, it will not be denied that some day or other these matters will require further and sympathetic consideration by the Government. Complete satisfaction cannot be expected until full civic rights have been conceded to the resident Indian population."

Then he goes on further to say :—

"The Immigrants Regulation Act of last year has in practice all but stopped further free Indian immigration and that my countrymen do

not aspire to any political ambition, they, the Europeans, will see the justice and indeed the necessity of my countrymen being granted the rights I have just referred to."

It seems to us that the intention and spirit of the Agreement was that the vested rights of the Indians should be protected and that in future the law should be sympathetically administered and also that although that agreement only settled matters existing at that time, my countrymen thought there were other matters that required consideration, but Mr. Gandhi did not think it proper to press for any more. He made it clear that although they were not pressing for them then, he thought it best to leave it until the good sense of the European public should see fit to grant them more elbow room to progress.

I wish you to remember that we are South Africans. A lot of us do not know India, except geographically. We are bred and born here. We have no other home. We speak the language, English being spoken. Some of the Indians do not know the Indian language. We live and think and move about exactly as the Europeans do. We are to a large extent South Africans and we expect that in any legislation that will be introduced that some consideration will be given as regards our faith, so that when we have said in that statement that it is a breach of the Smuts-Gandhi Agreement we do feel that all the legislation is being introduced in direct violation of vested rights and the spirit of the Agreement, which was that we should be sympathetically treated and that the other matters still to be considered would be sympathetically dealt with. Legislation is being introduced which certainly has the impression of restricting us. I think it was the view of the then Government, with Mr. Smuts at its head, that this should not be so.

On the question of immigration for Indians, the Smuts-Gandhi Agreement to a very large extent said that the question of immigration was practically settled as at that date. I don't want to enter into a discussion of this Bill as I attended the Conference and the Conference did not wish me to enter into discussion of this Bill. I think it is right to say, however, that in this Bill you have been pleased to introduce you are restricting our personal movement, for instance, wives should be brought in within a certain period, and the increasing of the immigration bail that was required from about £30 to £100. I think this is unreasonable. There are further restrictions. Then of course there is the question of domicile which is now defined in the Bill, which practically says that an absence from the Colony of three years means the loss of domicile. These are things which perhaps will appeal to you as showing that the spirit of the Agreement that we relied upon is not being carried out. Those are further restrictions, a repressive policy against the Indians, which we feel ought not to be the case. That is as much as I wish to say at present.

DR. MALAN: I think before we go further it is just as well that we come to some clear idea as to what was in the Smuts-Gandhi Agreement and what was not. As you will know the Asiatic Enquiry Commission was appointed in 1921, or rather the Report was published in 1921. That Commission went very exhaustively into the whole question of what the so-called Smuts-Gandhi Agreement really contained and what not. Now on page 18 of the Report. In the first place you will see there that that so-called Smuts-Gandhi Agreement which was to put an end to all these differences between the Government and the Indian population, was based on the definite understanding that after that agreement there should be no further agitation on the part of the Indian population in regard to the laws of the country. Now, as you will see from Mr.

Gandhi's letter, Mr. Gandhi did not accept that. It was definitely understood that there was to be an end to the agitation against legislation.

[The Minister then read over again the whole passage quoted above by Mr. Godfrey from Mr. Gandhi's letter.]

The second point is this—that the undertaking of General Smuts at that time related only to the administration of the existing laws. As far as I can see no undertaking was given or could have been given by any Government that the laws would not be changed or that any laws with regard to any question would not in future be introduced. Conditions are continually changing in every country and it is an impossibility for any Government to give an undertaking that no additional laws will be made in respect of a certain subject or that existing laws will not be changed. General Smuts said.—

"With regard to the administration of existing laws, the Minister desires me to say that it always has been and will continue to be the desire of the Government to see that they are administered in a just manner and with due regard to vested rights."

Now we come to the point of vested rights. Vested rights, General Smuts said, would always be protected. Now I find in the report of the Asiatic Enquiry Commission that Mr. Gandhi took the precaution before leaving South Africa to put on paper what he thought was included in that promise, what vested rights really meant. Now I think this is very different from what he says here:—

"DEAR MR. GORGES,—I have now got a moment to submit my note on the Gold Law. As you know, after mature consideration, I refrained from pressing for the insertion of a special clause defining "vested rights" in connection with the Gold Law and Townships Amendment Act, because I felt that any definition in the correspondence might result in restricting the future action of my countrymen. However, so far as my interpretation of 'vested rights' is concerned, I think I should reduce it to writing. General Smuts was good enough to say that he would endeavour to protect vested rights as defined by me. The following is the definition I submitted to Sir Benjamin Robertson, who, I understood, submitted it to General Smuts. My letter to Sir Benjamin Robertson containing among other matters the definition, is dated the 4th March 1914: 'By vested rights I understand the right 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 from place to place in the same township. I am fortified in my interpretation by the answer given by Mr. Harcourt in connection with the matter, in the House of Commons, on the 27th June 1911:—

'Complaints against that legislation (the Gold Law and Townships Amendment Act) have been made and are now being investigated by the Government of the Union of South Africa who have lately stated that there is no intention of interfering with any business or right to carry on business acquired and exercised by Indians prior to the date of the legislation.'

By vested rights he merely meant the right 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 his business from place to place.

You will find it has been the principle of legislation, both in the Transvaal and as far as the Union Government is concerned, always to protect vested rights. Vested rights were protected in 1835, the

old Transvaal Law, they were protected in 1908, the Transvaal Gold Law.

Vested interests, even though they were acquired illegally, even though they were acquired contrary to the spirit of the existing laws, were protected in 1919, and you will find that throughout this Bill that I have introduced existing rights, vested interests, of Indians are also protected. If the protection of vested rights whenever legislation is introduced is meant by the protection of vested interests, I think we have kept to the spirit and to the letter of the Smuts-Gandhi Agreement.

Now coming to the question the chief question that you have raised here this morning, viz. of a Round-table Conference between the Government of India, the British Government and the Government of the Union, in regard to Indian matters generally in the Union, I can just say that of course a suggestion was made in this connection by Mr. Thomas when he visited South Africa. I think that was the first suggestion made. Now, if I remember rightly, at that time when Mr. Thomas made his suggestion it certainly did not meet with the approval of the European population of the country. A good many newspapers at that time, voicing the opinion of the public, protested against that. They thought it was rather an interference on the part of Mr. Thomas, visiting our country, on a question which is very difficult and delicate. Any way, it was merely a suggestion on his part. Now the Indian Government, starting from that suggestion, entered into negotiation with the Union Government and they definitely asked whether it would not be possible to have a Round-table Conference. Now that question with reference to a Round-table Conference is practically settled between the Government of India and the Union Government, but the negotiations have not yet reached finality, that is to say, the Government of India and the Union Government are still negotiating with regard to Indian affairs in South Africa. As I say, the whole question with regard to the holding of the Round-table Conference has been gone into. We have come to a definite conclusion regarding it, and at the time I made a statement in Parliament that negotiations had taken a definite course in regard to this. The matter was at that time practically settled. Upon an occasion like this I don't think I should make any announcement to you or to the public as to the result of those negotiations. I think I should take another opportunity—it may be in Parliament or even before that—to announce what the result and contents of the negotiations are.

With regard to matters of this kind it is only considered as etiquette between Governments that no public announcement should be made in regard to the result of negotiations unless it be with the consent of both parties, and therefore I think I can say nothing more with regard to this point regarding the Round-table Conference.

I may just say, in general, that the Union Government considers the Indian question to be a question which has to be solved by South Africa. It is a South African question and it has to be solved by the South African Government and Parliament and people. This is not to say, of course, that we shall not welcome the representations made to us by people outside. We will always be willing to receive representations, but after all the question is a South African one and has to be solved and settled by the Government and the people of South Africa.

Now, as I understand from the document which you have read here, you have come here to-day only to object against the principle of the Bill, nothing more. You don't wish to enter into a discussion of the separate clauses. With regard to the principle of the Bill, I may just say in general that there is as far as I can see practical unanimity between all parties in South Africa and between all sections of

Asiatic Enquiry Commission was appointed some years ago, the report in 1921 went very exhaustively into the question. Attending the meetings of that Commission there was a representative of the Government of India, Sir Benjamin Robertson. He was in a position to acquaint himself with the circumstances, with the evidence and with the discussions of the Commission, and he was in a position to inform the Government of India of what was taking place. Now the conclusions of that Commission were accepted generally by the people of South Africa—I am speaking of the European population—and the previous Government, as you are aware, introduced legislation, the Class Areas Bill, to put into operation one of the chief recommendations of that Commission and if there had not been a dissolution of Parliament and a change of Government, then I daresay the Class Areas Bill would have been on the Statute Book to-day. Now, our present Bill follows to a very large extent the lines of the legislation of the previous Government in certain respects, specially with regard to land ownership in Natal. It goes further, it proposes to carry out more or less the recommendations in the report of the Asiatic Enquiry Commission. Now that was not included in the previous Government's Bill, but I merely mention it to show that both the previous Government, representing the South African Party, and the present Government, representing the other two Parties, agree as to the general lines on which this question shall be tackled and solved.

That means that no Government, whatever party it may represent, in this country is able to adopt the policy of "drift." No Government will be able to ignore what is undoubtedly the desire of the European community taken as a whole. No Government will be able to do what you ask me to do and that is to drop this Bill which is to be introduced and to leave the matter simply where it is. If I dared do it in the face of the feeling of the country, I think that would mean the end of the present Government.

Now let me just say this further. You do not wish to-day to discuss the clauses of the Bill. You do not wish to accept a general invitation to all sections of the community which I extended before the end of the last Session when I introduced the Bill, viz., I invited constructive criticism on the different clauses of the Bill. Now I must say that I have received criticism from various parts of the country, various sections of the population, and this simply confirms what I said just now with regard to the feeling of the European population generally, that all the constructive criticisms which I have received so far boils down to this—that the Bill does not go far enough. Because I have received constructive criticisms of that nature I would welcome any constructive criticism on your part, those who object to the various clauses of the Bill, to show that it goes too far because personally I wish to acquaint myself intimately with the views of all sections of the population—those who are in favour and those against.

You have decided not to discuss with me the clauses of the Bill so that means I will receive no constructive criticism or observations on the clauses of the Bill. In any case I think an opportunity will be given to you later on to lay your views before Parliament. This is a very important Bill. It has, of course, to do with the rights and the interests of a considerable section of the population, and it is only right that everybody shall have an opportunity to lay the views in regard to this Bill before Parliament. Because the Bill is an important one it will, I daresay, be referred to a Select Committee. I am willing to move myself that it be referred to Select Committee. That Committee will give an opportunity to everybody who is representative of a definite view of any section of the population to give evidence, if you wish, when the Bill is introduced into Parlia-

ment again and referred to Select Committee, to lay all the evidence you can get against the various clauses of the Bill before the Select Committee, you will be very welcome to do so.

After Mr. Godfrey had made his reply the Minister again referred to his offer to hear criticisms in detail about the Bill and the Deputation departed.

#### OUR LONDON LETTER

[ FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT ]

5th November, 1925.

Mr. E. L. F. Wood the Minister of Agriculture in the present Conservative Government of Great Britain, has been appointed to succeed Lord Reading as Viceroy of India. He is a son of Lord Halifax, and grandson of the first Viscount Halifax, who was Secretary of State for India from 1859 to 1866. Mr. Wood is 44 years. He is a High Churchman like his father. He has never exercised himself in oriental problems and pursuits. He belongs to the school of Lord Grey of Fallodon. He will go to India with an open mind. The new Vicereine Lady Dorothy Wood, was before her marriage Lady Dorothy Onslow.

The political Levée is not without its consequences. Labourites who are members of the Conservative and Liberal Parties, from time to time object to paying the Levée to the Trade Unions to which they belong, on the ground that it is used for the advancement of the Labour Party. The objecting Labourites have the right of statutory exemption from such a payment, and some of them are exercising it. Mr. Macquiston and other Conservatives are urging the Government to introduce further legislation on the question.

Ambah III Chief of three million subjects on the Gold Coast of Africa has arrived in England. He dresses in European clothes, and speaks English fluently. He has come to study the methods of education in the Universities, with the view to applying them to a College, opened not so long ago at Accra for West Africans. He has been to the United States on a similar mission, where he visited several centres of learning delivering addresses at Columbia University, and Hampton College. The College at Accra was built at a cost of £500,000, which was loaned from the British Government, and will be paid back by means of taxes collected in the country. The staff of the college will consist of British and American Masters, about 48 going from Britain. The Vice Principal of the College who is now in London is Dr. Aggray, who it will be remembered was one of the Phelps Stokes Commission, which visited African Colonies in the interest of the education of Africans.

Lt. Commander Hilton Young, M.P., chairman of the Royal Commission on Indian Currency and Finance with his colleagues from England Sir Henry Strakosch, Sir Reginald Mant and Mr. W. E. Preston, left London to-day for India where they will be joined by their other colleagues Professor J. C. Coyajee, Sir Manekji Dadaboy, Sir Randerdhanath Mukerjee, Sir Alexander Murray, Sir Purshotamdas Takirdas and Sir Norbet Warren. The Commission will first take evidence in terms of its reference, and then proceed to London to take evidence there and formulate its findings and recommendations.

Turkey is being rapidly westernised. It has now made the wearing of the Fez illegal, and has got the Mufti to declare that the Fez has no religious sanction. On the occasion of the celebration of the third anniversary of the proclamation of Turkey as a Republic, the President Mustafa Kemal Pasha

arrived wearing evening dress and a tophat. The deputies were so attired, or wore morning coats. The diplomatic corps wore uniform. In the evening at the State Ball, men and women dressed in the fashions of Europe danced to Western music. Men in the Services and in the Police, wear peaked and other forms of Western headgear. Madame Sami Bey who came to London with her husband, who is a distinguished Turkish official, is the first Turkish woman to broadcast her subject was the Turkish Lady of Yesterday and To-day, and gave selections of genuine Turkish music arranged for the piano. It would appear that the characteristics in dress and manner, which distinguished the Turks from other peoples, will be matters of the past. These changes will be regretted by all lovers, not only of the spectacular, but of national traits.

The closing scene at the Wembley was as triumphant as its opening was magnificent. Over 27,000,000 people visited Wembley. They came not only from the British Isles, but from every part of the world, to see the productions of the British Empire, and none has left it without a deep impression of the potentialities of the British Empire. The King was pleased to say that the Exhibition has stimulated a legitimate pride in Britain's past achievements, as well as an increased sense of responsibilities, for the years to come. And the Duke of York, in declaring the British Empire Exhibition closed, said that he was confident that its results would endure for the benefits of the Empire, and its peaceful mission in the world.

Miss Enid Russell Smith and Miss Alix H. Kilroy have the distinction of being the first women to pass a civil service examination under the new conditions, which admit women to the higher Government posts. They will start at salaries from £200 to £400 a year, with added bonus, and there is nothing to prevent them in due course, from rising to the topmost heights, in any British State Departments, from salaries of £3000 to £2500 a year. Any woman with the necessary qualifications may become permanent Secretary to the Treasury and head of the Civil Service, or permanent Under-Secretary of State for War, or for foreign affairs, or for the Dominions, or for India, or Head of the Board of Trade, the Post Office, the Ministry of Health or any other Government office in Whitehall.

The sons of Prime Ministers do not always follow in the footsteps of their fathers. Mr. Anthony Asquith plays on the films. Brigadier-General Arthur Asquith is an industrialist, Mr. Cyril Asquith is a lawyer. Mr. Lloyd George's two sons are in business. Mr. Bonar Law's son Richard is studying law. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's eldest son is an architect. His younger son Malcolm is writing a book on his recent trip round the world. Mr. Oliver Baldwin, the son of the present Conservative Prime Minister, is a labour party man, and grows vegetables and rears chickens.

Everywhere to-day boys are playing at Guy Fawkes, but it lacks the variety and enthusiasm that were manifest years ago. There is too much of seriousness in the country, and it affects national celebrations, which was marked with the mirth and freedom of a happy people.

#### "INDIAN OPINION"

##### Subscription Rates.

WITHIN THE UNION:	s.	d.
Yearly ... ..	20	0
Half-Yearly ... ..	10	6
OUTSIDE THE UNION and OVERSEAS:	s.	d.
Yearly ... ..	20	0
Half-Yearly ... ..	10	6