

This PDF is a selection from an out-of-print volume from the National Bureau of Economic Research

Volume Title: International Migrations, Volume II: Interpretations

Volume Author/Editor: Walter F. Willcox, editor

Volume Publisher: NBER

Volume ISBN: 0-87014-017-5

Volume URL: <http://www.nber.org/books/will31-1>

Publication Date: 1931

Chapter Title: Indian Migration

Chapter Author: G. Findlay Shirras

Chapter URL: <http://www.nber.org/chapters/c5120>

Chapter pages in book: (p. 591 - 616)

CHAPTER XIX

INDIAN MIGRATION.¹

By

G. FINDLAY SHIRRAS,

Gujarat College, University of Bombay.

Formerly Director of Statistics with the Government of India.

This analysis and interpretation of the statistics of migration from British India and its dependencies to other parts of the world aims to get at the truth on a controversial subject through the eminently non-political method of statistics. While the author is indebted to the Government of India for much assistance in its preparation, the chapter is unofficial and for the views expressed in it the author alone is responsible.

At the start, it is necessary to envisage the problem by setting forth, from the best available sources, the number of Indians enumerated abroad. For some countries the statistics are incomplete. Where possible the census of the country concerned has been used. The figures refer generally to 1921, or a subsequent year. According to Table 269 (p. 592) there are 2,795,000 Indians abroad, including those born in India or of Indian extraction. More than four-fifths are Hindus, and about half of the remainder are Mohammedans. This number is less than 1 per cent of the 318,942,480 Indians in India—a large population crowded into an area about half the size of Europe.

In Ceylon the population of Indian extraction is 1,405,000 or 31 per cent, and of Indians born in India 635,000 or 14 per cent of the total population of that island. Ceylon Tamils have been domiciled in Ceylon for centuries; Indian Tamils have arrived recently from India for labor on tea, rubber, and other estates. The Ceylon Labor Commission recruits only for estates and therefore practically all who emigrate to the island through its agency are agriculturists. Malaya stands next to Ceylon with 472,000 Indians. The Indian population in Malaya in 1921 had increased 76 per cent over the census figure of 267,000 in 1911.² Unskilled

¹[See *International Migrations*, Volume I, pp. 140-148; 230ff.; 240-260; 296-309; 900-9; 911; 913; 915.—Ed.]

²*Annual Report, Agent of the Government of India in British Malaya for 1925.*

labor under the Emigration Act (Act No. VII) of 1922 may emigrate lawfully from India only to Ceylon and to Malaya. Skilled labor may emigrate under certain safeguards to any country. In some colonies the number of Indians born in India is not great, but there is often permanent colonization. In East Africa there is a considerable number of Indian traders. Thus Sir Benjamin Robertson, in a report on the proposed settlement of Indian agriculturists

TABLE 269.

ASIATIC INDIANS RESIDENT ABROAD IN 1921, OR IN LATER YEARS.
(In Thousands)

<i>Ceylon</i>	<i>Scotland</i>8
Indian Tamils.....603	<i>East Africa</i>
Indian Mohammedans...33	Kenya.....23
Ceylon Tamils.....517	Tanganyika.....15
Ceylon Mohammedans...252	Uganda.....10
<i>Total</i>1,405	Zanzibar.....13
<i>Malaya</i>	Rhodesia.....4
Straits Settlements.....105	Nyassaland.....0.6
Malay States.....367	<i>Total</i>65
<i>Total</i>472	<i>Fiji</i>61
<i>Mauritius</i>266	<i>United States of America</i>5
<i>South Africa</i>	<i>Australian Commonwealth</i> ...2 ^a
Cape Province.....6	<i>New Zealand</i>2
Natal.....141	<i>Hongkong</i>1
Transvaal.....13	<i>Canada</i>1.2 ^{ab}
Orange Free State.....0.1	<i>Egypt</i>1
<i>Total</i>161	<i>Japan</i>0.2
<i>West Indies</i>	
Trinidad.....125	
Jamaica.....20	
Saint Lucia.....2	
<i>Total</i>147	
<i>British Guiana</i>125	
<i>England and Wales</i>74	<i>Grand Total</i>2,795,000

^aApproximate.

^bIncludes 1100 Sikhs, mostly in British Columbia.

in Tanganyika, says:¹ "Indian traders . . . have penetrated to every corner of the country and practically monopolize the retail trade. The retail dealers are largely supplied by Indian merchants." For reasons explained below, Indian opinion is much interested in the question of the treatment of Indians abroad, especially in South Africa, East Africa, and Fiji.

Scope of the Statistical Tables.

The statistical tables in Volume I unfortunately are incomplete so far as India and Ceylon are concerned. They do not include all those who emigrated or immigrated during a year. They refer in the main to indentured or unskilled labor, except for 1923 and 1924, years for which more detailed data are available about certain countries.² Moreover, even for unskilled labor, statistics are not in all cases available back to the years in which emigration actually began. Emigration to Mauritius began as early as 1819, it is said, and certainly between 1826 and 1830.³ In 1834, following the abolition of slavery in the previous year throughout the British Empire, emigration from India to Mauritius started on a large scale. Calcutta sent 7000 emigrants there between 1834 and 1837.⁴ These years, however, do not appear in the tables, probably because the records are inaccessible. These are cautions that must be clearly remembered as one's eye runs down the columns.

Again, it is very difficult to define an emigrant or an immigrant. For example, should British or Americans arriving in India for government or private service through long periods or periods of only a few years' duration, be included? As pointed out in the *Reports on Legislation concerning the Movement of Labor and Migration in General*, there is no uniformity in usage about the terms "emigrant" and "immigrant." The present impossibility of reconciling the various points of view was clearly brought out at the discussions of the International Conference on Emigration and Immigration held at Rome in 1924, when the section instructed to draw up an international definition was unable, after prolonged efforts, to produce anything but a very incomplete text. It was finally recognized

¹India. Commerce Dep't. *Resolution No. 2477d (18 Mar. 1921)*.

²[See Volume I, pp. 906 f., Tables V and VII.—Ed.]

³"Emigrant," *Indian Emigration*, p. 7. Most of the despatches on which the text of this Chapter is based, have not been published, although quoted by "Emigrant" in his work. The writer must, therefore, refer to his pages and not to the original documents.

⁴*Indian Emigration*, p. 7.

that the term "migration" really covered two distinct phenomena, which had to be taken into account in the definition proposed by the Conference. These were: first, migration for the purpose of settlement, consisting in settlement in another country for a long period (generally permanent); and, secondly, the international exchange of labor, a temporary and fluctuating phenomenon which follows the oscillations in the international labor market.¹

Europeans and Americans are excluded from the tables. At the last census (1921) the number of persons resident in India who were born outside India was only 604,000, of whom 274,000 were born in Nepal, 116,000 in the British Isles, 108,000 in China, and 48,000 in Afghanistan. The number who came from European countries other than the British Isles was 5,000. The figures for the British Isles include the European army in India. The number of males decreased from 103,000 in the 1911 census to 93,000, while females increased from 19,000 to 23,000. Americans (3,000) and Australians (2,000) had increased considerably at the census of 1921, while the number of Germans was 247, as against 2,000 in 1911. Thus it appears that the tables in Volume I do not include the entire migration to or from India, as Europeans, Americans, and Australasians are omitted.

Moreover, those tables do not include the movements across the land frontiers of India, extending for 6000 miles. We know of the existence of a casual movement of population between India and China, Nepal, Afghanistan, and Persia. There is, for example, a considerable movement over the frontier between Burma, China and Siam, just as there is between British territory and native states in India itself, a migration that is not recorded. The migration across the northwest frontier is of especial interest. Probably no country in the world, it is said by the Census Superintendent of Baluchistan, apart from exclusively nomadic regions such as central Arabia, has so much nomadism as Baluchistan:²

Its people seem indeed to have discovered the secret of perpetual motion. The autumn and spring are—as all over the world—the two seasons for migration, in the former towards the plains, in the latter towards the highlands...Even the agriculturists often occupy their so-called permanent villages for certain periods only and return to tent life as soon as the season permits...In 1911, of the total indigenous population, only 54 per cent passed their life permanently under roof; 13 per cent used both roof and tent, while 33 per cent were nomads pure and simple. Similar figures for this decade are 60, 18, and 22.

¹International Economic Conference, Geneva, July 4, 1927, Report C. E. 12.

²*Census of India*, IV, p. 35.

From Afghanistan in the last twenty years there has been a steady decrease of immigrants into India. The immigration from Afghanistan into the Northwest Frontier Province is divided into four streams and is temporary in character, viz.: (1) the carriers who pass in caravans through the Khyber Pass twice a week under the protection of the Khyber Rifles. They move between Kabul and Peshawar; (2) Afghan laborers who immigrate especially to Peshawar for the winter to work; (3) warrior traders (powindah) almost wholly engaged in the carrying trade between India and Afghanistan.¹

They assemble every autumn in the plains east of Ghazni, with their families, flocks, herds and long strings of camels laden with the goods of Bokhara and Kandahar. Entering the Dera Ismail Khan district they leave their families, flocks, and a considerable proportion of their fighting men in the great grazing grounds which lie on either side of the Indus, and while some wander off in search of employment, others pass on with their merchandise by railway to Multan, Rajputana, Lahore, Amritsar, Delhi, Cawnpore, Benares, Calcutta, and other important centers of trade.

(4) The graziers who pass the summer in the hills and in the winter search for pasture in the lowlands. The Afghan immigrants are usually accompanied by their wives, who numbered 69 per 100 males in the Northwest Frontier Province.

The history of Indian migration may conveniently be divided into three periods: (1) from the abolition of slavery and the recruiting of unskilled labor under indenture to the consolidation of the laws regarding the migration of such labor. This period extends over the 75 years, 1833-1908; (2) the dawn of a national policy, 1908-1922. In this period of 14 years indentured labor was stopped and the law of 1922 removed many of the evils of coolieism; (3) the execution of a national policy in regard to emigration. This period extends from 1922 to the present.

Period from 1833 to 1908.

In early times emigration took place from India to Ceylon, Java, and Cambodia. There were two streams of emigration to Ceylon: one was Dravidian from Orissa and the other mainly Aryan from Kathiawar. The emigration to Java took place, probably, in the seventh century from western India. Sculptures in Angkor Vat

¹*Census of India*, XIV, p. 63f.

temple near Angkor in Cambodia, depict events in the Indian classic epics, the Ramayana and the Mahabharata. Colonization, except to Ceylon, was suspended for a thousand years, only to be renewed when slavery was abolished in 1833. Shortly after the renewal of this emigration, malpractices and mortality made it necessary almost entirely to suspend emigration to Mauritius and the West Indies. Lord Brougham in 1838 quoted a circular of a firm, Messrs. Husan and Co., who, according to his lordship, "had held themselves forth to the public as accomplished man merchants, and who had bragged that in two years they could furnish to the Mauritius 5000 hill coolies at £10 a head, including passage money, provision, water, and all other stores, and an advance of six months' wages and clothing."¹ Emigration to British Guiana was stopped between 1848 and 1851, owing to excessive mortality on the voyage. In 1863 emigration to Jamaica was suspended, owing to depression and to the unsuitability of the immigrants. Emigration to Natal was stopped between 1866 and 1874 because of unsatisfactory conditions of labor.² Between 1837 and 1864, when the laws were consolidated, there were no fewer than 21 acts placed on the statute book. These acts dealt with recruiting, the care of emigrants during the voyage, the periods for which emigration was permitted, and authorized emigration to particular colonies. The Act of 1837 required emigrants to appear before magistrates at ports of embarkation, and provided that no contract was valid unless the magistrate certified that it was clearly understood by the laborer. Until the contract had been certified no vessel was to have port clearance. Suitable accommodations during the voyage were also required. In Act XXXI of 1855, which deals with emigration to Grenada, the Government of India for the first time took steps to protect its own nationals during their residence in the colony,³ and Act XIX of 1856 empowered the Government of India to suspend emigration to any colony which had not taken measures to protect emigrants on arrival or during residence, or to provide for return passage to India when the emigrant was entitled to it. The Act of 1864 was both a consolidating measure and an attempt to remedy abuses. Its chief provisions were: (1) examination by a magistrate before registration and before the emigrant was taken to the port of embarkation; (2) licensing of recruiters, and fines and imprisonment for unlicensed

¹*Indian Emigration*, p. 8.

²*Indian Emigration*, p. 9.

³[For regulations and statistics of emigration to the West Indies colonies see also Volume I, pp. 141, and 143 f., 506 ff., 514, Table III, ff.—Ed.]

recruiting and recruiting under false pretenses; (3) licensing of the depots at ports which were to be inspected; (4) appointment of a medical officer for every place to which emigration was permitted; (5) definition of the duties of the Protector of Emigrants; and (6) authorization by Government of emigration to any new colony, subject to the provisions of the act. The act of 1883 introduced a more uniform registration procedure, made registration more careful and subject to greater supervision. Act XVII of 1908 consolidated the previous laws, but did not change the attitude of the Government towards migration.

During this period the emigrants were: (1) unskilled laborers under indenture, as in Mauritius, the West Indies and Natal, or under a special system of recruiting, such as was adopted in Ceylon and Malaya. The system of indenture brought many troubles in its train and was abolished in 1917; (2) skilled laborers and persons belonging to the trading, clerical, and professional classes. Emigration of this class has usually followed the emigration of unskilled labor, because the ex-indentured laborers and their descendants form themselves into communities abroad and are Indians in various walks of life who may not be described indiscriminately as coolies or laborers.

Under the system of indenture the laborer was bound to the master since, in consideration of the cost of his passage and a wage, he undertook to engage himself for a fixed period, which varied from one month to five years, according to the colony. On the expiration of this period the laborer could renew his contract; or settle in the country and work as he pleased; or, after 1857 (except in Mauritius), return to his home at the expense of the colony which had imported him. The employer tried, in short, to secure a sufficient supply of labor at a minimum cost for a maximum period. *Laissez-faire* up to 1908, discouraged the fixing of the minimum wage or, as in Fiji and elsewhere, of the ratio of the sexes among emigrants, the absence of a proper ratio leading, of course, to crime and immorality. One writer states:¹

The defects of indenture were many. They were inherent in the system. So far as protection of the emigrant in the land of his adoption was concerned, its effectiveness depended in a large measure, if not entirely, on the good will of its government, the active co-operation of the officials specially charged with the administration of the labor laws, and the force of public opinion. As Mr. (now Sir) Courtenay Ilbert admit-

¹*Indian Emigration*, p. 13 f.

ted in Council in 1883, the only weapon in the hands of the Government of India to safeguard Indian interests was the weapon of persuasion. The removal of other evils, whether moral or economic, was equally beset with formidable difficulties. . . Indenture has now been abolished . . . Its practical importance to us lies only in the problems which it has bequeathed.

Period from 1908 to 1922.

The second period brought the dawn of a national policy which (a) abolished indentured labor of emigrants; (b) passed the Act of 1922 (Act VII); and (c) ventilated Indian grievances in regard to emigration before the Imperial Conference. Educated public opinion in India was awakened, especially to the iniquities of the indenture system.

"It is needless to draw your Lordship's attention," wrote the Government of India in 1908 to the Secretary of State for India in London, "to the serious crisis with which we are now faced in, at any rate, one portion of the Empire, owing to the methods of self-governing colonies in dealing with the status and rights of British Indians whom they had allowed, if not actually encouraged, to settle within their borders. It is impossible for us to disregard the fact that the history of the anti-Asiatic legislation in Natal and the Transvaal may at any time be repeated in others of the Crown Colonies. . . Indian settlers lived and traded in British East Africa long before the days of British rule, and their status in the country and their claims to political recognition are such that they cannot be overlooked. We believe, however, that these claims are not regarded with favor by the white colonists, that the Indians as a whole are disliked by them."

In February, 1910, in the Indian Legislative Council, the late G. K. Gokhale of the Servants of India Society moved the following resolution: "That this Council recommends that the Governor-General in Council should be empowered to prohibit the recruitment of indentured labour in India for the Colony of Natal." The object of the resolution was to improve the lot of free Indians in South Africa, whose presence was regarded with alarm by the whites. The Government of India accepted the resolution and emigration was stopped in the following year. Two years later Mr. Gokhale moved the "prohibition of recruitment of Indian labourers under contract of indenture, whether for employment at home or in any British colony." Every one of the 22 Indian members present voted in favor of the resolution, but it failed of passage. In 1915 the Government of India informed the Secretary of State that "the time has come for His Majesty's Government to assent to a total abolition of the system of indentured Indian labour in the four

British colonies where it still prevails, and in Surinam." This was agreed to on March 20, 1915, the Defence of India Act stopped it, and the prohibition received further legislative sanction by the Emigration Act of 1922.¹

This Act is an important landmark in the history of Indian migration. Organized emigration of unskilled labor can now be controlled by the legislature. A standing emigration committee, composed of 12 members of the Indian Legislature, 8 of whom are members of the Legislative Assembly and four of the Council of State, advises the Government of India on all major emigration questions. The fact that the consent of the elected legislature is necessary to the existence of Indian emigration has exercised a liberalizing influence upon colonies which require Indian labor.

Public opinion in India on the status of Indians overseas, has crystallized and after the World War that country, realizing her importance in the British Commonwealth, felt that the treatment accorded to Indians in some parts of the Empire was not such as was fitting for a country the destiny of which under the Government of India Act of 1919 was dominion status. Its chief grievances are that in some portions of the British Commonwealth India's nationals are placed in a position of inferiority in regard to the franchise and the conditions under which they can immigrate and obtain and retain domicile; and that in some parts of Africa their rights to hold land, to enjoy trading facilities and to escape from compulsory

¹Section 10 of Chapter III of the Emigration Act reads: (1) Emigration, for the purpose of unskilled work, shall not be lawful except to such countries and on such terms and conditions as the Governor General in Council, by notification in the Gazette of India, may specify in this behalf.

(2) No notification shall be made under subsection (1) unless it has been laid in draft before both Chambers of the Indian Legislature and has been approved by a resolution of each Chamber, either without modification or addition, or with modifications and additions to which both Chambers agree, but, upon such approval being given, the notification may be issued in the form in which it has been so approved.

Section 11 gives the Governor General power to suspend the emigration of unskilled workers and to revoke such prohibition.

Chapter IV deals with the emigration of skilled labor and provides, in Section 16 (1), that "whoever desires to engage, or to assist, any person to emigrate for the purpose of skilled work shall apply for the permission of the local government having jurisdiction at the port from which such person is to depart, and shall state in his application: (a) the number of persons whom he proposes so to engage or assist; (b) the place beyond the limits of India to which each such person and his dependents are to proceed; (c) the accommodation to be provided for each such person and his dependents until their departure out of India and during the voyage." Information has also to be supplied in regard to the provision for the health and well-being of such person, the terms of the agreement under which such person is to be engaged, and the security in British India which he proposes to furnish for the due observance of such agreement, and for the proper treatment of the person to be engaged and his dependents. The local government may give the permission or withhold it, as it thinks fit, and its decision is final. The Protector of Emigrants has to see such persons who are engaged and their dependents (Section 18).

segregation are restricted. There is, it is clear, a distinction between the position of the self-governing dominions and of the crown colonies. The dominions control their domestic affairs, and are themselves responsible for the treatment of Indians within their confines. It is otherwise with the colonies, and Indian Nationalist opinion regards the mother country as the final arbiter of these grievances.

It was in circumstances such as these that the matter was brought before the Imperial War Conference of 1918. The whole question of the position of Indians overseas assumed vital importance in the public life of the country. That Conference passed what is known as the Reciprocity Resolution,¹ affirming the right of each community of the Commonwealth to control, by immigration restrictions, the composition of its own population. The resolution recommended that facilities should be given to Indians for visits and temporary residence; that domiciled Indians should be permitted to import their wives and minor children "on condition (1) that no more than one wife and her children shall be admitted for each Indian, and (2) that each individual so admitted shall be certified by the Government of India as being the lawful wife or child of such Indian." The resolution also recommended early consideration of the removal of the civic and social disabilities to which Indians were subjected overseas. Some adversely criticized this resolution, because it surrenders the rights of Imperial citizenship. This concept of Imperial citizenship has no legal significance, and the resolution merely accepts what was already in being. At the Imperial Conference of 1921 India's representatives secured the adoption of a Resolution favoring equality of citizenship for Indians who were lawfully settled in the Dominions.²

The last sentence of this resolution was an achievement. An important step was taken at the conference by permitting India to negotiate direct with South Africa, thereby making it certain that

¹Imperial War Conference, 1918 (Cd. 9177). Resolution XXI.

²The resolution agreed to—the South African delegates dissenting—read as follows: The Conference, while re-affirming the Resolution of the Imperial War Conference of 1918 that each community of the British Commonwealth should enjoy complete control of the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any of the other communities, recognises that there is an incongruity between the position of India as an equal partner of the British Empire and the existence of disabilities upon British Indians lawfully domiciled in some other parts of the Empire. The Conference accordingly is of the opinion that in the interests of the solidarity of the British Commonwealth, it is desirable that the rights of such Indians to citizenship should be recognized.—(Cmd 1474-1921-Conference of Prime Ministers and Representatives of the United Kingdom, the Dominions, and India, held in June, July, and August, 1921. *Summary of Proceedings and Documents.*)

India's case would be presented with the greatest possible force. The representatives of South Africa were unable to accept the resolution "in view of the exceptional circumstances of the greater part of the Union." It was also informally agreed that a deputation from India should visit Canada, New Zealand, and Australia to consult with the Governments of these dominions with a view to giving effect to the resolution of the conference.

In South Africa in 1921 there were 161,000 Indian residents, of whom 141,000 were in Natal, 13,000 in the Transvaal, and 6,500 in the Cape Province. The number in the Orange River Colony, which excluded Asiatics at an early period, was about one hundred and no difficulties arise there. The same may be said of the Province of the Cape of Good Hope where Cecil Rhodes' policy of "equal rights for every civilized man" prevails. In the Transvaal Indians are politically helpless.¹ The Dutch aim is revealed by the language of the Grondwet of 1883, "that there shall be no equality between the white and the non-white." A thoughtful writer described it thus:²

The cumulative testimony of anti-Asiatic legislation makes it difficult to resist the inference that economic differences alone do not account for this persistent hostility. . . A little reflection will reveal that the historical circumstances of this region have a sinister peculiarity. The memories of a struggle for existence, accompanied by all the brutalities of uncivilized warfare, have left a lasting legacy of hatred and fear. Those who are familiar with the early history of Dutch colonisation in South Africa will find it easy to understand this attitude. Re-inforced by the fear of economic competition, the prejudice against non-white peoples becomes hard and tenacious.

In the Province of the Cape of Good Hope and in the Transvaal the Indians are petty traders, except in a few cases in the larger towns where they carry on wholesale business; in Natal they are almost entirely indentured laborers or the descendants of such, and are engaged in gardening or small-scale farming. In Natal, where Indians possess the municipal franchise, their position was assailed in 1920 by a commission appointed to inquire into the question of Asiatics trading and holding land in the several provinces of South Africa. Sir Benjamin Robertson, an experienced officer, put the Indian case before the commission. The commission declined to recommend compulsory segregation, but favored the retention of a law prohibiting Asiatics from owning land in the Transvaal. It believed that in future Natal Indians should not be allowed to

¹"India" in 1922-23, p. 5.

²*Indian Emigration*, p. 117.

acquire land in the upland region of Natal. The spokesman of the Natal Agricultural Union held that "the Indians who are already beginning to invade the highlands may one day swamp the European element there." The Union Government, however, rejected this recommendation. Two ordinances introduced shortly afterwards in Natal, and likely to endanger further the position of Indians, were vetoed by His Excellency the Governor General of South Africa. In March, 1922, feeling in India was so stirred that a deputation of members of the Council of State, the Legislative Assembly, and the Imperial Indian Citizenship Association of Bombay, together with delegates of the Transvaal British Indian Association and of the Natal Indian Congress, waited upon His Excellency the Viceroy of India (Lord Reading), who said:¹

I note with pleasure your statement that the domiciled Indian community in South Africa desire to progress in education and are determined to prove themselves in all respects as deserving as the Europeans of the full rights and responsibilities of citizenship. This, I am confident, is a true avenue of advance. The British citizen, in whatever part of the world he may be, has a strong sense of fair play; and I feel sure that when he finds his Indian fellow-citizens in the Union steadfastly proving themselves by their conduct useful and loyal members of the body politic, he will not persist in withholding from them the status which they justly claim. I am glad that you recognise that it is to the Union Government that Indians must look for the redress of their grievances. While we are determined to do whatever lies in our power to forward the reasonable aspirations of Indians domiciled in the self-governing Dominions, and to press constantly and consistently for the recognition and application of the broad principles of equal citizenship for which we contend, we are sure that you will agree that we must respect the principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of the self-governing Dominions, and that any interference which might seem to infringe this principle would not be conducive to the good of the Indian community.

Period from 1922 to 1927

The latest period is one of execution. The policy framed in the previous period has been or is being carried into operation. Thus, following a resolution of the Imperial Conference, a deputation visited the dominions other than South Africa in 1922. After the meeting of the Imperial Conference of 1923 a Colonies Committee met in London in 1924 and consulted with the Imperial Government especially in regard to Indians in East Africa. The control of emigration of unskilled labor and its complete stoppage, except to

¹"India" in 1922-23, p. 6 ff.

Ceylon and Malaya, and the difficult but satisfactory negotiations with the Government of the Union of South Africa are, perhaps, the main features of this period.

In May, 1922, the Rt. Hon. Srinivasa Sastri, accompanied by Mr. G. S. Bajpai as private secretary, left for Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, after the Dominion Governments had officially endorsed the proposal of the Imperial Conference that as soon as possible after the termination of the Imperial Conference of 1921 a deputation should visit the governments of the dominions concerned to give effect to the resolution recognizing the rights of Indians lawfully domiciled there. Mr. Sastri, in addition to his primary duty of implementing the resolution, was instructed generally to examine any other disabilities of Indians in the three dominions and to ask the authorities to remove them.

In Australia he found the disabilities small and unimportant. An Indian cannot be an elector for the Senate or the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth unless he has the vote in his state for the House of Parliament of that state. In Western Australia and Queensland Indians are disqualified, owing to the fact that in the former they can not be registered as electors for the Legislative Assembly while in Queensland they are disqualified from membership in the Legislative Assembly and from voting at Assembly elections. Like other Asiatics, they are disqualified in the Commonwealth from obtaining leases of land in certain irrigated and reclaimed areas. In regard to employment and occupation they are under some disadvantages; *e. g.* bounties paid under the Bounties Act can be paid only for goods grown or produced by white labor, while in Queensland certain acts prohibit the employment in some occupations of persons who have not passed an educational test which in practice excludes Asiatics. There are also some disabilities about invalid and old-age pensions and in the administration of passports. The Commonwealth and Western Australia Governments promised sympathetic consideration regarding the franchise, while Queensland awaited the lead of the Commonwealth Government. In South Australia the Government decided to remove the only disability from which the Indians suffer in that state by amending its Irrigation and Reclaimed Lands Act. The Commonwealth Government has given an assurance that steps will be taken to enable Indians in Australia to participate in old-age pensions equally with other citizens. In regard to passports, Mr. Sastri thought that local governments in India should see that the

Australian requirements are complied with by persons proceeding to Australia.

In New Zealand there are no disabilities, except in regard to old-age pensions, and the New Zealand Government has promised to give sympathetic consideration to Indian representations when the act is revised. Mr. Sastri's negotiations in regard to passports were successful. The limitation on the number of passports to be issued by the Government of India annually in accordance with the New Zealand Immigration Restriction (Amendment) Act of 1921 was withdrawn, and the Government of New Zealand agreed that such permits will in every necessary case be extended to enable the visitor to complete the purpose of his visit. The New Zealand Government also agreed to amend the regulations providing that Indians lawfully resident in New Zealand can leave the country only for four years without loss of domicile, if it is found that the time fixed can be safely extended with due regard to the prevention of fraudulent use of the old certificate.

In Canada the Prime Minister said, that in regard to the federal franchise for such Indians as do not possess it, Parliament would be requested to give Dominion Parliamentary franchise to Indians in Canada on terms and conditions identical with Canadian citizens generally. Regarding the provincial and municipal franchise in British Columbia, Mr. Sastri found difficulties on account of the economic rivalry between the white and the non-white races, "in which, while Indians do not share to any appreciable extent; popular prejudice is deeply involved." The Government of Canada promised to look into grievances, such as the difficulty of education for children, and also to administer with sympathy the rule regarding the entry of wives and children of resident Indians under the Reciprocity Agreement of 1918.

The increased sensitiveness—a sensitiveness that is thoroughly understandable and justifiable—of Indian opinion regarding the emigration of labor, either skilled or unskilled, is seen in the attitude taken by the Government of India and the Legislature in regard to emigration to Mauritius, British Guiana and Fiji, and also in regard to affairs in East Africa. Coolieism has impaired India's national dignity in the eyes of the world. The unskilled laborer or coolie has been taken as representative of the entire population. For this reason, if for no other, the whole question of emigration requires careful control. The Government of India in its Notification No. 282 of March 22, 1923 (Emigration), in exercise of the powers

conferred by Section 10 of the Indian Emigration Act of 1922 (VII of 1922), laid down the conditions under which emigration to Mauritius for the purpose of unskilled labor would be lawful for a year. In April, 1924, the Government of Mauritius requested that this arrangement might be continued for a further period of one year, but the Government of India, in consultation with the Standing Committee on Emigration, decided that a local investigation should first be undertaken by one of its own officers. This officer reported that unskilled labor should not be sent from India to Mauritius in the immediate or near future.¹ It should be allowed only if Indian interests required it and if Indian opinion in Mauritius favored it. He recommended, among other things, better housing accommodations for laborers on estates, better medical aid in estate hospitals, the prohibition of child-labor in factories, and the introduction of a workman's compensation act.

A deputation from British Guiana arrived in India in 1924 to discuss the conditions under which emigration to that colony might be resumed. The Standing Emigration Committee of the Legislature suggested that an officer should be deputed to report, and in 1925 his report was published.² The investigations of this officer dealt with (1) the provision of suitable land for prospective settlers and existing immigrants, of financial assistance for agricultural development and of measures for improving sanitation (drainage and water supply); (2) repatriation; (3) the political and economic status of Indians since the Indian deputation had visited the colony in 1922; and (4) the sentiments of Hindu residents in regard to the cremation of the dead. He reported:

Education and medical facilities in British Guiana are superior to those in rural India. There are no caste restrictions or *purdah*, and the colonial Indian, man and woman, has a somewhat higher standard of living and is certainly more independent than his confrère in India. There are no political or economic inequalities such as exist, for instance, in South Africa, no segregation, and no restrictions on the acquisition of land.

Emigration to British Guiana on terms approved by the Standing Emigration Committee has not yet (1927) been renewed.

It is, however, in Fiji and the East African territories, so far as Crown colonies and mandated territories are concerned, that the interests of Indian emigrants have been called into question. In

¹Kunwar Maharaj Singh, *Report on his deputation to Mauritius*. P. 40.

²*Idem*. *Report on his deputation to British Guiana*.

1922 a deputation left India for Fiji to inquire locally whether these colonies were suitable for Indian settlement. The report submitted by the deputation is still under consideration. Indians in Fiji long have been dissatisfied. They have asked for better representation on the Legislative Council, for a municipal franchise based on a common electoral roll, and for a minimum wage fixed in relation to the cost of living. More recently a poll tax has been levied on all males except Fijians, and this has pressed severely on the Indian population. The Government of Fiji have, however, exempted from the tax persons having 5 dependent children under the age of 18. The Colonies Committee which assembled in London in 1924, interviewed the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the officials of the Colonial Office, and made representations affecting Indians in Fiji as well as in Kenya and the Mandated Territory of Tanganyika. Pending the settlement of the case, emigration of unskilled labor to Fiji is prohibited.

Indian sentiment, both in India and in Kenya, was much stirred by the legal discriminations against Indians in Kenya. The transfer to Indians of agricultural lands in the highlands of the colony was forbidden. The representation of the Indian population on the Legislative Council was inadequate, and it was proposed to restrict emigration. This was all the more galling because, as Winston Churchill wrote:¹

It was the Sikh soldier who bore an honorable part in the conquest and pacification of these East African countries. It is the Indian trader, who, penetrating and maintaining himself in all sorts of places to which no white man would go or in which no white man could earn a living, has more than anyone else developed the early beginnings of trade and opened up the first slender means of communication. It was by Indian labour that the one vital railway on which everything else depends was constructed. It is the Indian banker who supplies perhaps the larger part of the capital yet available for business and enterprise, and to whom the white settlers have not hesitated to repair for financial aid. The Indian was here [in Kenya] long before the first British official. He may point to as many generations of useful industry on the coast and inland as the white settlers, especially the most recently arrived contingents from South Africa (the loudest against him of all), can count years of residence. Is it possible for any Government with a scrap of respect for honest dealing between man and man, to embark upon a policy of deliberately squeezing out the native of India from regions in which he has established himself under every security of public faith?

¹W. Churchill, *My African Journey*, p. 49 f. Quoted by Mr. N. M. Samarth before the Indian Legislative Assembly.

Early in 1923 the Colonial Office in London discussed the terms of a settlement, and the Government of India put the case on behalf of India in the strongest possible manner. The White Paper of 1923 laid down that: (1) the interests of the African populations must be paramount; (2) the existing system of government was best calculated to achieve this aim and that the immediate grant of responsible government, which had been urged by the white settlers, was out of the question; (3) there was to be communal representation, under which the Indian community was to have five selected representatives; (4) in deference to Indian opinion the policy of segregation of Asiatics was abandoned, while the reservation of the highlands for Europeans was maintained; and (5) in regard to immigration, legislation discriminating against the entry of Indians into Kenya could not be countenanced, but some further control to protect African economic interests was needed. These decisions raised a storm of resentment. The Government of India continued to press their views through the constitutional channel open to them as a result of the Imperial Conferences of 1921 and 1923. The premiers of the four dominions other than South Africa, expressed their sympathy with Indian feelings and their desire to remove the disabilities of Indians resident within their borders. The Secretary of State for the Colonies accepted the suggestion that there should be full consultation and discussion between the Colonial Office and the Colonies Committee (see pp. 602 and 606) which was appointed by the Government of India, to examine all questions affecting British Indians domiciled in British colonies, protectorates and mandated territories.

The result of these representations was announced by Mr. Thomas in the House of Commons on August 7, 1924. On decisions (1), (2), (3), and (4), above, no change was announced. As to (5) no ordinance was to be enacted, although the Secretary of State for the Colonies reserved the right to enact an ordinance at any time, should native interests appear to be threatened by an influx of immigrants from abroad. His Majesty's Government proposed to set apart an area in the lowlands of Kenya for the immigrants from India and advised that an officer with special knowledge of Indian settlers should be sent to report on the areas offered for colonization. The Government of India has thought it inadvisable to proceed any further with this idea. The Colonies Committee's work did much to allay bitterness among the settlers in Kenya, and the Indian community abandoned non-coöperation and selected 5

members for nomination by the Governor to the Legislative Council. But the Kenya decision cannot be accepted by India as final.

The attitude taken toward Indians in Kenya was found also in certain other parts of East Africa. Trouble arose in 1923 between the Indian population of Tanganyika and the government or administration of that territory. Among mandated territories of His Majesty's government Tanganyika has the largest Indian population, and Indian interests there are important. In 1923 three ordinances were published, imposing taxes and prescribing rules for the keeping of accounts to facilitate collection. A deputation was sent by Indians in Tanganyika to the Colonial Office to draw attention to the defects of the legislation. The provision for a yearly renewal of trade licenses would put traders at the mercy of the executive. The difficulty of keeping accounts only in English, Swahili, and French was shown, and it was suggested that Gujarati be included in the list of permitted languages. The Government of India made separate representations to the India Office. The Colonial Office gave an assurance that trading licenses would be renewed as a matter of course, and by raising the limit of taxable income the small Indian trader would be relieved of the obligation to keep accounts. The true solution, as it appears to the Indian community, is to include Gujarati in the list of languages in which accounts may be kept. In 1924 a resolution was carried in the Indian Legislative Assembly that at the next Assembly of the League of Nations India's representatives should be instructed to ventilate this grievance. The Government of India indicated that it preferred to negotiate patiently with the India Office, and the Colonies Committee also took up the matter. The Governor of Tanganyika Territory appointed a committee to investigate the question of trade licenses and the possibility of raising by alternative taxation the revenue from the profits tax. Both European and Indian trading communities were represented on the committee. The provision regarding accounts has not taken effect. The position of Indians in mandated territories was discussed during the consideration of a motion by Mr. K. C. Roy for the adjournment of the Indian Legislative Assembly on August 18, 1927, to discuss the question of the appointment of the Royal Commission on East Africa, its terms of reference, and its personnel. The resolution was adopted, and the Government of India promised to do everything possible to insure the adequate representation of India by Indians on the Royal Commission on East Africa. A deputation, consisting mainly

of members of the Central Legislature, waited on the Viceroy of India on September 17 and expressed concern at the publication of the Feetham Report, which recommended drastic curtailment of Indian representation on municipal councils in Kenya. The deputation requested Lord Irwin to insure that Indians were appointed members of the Royal Commission which had recently been designated to enquire into conditions in East Africa. The Viceroy replied that the Government felt not less deeply than the deputation, and was both anxious and determined to uphold the status and honor of Indian communities in East Africa.

This is another instance showing that the treatment of Indians overseas is at present a very real issue in the eyes of educated Indian opinion. Anything which is regarded as an aspersion upon India's dignity is much resented and affects the course of domestic politics to a large degree. Speaking at the Imperial Conference of 1923 Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru said:¹

Really and truly, I am fighting the cause of my country, and the premiers of the various dominions, who have in their day fought the cause of their country, will not object if I fight the cause of mine. But I do fight, let me tell you frankly, as a subject of King George, and I fight for a place in his household, and I will not be content with a place in his stables. . . Do not forget that my country, India, is the one country which makes the British Empire truly Imperial. I take pride in that. . . I do not indulge, in the slightest degree, in reflection upon the dignity or honor or position of any of the dominions, but I do claim that it is my country which makes the British Empire truly Imperial. One-fifth of the human race, with a far more ancient civilization than your own, to which eloquent reference has been made by Lord Peel, joins with you in acknowledging the suzerainty of our common throne. That allegiance with us is a living thing. Shake that allegiance, and you shake the foundations of the entire fabric, with consequences which it is difficult to overestimate.

One of the brightest pages in the interesting history of this period is the working of the Indian Emigration Act of 1922 in regard to unskilled labor. The Government of India has been able to secure, after negotiations with the Government of Ceylon, a scale of standard minimum wages, the payment of full and regular earnings within a reasonable time after they are due, the improvement of medical and sanitary arrangements, increased facilities for the proper education of children, the prohibition of the employment of children under 10 years of age, and the provision by law for the

¹*Proc. Imp. Confer.* 1923, p. 10 f.

issue of rice of a prescribed quality at a prescribed rate.¹ The emigrant may be recruited by a person licensed for the purpose and responsible to the Emigration Commissioner, or, if he applies direct at a depot for an assisted passage, by the Emigration Commissioner himself. The emigrant shall not enter into a contract of service for a period exceeding one month, and no part of the cost of his recruitment, transport, or subsistence during transport shall be recoverable from him. Within one year of his arrival he can return to India, on satisfying the Agent, on account of ill health, of the unsuitability of the work, unjust treatment, or any other sufficient reason, his repatriation being free of cost to him.² Most of the Indian labor since 1842 has been absorbed, originally for coffee raising and after 1880 for tea and rubber. In the last few years there has been a decrease in the number of emigrants to Ceylon. "The gradual decrease seems to bear out the opinion of the Agent to the Government of India in Ceylon that Ceylon is slowly reaching saturation point in absorbing Indian labour on the estates."³

The regulations for Malaya are similar to those for Ceylon.⁴ In Malaya the voluntary system of recruiting is gaining in popularity. Laborers wishing to go to Malaya independently of the *kangani*, or recruiter, appear at the nearest emigrant depot. If they are *bona fide* laborers they are sent by the Emigration Commissioner to Malaya at the cost of the Indian Immigration Fund. They are at liberty, on discharge at the port of destination, to go to any place of employment and they receive free railway tickets before they leave the immigration depot. The usual system is the *kangani* system, by which a few selected laborers are sent to India as *kanganis* by estate managers and other employers of labor who want laborers. Each *kangani* can recruit 20 adult laborers. The recruited laborers are assisted to emigrate to Malaya from the Indian Immigration Fund. The conditions of work in Malaya are similar to those in Ceylon. For example, under the Labor Code, a laborer may not be required to work for more than 9 hours a day, nor may he be asked to work for more than 6 hours continuously. Overtime is paid at the rate of one and a half times the usual rate. According to the Agent of the Government of India in British Malaya:⁵

¹Press Note, Department of Education, Health, and Lands, September 27, 1926. Cf. *Report on the Working of the Indian Emigration Act of 1922, during 1926*, p. 9 f.

²*Government of India Notification No. 186, 1923.*

³*Government of Madras Resolution No. 1161, 1927.*

⁴*Government of India Notification No. 137, 1923.*

⁵*Annual Report for 1925.*

The wages paid to Indian labourers are generally very much lower than the rates paid to the Chinese and other labourers. Indian labourers are in great demand in rubber estates by reason of the fact that they are most docile and amenable to discipline and are very cheap. There has been, however, quite recently an awakening among Indian labourers, and they have begun to demand higher wages. Chinese labourers are not so easily manageable, though it must be said to their credit that they are assiduous and hardworking and need less supervision than Indian labourers. But the Chinese have a reputation for wounding rubber trees in their desire to obtain more latex. The Chinese labourers invariably demand higher wages.

The most important events of the period 1922-27 are those relating to South Africa, where patient statesmanship on the part of the Union Government and the Government of India resulted in an agreement in 1927 which has been satisfactory to both parties. In 1923 a Natal ordinance dealing with the township franchise to the detriment of the Indian community was again held up by the Union Government. In the same year the Union Government itself introduced the "Class Areas Bill," which would have made it possible to segregate Indians compulsorily in urban areas. The bill lapsed in April, 1924, with the dissolution of the South African Assembly. In December, 1924, the Governor General gave his consent to the Natal Boroughs Ordinance, which safeguarded the rights of Indians already on the roll of boroughs, but prevented further enrollment of Indians as burgesses, which would hit the future of Indians trading and working in South Africa. In January, 1925, the Union Government decided to amend the Mines and Works Act in order to make it possible to refuse certificates of proficiency to natives or Asiatics in certain occupations. In June of the same year the Senate rejected this piece of legislation, but in the following month further anti-Asiatic legislation in the form of the "Areas Reservation and Immigration and Registration (Further Provision) Bill" was introduced into the Union Parliament. This would have prevented the acquisition of land by Asiatics, save in certain specified areas. The Government of India in August, 1925, made representations to the Union Government regarding the proposed Natal ordinance to consolidate and amend the law relating to townships, an ordinance that would have disfranchised Indians already on the electoral roll. The Government of India was informed that the proposed ordinance was standing over until next year, and that steps would be taken at safeguard Indian voters already on the roll. In September, 1925, assent was given to the "Transvaal General

Dealers (Control) Ordinance," which regulates, controls, and restricts the future granting of licenses to Asiatics. Under this ordinance an appeal is permitted to the Supreme Court of South Africa. Early in 1925 the Government of India suggested a conference between their representatives and representatives of the Union Government to formulate an Indian policy in South Africa. The Union Government found some difficulty in agreeing and preferred to bring forward their own proposals in the form of the "Areas Reservation Bill." They agreed that India should send a deputation to South Africa to inquire into the general position of resident Indians. Mr. Paddison left India in November, 1925, and his first report reached India in January, 1926. This encouraged the Government of India to renew their suggestion for a round table conference or for a fresh enquiry before the legislation was carried further. The Union Government was unable to accept either suggestion, but offered to refer the Areas Reservation Bill to select committee before the second reading instead of after it. The Government of India accepted this, and its deputation arrived in March, 1926, to present the Indian case on broad grounds. The Indian Government again renewed the request for a Round Table Conference, and the reply of the Union Government was favorable. On April 23, 1926, the announcement simultaneously was made in both countries that the conference would take place, but that public opinion in South Africa "will not view with favor any settlement which does not hold out a reasonable prospect of safeguarding the maintenance of a Western standard of life by just and legitimate means." The Union Government, in order to insure that the conference should meet under best auspices, decided not to proceed further with the Areas Reservation and Immigration and Registration (further Provision) Bill until the results of the conference were available.¹

The results of this conference were, on the whole, most satisfactory and may be considered under four heads: (1) A scheme of assisted emigration; (2) Entry of wives and minor children; (3) Uplift of the Indian community in South Africa; (4) The appointment of an agent.

The following is a summary of the conclusions reached.

(1) The scheme of assisted emigration or repatriation to India provides that any Indian of 16 years of age or over may avail himself

¹See *Correspondence between the Government of India and the Government of the Union of South Africa regarding the position of Indians in South Africa, 1926.*

of it and that in the case of a family the decision of the father will bind the wife and children under 16 years of age. Each person 16 years old or over will receive a bonus of £20 and each child under that age a bonus of £10. Free passages to India and free railway fares to the port of embarkation and from the port of landing in India to the destination inland in India are also provided. Arrangements have been made to meet in India the emigrants leaving the Union. Any assisted emigrant wishing to return to the Union will be allowed to do so within three years from the date of departure from South Africa.

(2) To give effect to paragraph 3 of the Reciprocity Resolution of the Imperial Conference of 1918, which intended that an Indian should be enabled to live a happy family life in the country in which he is domiciled, the entry of wives and children is governed by certain principles accepted by both parties.

(3) The conclusions for the uplift of the Indian community in South Africa may be grouped under four heads:

(A) The Union Government firmly believes in and adheres to the principle that it is the duty of every civilized government to devise ways and means and to take all possible steps for the uplifting of every section of their permanent population to the full extent of their capacity and opportunities, and accepts the view that in the provision of educational and other facilities the considerable number of Indians who remain part of the permanent population should not be allowed to lag behind other sections of the people

(B) It is difficult for the Union Government to take action which is considerably in advance of public opinion, or to ignore difficulties arising out of the constitutional system of the Union under which the functions of government are distributed between the central executive and the provincial and minor local authorities. But the Union Government is willing:

- (a) in view of the admittedly grave situation in respect to Indian education in Natal, to advise the provincial administration to appoint a provincial commission of enquiry and to obtain the assistance of an educational expert from the Government of India for the purpose of such enquiry;
- (b) to consider sympathetically the question of improving facilities for higher education by providing suitable hostel accommodations at the South African Native College at Fort Hare and otherwise improving the attractiveness of the institution for Indians;
- (c) to take special steps under the Public Health Act for an investigation into sanitary and housing conditions in and around Durban, which will include the question of (i) the appointment of advisory committees of representative In-

dians; and (ii) the limitation of the sale of municipal land subject to restrictive conditions.

(C) The principle underlying the Industrial Conciliation Act (No. 11 of 1924) and the Wages Act (No. 27 of 1925), which enables all employees including Indians to take their places on the basis of equal pay for equal work, will be adhered to.

(D) When the time for the revision of the existing trade licensing arrives, the Union Government will give all due consideration to the suggestions made by the Government of India delegation that the discretionary powers of local authorities might reasonably be limited in the following ways:

- (a) The grounds on which a license may be refused should be laid down by statute.
- (b) The reasons for which a license is refused should be recorded.
- (c) There should be a right of appeal in cases of first applications and transfers, as well as in cases of renewals, to the courts or to some other impartial tribunal.

(4) The last arrangement, important as a step towards the education of public opinion, was the appointment of an Agent. "If the Government of the Union of South Africa makes representations to the Government of India to appoint an Agent in the Union in order to secure continuous and effective coöperation between the two governments, the Government of India will be willing to consider such a request."

Mr. C. F. Andrews, who for his services in Africa on behalf of Indians was presented on August 23, 1927, with an address by the Bombay Municipal Corporation, said that three things badly wanted saying in regard to Indians in Africa. In the first place, they should live in Africa a more settled family life, and not occupy a mere business home in Africa and a family home in Bombay. They must have their wives and children with them in Africa. Secondly, he urged that the money which is being earned by Indians in Africa should be spent in Africa in order to build up the new life of the country. He instanced the Parsee Rustomjee Library in Durban, the Alladina Visram High School of Mombasa, and recently the beginning actually made for a chair of Oriental studies in Capetown University, owing to the founding of the chair by Hajee Suleman Shah Muhammed of the Memon community of Kathiawar. Thirdly, he urged the Indian community in Africa to foster in themselves and in their children a more wholehearted patriotism for their

adopted country. Only as they became good South Africans or East Africans would they win their way to the affection both of the European settlers in Africa and of the Africans themselves, for a wave of patriotism is passing over Africa just as it is passing over India, and only those who cherish that patriotism are now acceptable and accepted.

Since the agreement was reached between the countries, the legislation hitherto proposed by the Union Government has been dropped and emigrants are now returning from South Africa to their native land. This will be susceptible of statistical appraisal in succeeding years. The great and complex problem in South Africa has been assisted to a very large degree in its solution at the moment by the action of the Government of India in selecting the Rt. Hon. Srinivasa Sastri, P. C., as its first Agent. As an ambassador of India, he is coming into close touch with South African problems which in the past have called for the exercise of the greatest skill and ingenuity.

(Since the preceding account was written there has been a greater appreciation of and a greater sympathy with India's point of view in the various parts of the British Empire where Indians are found. In India itself the question has become a political one of high importance and affairs in South Africa, Central Africa and East Africa have received much attention. In South Africa the settlement is a very great step forward in a complicated problem. On the ratification of the Agreement the Union Government introduced legislation to give effect to their promises and lost no time in moving the Provincial Administration of Natal (where the majority of Indians reside) to take the necessary steps with regard to the education of the domiciled Indian community. The friendly spirit of the Union Government was further illustrated when in 1927 the Minister in charge of the Liquor Bill withdrew Clause 104 which purported to prevent the employment of Indians on licensed premises such as hotels, clubs, and breweries. This would have affected 3000 Indians engaged in these occupations. The Commission to investigate the possibility of securing more effective coöperation between the governments of Eastern African and Central African Dependencies has published its Report and this has once more brought the question of Indians in Kenya to public notice. Racial appeasement in colonies to which East Indians have gone has on the whole been uninterrupted. In Kenya there has

been some excitement over the Government's raising funds from Indians by a poll tax and from Europeans by a tax on domestic servants in their employ to pay the net cost of European and Indian education. But the proposal was modified so that both communities should pay the same form of tax—an adult poll tax of 30 shillings for Europeans and 20 shillings for Indians. Some excitement also was caused by the report of a local Government Commission which recommended a European elected majority at Nairobi and Mombasa in local bodies. Four out of five Indians on the Legislative Council withdrew in protest and the Government of India made representations to the Secretary of State. In Ceylon and Malaya negotiations have proceeded successfully in regard to the fixation of a standard wage for Indian estate laborers in Ceylon and Malaya. In Canada domiciled Indians enjoy the federal franchise in eight out of the nine provinces, and in New Zealand likewise Indians have the franchise. In Australia Indians possess both the Commonwealth franchise and the state franchise, except that in Queensland and Western Australia Indians do not vote at elections to the Lower House. By Commonwealth legislation British Indians have also been admitted to the benefits of Invalid and Old Age Pensions and Maternity allowances from which as Asiatics they were previously excluded. This legislation removes the last grievance of Indians in Australia remediable by the Federal Government. In Western Australia and Queensland they are still subject to certain disabilities of which exclusion from the state franchise is the chief.

India, 16th May, 1930.

G. F. S.)