

# Indian Opinion

ઇન્ડિયન ઓપિનિયન

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN ENGLISH AND GUJARATI

No. 30—VOL. XI.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 2ND, 1913.

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

## NATIVE WOMEN'S BRAVE STAND

IN Winburg—the oldest town in the Free State—as soon as the women heard what the Bloemfontein women had done and were doing (observes the native newspaper, *Abantu*.) they also decided to take action. A meeting was immediately called, in which it was agreed that all the passes be collected and delivered to the proper authorities with the intimation that the papers will not be wanted any longer. On Monday, June 2, all the women of the location assembled at the square and formed themselves into a procession and proceeded towards the town. On reaching the gate dividing the town and the location they stopped, and all the passes were collected from each individual, young and old, and were wrapped up in a rag and the bundle was carried onwards. Being led by three big tall women, they marched 10 by 10 through the town. The three leaders had flags of the Union Jack as an emblem of freedom and liberty. Young women and girls had sticks, whips and sjamboks. The old ladies had long broom-sticks in their hands. There was no outward demonstration; no noise, no shouting or singing—in fact, one woman in the crowd tried to sing and demonstrate, but she was quickly stopped by the others; sticks and sjamboks being instantly applied to silence the woman who dared to make noise of any sort! The procession was quiet and very impressive; so much so, that for want of a Biercoach and two black horses, it might have resembled a funeral procession. Nevertheless, the women went on bravely and resolutely, pledged never to carry the obnoxious passes again.

The same paper thus amplifies the account:—

The Town Hall was reached. A clerk appeared, and the women demanded to see the Superintendent of the Location. He was soon found, and when he appeared he said:

"Oh! you people almost frightened me. What's wrong?"

"We've brought your passes; we don't want them any more," spoke one of the leaders, showing the little bundle.

The Superintendent said: "I don't want the dirty things!"

"Where shall I put them?" asked the same woman, and then threw the bundle down at the door, whereas the Superintendent had pointed to some other direction where to put the "dirty" papers. But eventually he called a clerk or official to pick the bundle up, and commanded him to burn it at the yard yonder. The women were also standing in the yard, and so the bundle was picked up, and at a further corner a match was lit and put into the bundle. Thus, in the presence of the Superintendent and before all the women, the "dirty" passes were burnt into ashes! To an outsider it was an amusing little ceremony, but to the women it

meant much and more than the Superintendent himself realised.

The Superintendent then said the married women need not carry passes, but that all young ones must. The leaders protested against their daughters being compelled to carry passes as if they were loose girls. The Superintendent, however, took down the names of three leaders, and then made the rest file in fives so as to count them. They numbered 162. He told them to go away quietly, and promised to bring their grievances before the Town Council, and would report the result to the Location Vigilance Committee. The crowd, satisfied for the time, dispersed quietly without noise or singing or other demonstration.

The scene was a great contrast to that which I described to your readers a little while ago about the Bloemfontein women of the Waaihoek Location. At Winburg everything done was quite simple and orderly—the forming of the procession; the solemn delivery of passes by each individual; the impressiveness of the march towards the Town Hall; the gentle manner in which the "dirty" bundle was thrown down in front of the Superintendent; the short, interesting ceremony of the burning of passes; the quiet and orderly way in which the crowd dispersed—each act, one by one, showed in remarkable degree what combination can do, what great victory boldness and determination can win. One wondered how these women kept their tempers and remained orderly throughout, more especially when one remembered those wild and violent scenes of big political demonstrations by the women of England—the disorderly and unwomanlike scenes one so often witnessed in Hyde Park or Trafalgar-square, or on the Bristol Downs. There was no doubt at Winburg as to which demonstration was more ladylike in conduct and manner.

The day after I asked one of the women who had taken part as to what they would do next. She said, "We won't carry passes, and we are determined to go to Edenburg (meaning to gaol) and to reduce the Pass Law into ashes, as we did the 'dirty papers.'" This was without doubt a solemn declaration representing the united opinion of all other women, not only in Winburg, but throughout the Free State.

The A.P.O. says that thirty-four women of Bloemfontein have gone to gaol, rather than submit a day longer to the humiliation of carrying passes.

The same paper has opened a shilling fund to provide for the children.

Our readers will be glad to learn that Miss S. Schlesin was the recipient during the week of a gold medal, from the Johannesburg Shorthand Writers Association, for high speed.

Correspondence

To the Editor, INDIAN OPINION.

Sir,—Having been a scholar under Mr. Robert Hoover, the Headmaster of the Victoria Street Government Indian School, and having heard of the closing of the said School, with the eventual retirement of Mr. Hoover from the service of the Government, I take the opportunity of writing this letter, through your valuable paper, in the hope that it will catch the eyes of many of the old scholars to see with me with regard to the recognition of Mr. Hoover's services to the Indian Community in Natal. Mr. Hoover, I believe, has served as a teacher, both under the Wesleyan Indian Mission and the Government, his services extending over thirty-three years.

Will the old scholars of Mr. Hoover's school kindly communicate with the undersigned, with a view to forming a committee, so as to discuss ways and means?—Yours, etc.,

XAVIER DAVID.

C/o A. R. Michel, Esqr.,  
Field Street, Durban,  
28th July, 1913.

From the Editor's Chair

THE REGULATIONS

WE published last week an analysis of the regulations framed under the Immigration Act. The Act will be in force as from the 1st instant. Its working will depend upon the regulations and on the manner in which the officers interpret them. The latter, therefore, require to be studied somewhat carefully. There are sections which are open to objection and ought to be amended. For instance, the proof required regarding wives may lead to grave abuse of power. Too much power has been given to the officers. It may not be always possible to obtain the proof required under the regulations as to marriage or the birth date of children. And many innocent residents may be prevented from bringing in their wives and children.

The regulation that requires an appellant to have to appear before an appeal board at a place other than the Port where he has been declared prohibited, and that requires him to pay the expenses of his escort to the place of appeal, without even the prospect of a refund, although he may be successful in his appeal, is a cruel thing, and strong representations should be made for an amendment of the regulation.

The regulations give very wide powers as to the fixing of the amount of security to be found by the appellant. It is possible, under it, to make the amount so great as practically to bar the right of appeal.

Similarly for visiting passes also, the security to be deposited may be made prohibitive. Surely £10, that were required in Natal, were always found to answer the purpose.

There is, moreover, too much exacting of fees. Every pass requires a fee of £1. Thus we presume that a man, wishing to pass through Natal to the Transvaal, after he has proved his right of residence in the Transvaal, will have to pay a fee of £1 for the privilege of passing through a province which is part of the same Union as the Transvaal. The thing will be termed ridiculous if it were not painful. The Transvaal Indians may have something to say on this regulation. On a par, almost, with this is the imposition of £1 every time a certificate of identity is issued. Why such certificate should not be issued, once for all, we fail to see. The Cape and the Natal Indians should

take up this matter and make a strong appeal for oration. The amendment made in the Act as to certificates is made almost nugatory by the regulation in question.

The Senate Debate

(Concluded)

Before Senator Schreiner's amendment was put and which read as follows: On page 10, line 21, to delete paragraph (e) and to insert the following new paragraph instead thereof: "(e) Any person, born before the commencement of this Act in any part of South Africa included in the Union, or born therein after the commencement of this Act, if the parents of such persons were there domiciled at the time of his birth."

Senator STUART said he would like to point out that the amendment did not travel one whit beyond the Cape Act of 1906, as it only left the question with the courts of law should it be raised. It would still be necessary for a person to prove that he was not only born within the Union, but that he had also acquired rights. The amendment, he contended, was a just and a fair one, and which appealed to their sense of justice and, if rejected, legislation might be passed depriving them of any right they possessed.

On being put, the CHAIRMAN declared the Non-contents had it.

A division was called for with the following result:

|                   |    |
|-------------------|----|
| Non-contents..... | 19 |
| Contents.....     | 9  |

The minority was composed of Senators Fuller, Searle, Solomon, Schreiner, Weeber, Whiteside, Stanford, Tucker, Stuart, and Lance.

The amendment was, therefore, lost.

Senator WHITESIDE asked what constituted "adequate wages"? What was an "employer of repute"?

The MINISTER of the INTERIOR said that an inquiry would be instituted on the man's arrival.

Senator WHITESIDE said that the Minister was so nebulous about the matter that the words might as well be crossed out altogether.

Recognition of Marriages

On sub-section (g),

Senator SCHREINER, dealing with the question of the recognition of marriages of immigrants, said that they wanted to recognise the lawful wife, but they did not want to encourage polygamy in the Union—they could not recognise polygamous unions as proper marriage.

The sub-section referred to read as follows: (g) any person who is proved to the satisfaction of an immigration officer or, in case of an appeal, to the satisfaction of the Boards, to be the wife, or child under the age of sixteen years, of any person exempted by paragraph (f) of this section, including the wife or child of a lawful and monogamous marriage duly celebrated according to the rites of any religious faith outside the Union, and duly registered at the place of celebration, and having all the legal consequences of a lawful marriage duly celebrated within the Union, provided that the wife or the child (as the case may be) is not such person as is described in sub-section (1) (d), (e), (l), (g) or (h) of the last preceding section.

Senator SCHREINER said that in the case of a Mahomedan and a Hindu there was no official registration, although the priest might register such marriages. There was no "official registration" at the place of celebration. They could not prove that a Mahomedan marriage was "officially registered." Although there might be polygamous Mahomedan and Hindu marriages, the proportion of such marriages was exceedingly low: most of the marriages were monogamous. The hon. Senator went on to deal with the question of

"legal consequences of a lawful marriage," and said that the marriage celebrated in other countries of the world did not all have the same legal consequences as a marriage celebrated within the Union. It did not only affect Hindus, but Mahomedans, which included the Turks, and others. Let them not include in the Bill what was regarded as an insult to the marriage relations of millions of their fellow British subjects, for Great Britain was the greatest Mahomedan Power in the world. He moved as amendments in line 36, to delete the words "and duly registered," and to insert the words "lawfully recognised" instead thereof; in line 37, to delete the word "and" and to insert the word "as" instead thereof; and in lines 38 and 39, to delete the words "duly celebrated within the Union."

THE MINISTER of the INTERIOR hoped hon. Senators would bear in mind what Senator Schreiner had said regarding the origin of the clause. When they first dealt with the vexed question of rights they intended to go as far as they could. They conceded all they could; but all the concessions had not been taken as they were meant. He could not say he liked the complicated provision; but he was told that it would satisfy the people concerned. On the strength of that, he accepted the provision. He was afraid that the spirit in which the present objections were made was the spirit that, no matter what they did, it was useless. What was here sought to be done had already been met by administrative action. Whenever there was no doubt as to a man's wife, she was admitted. In regard to the special clause, he thought he could meet the hon. Senator in one respect, but not another. He would admit that there might be some doubt regarding the words "all the lawful consequences of marriages duly celebrated in the Union." To meet the case, he thought they could delete the words "duly celebrated in the Union." But in regard to polygamous marriages, they could not, in self-defence, recognise the wives of a polygamous marriage. In the Cape they had dealt with the question of the registration of Mahomedan marriages; but even though the State had given every facility for registration, the Malays refused to do so. They had gone on marrying according to their own rites without registration, despite Supreme Court judgments declaring such marriages unlawful. In civilised law there must be registration of marriage. To recognise a marriage which was not registered was against all their principles. What could be easier than for the Indians to make an honest attempt to meet the requirement of the law? They could obtain certificates from some official in India. They did not want the signature of the Viceroy. They wanted monogamous marriages, proof of which was given by registration. He moved the deletion of the words "duly celebrated in the Union." That, he thought, should meet Senator Schreiner.

Senator COL. BYRON asked for a reason for the inclusion of the words "or child." The Minister had told them that they could not admit wives unless the marriages were monogamous, lawful, and registered. But this clause went further, and provided that the marriages should be by religious ceremony. He would like an explanation.

Senator WOLMARANS said that as he understood English badly he would like to be informed what the effect of Senator Schreiner's amendment was.

The MINISTER of the INTERIOR said that the child meant a child under 16 years of age, who was supposed to be under the care of the parents. Regarding the second point raised by Senator Col. Byron, the objection was met by the first part of the section, which did not mention religious marriages.

The RIGHT HON. MINISTER explained the effect of the amendments for the benefit of Senator Wolmarans.

Senator WOLMARANS said that here they had to do with their own Union, and must they recognise marriages which might be considered as proper marriages in certain other countries. Say that in one country the drinking of a glass of wine was considered sufficient

"celebration" of a marriage, must they recognise such a marriage in the Union? He could not vote for Senator Schreiner's amendments for that reason.

Senator SCHREINER said Senator Wolmarans had quite misunderstood the position. He seemed to think that he (Senator Schreiner) meant that if there was anything, even a glass of wine drunk, that would mean legal celebration; but that was not what he meant. He meant that the marriage must be lawfully celebrated in any country. If a marriage was lawful in one country it should be regarded as lawful in this country. He could not conceive a more painfully narrow outlook on this matter of marriages than that of the Minister. The Minister said that if these people did not choose to register their marriages as was done in this country he would not allow them to come to this country. The Minister, however, did not deny that the custom in India was as he had stated. He had to protest against the re-introduction into the debate of polygamy, when it was only monogamous marriages with which they were dealing. Did the hon. Minister think he was addressing children? The Minister had told them that they need not be afraid because administratively all hard cases were met. He would tell the Minister what happened in Natal. Proceeding, the hon. Senator read the details of a case in which a Durban Indian merchant went to India and got married a few years ago. He remained with his wife in India until a month or two ago, and then the couple returned to Durban. The husband was allowed to land; but the wife was detained on board the ship, though affidavits were given the Immigration Department proving the marriage. The Immigration Officer refused to allow her to join her husband, because he said the proof was inconclusive, and despite the fact that a certificate from the English head of a big firm in India was presented. This was the kind of Immigration Officer the Minister told them they could rely upon to meet all hard cases. To obviate heavy legal expenses the Minister was telegraphed to, but he replied that he could not intervene in the absence of the papers. This was what happened when the law gave a Jack-in-office at Durban the power to make things as impossible as he could. How long was this to continue? For how long were they going to refuse admittance to a wife whose credentials were undoubted?

Senator DE VILLIERS said that he also regretted that such things happened, because no specific reference could be made in the Bill to Indians as such. Unless the Minister could make matters clear to him, he must vote for that amendment, because it was clear that marriages were not "officially registered" in every country. The drinking of wine would be a sufficient ceremony; to refer to what Senator Wolmarans had said, if the man and the woman honestly believed that by that ceremony they were being lawfully married.

Senator POWELL said the Minister seemed to think it a reply to Senator Schreiner to say that this clause was inserted at the instigation of the friends of the Indians. It was no reply, especially when they were trying to create an absurdity in their legislation. They were aware that there was no registration in India, so why suggest the absurdity of demanding proof of registration. That provision meant that not one of those people could come into this country. If that was what they meant, why not put it plainly in the Bill? For that matter, there were many marriages in England which were not registered. It was only in the thirties that the British Registration Act was passed for statistical purposes, so that it was a comparatively modern provision.

Senator BREBNER said that, whether a marriage was celebrated by Christian rites or otherwise, it was a proper, or a lawful, marriage. He would move as an amendment, in line 33, to delete all the words beginning with "including" to "Union," in line 36.

Senator CHURCHILL asked if it was not true that many marriages in Scotland were not registered, and although a proof of such marriages might be obtained, would

not such absence of registration be a bar to these people entering the Union?

Senator SCHREINER explained what the effect of his amendment was.

The MINISTER of the INTERIOR said that what was intended by Senator Schreiner was that in the immigration law they should set aside their marriage law. Regarding the hon. Senator's allegations, he would say that in the last few years over 1,700 women and children had been let in administratively. If they did not insist on safeguards, they would soon see what the resultant influx would mean. The Government did not want the affidavits of a couple of friends to say that a couple were legally married. They wanted official proof. Personally, he would like to stop the influx of Indians at once. He would like to make that clear in the Bill, but, unfortunately, he could not do it. If the Senate was going to throw open the door for the indiscriminate admittance of women, they would soon see what would happen.

Senator SCHREINER said that the Minister must be helped out, as he had evidently forgotten his law. He had talked as if they were opening the door wide to thousands of Indians, whilst they were only considering the case of those domiciled within the Union. Did the Minister say that there was registration in India? He knew there was not. The Minister had been wrong in his law as well as in his fact. He (Senator Schreiner) was not in favour of 17,000 Indian women and children coming in instead of 1,700, as the Minister had said.

Senator Colonel STANFORD thought the Bill was asking too much in regard to proof of marriage, when it was clearly shown that there was no system of registration in India which met the case. The conditions in India were far different to those in the Union. He thought that reasonable proof should be considered sufficient evidence, in view of the fact that Indian customs found no counterpart in the marriage laws of the Union.

Senator MARAIS said that if the Bill intended to prevent Indians entering the Union of South Africa, he went heart and soul with the Minister, because he did not favour another Indian coming to South Africa. He thought it would be a protection to the Indian women themselves if their marriage was properly registered, because they were under the law of the Union and properly registered marriage would safeguard their interests.

Senator Brebner's amendment was put, and declared to be negatived.

A division was called for, which resulted as follows:

|                   |    |
|-------------------|----|
| Contents.....     | 14 |
| Non-contents..... | 14 |

The Contents were as follows: Senators Searle, Stuart, Viljoen, Tucker, Fuller, Schreiner, Weeber, Churchill, De Villiers, Powell, Beukes, Byron, Stanford, and Lance.

The Non-contents were as follows: Senators Munnik, Wolmarans, Delarey, Marks, Potgieter, Brebner, Marais, Graaff, Claassens, Nel, Winter, Moor, Southey, and Krogh.

The CHAIRMAN gave his casting vote against the amendment, in order to keep the matter open.

The amendment was therefore negatived.

Senator Schreiner's amendment was then put, and the Non-contents were declared to have it.

A division was called for, which resulted as follows:

|                   |    |
|-------------------|----|
| Contents.....     | 14 |
| Non-contents..... | 14 |

The Contents were as follows: Senators Wolmarans, Munnik, Delarey, Marks, Viljoen, Brebner, Potgieter, Marais, Beukes, Graaff, Claassens, Nel, Winter, and Krogh.

The Non-contents were as follows: Senators Searle, Stuart, Tucker, Schreiner, Fuller, Weeber, De Villiers, Powell, Byron, Churchill, Southey, Stanford, Moor, and Lance.

The CHAIRMAN gave his casting vote against amendment, to keep the question open.

Clause 5 as amended was agreed to.

Senator SCHREINER withdrew his amendment clause 7, and the clause as printed was agreed to.

In clause 20,

The MINISTER of the INTERIOR moved the following amendment: On page 18, line 49, after the words "or of" to insert the words "facilitating or," and on page 18, line 50, after the words "entrance of" to insert the words "himself or."

The motion was agreed to.

The clause as amended was agreed to.

In clause 30,

The MINISTER of the INTERIOR moved, on page 24, line 41, after the word "than" to insert the words "under terms of conditional or temporary residence permitted by this Act or any other law or."

The motion was agreed to.

The clause as amended was agreed to.

In clause 31,

The MINISTER of the INTERIOR moved, on page 26, line 15, to delete the word "July" and to insert the word "August" instead thereof.

The motion was agreed to.

The clause as amended was agreed to.

The Bill was reported with amendments.

The MINISTER of the INTERIOR moved that the amendments be considered to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

The MINISTER of FINANCE moved the consideration of the following resolution received from the House of Assembly for concurrence: "This House resolves in terms of section 6 of the Exchequer and Audit Act, 1911, that it is in the public interest that the Controller and Auditor-General, Mr. Walter Edwin Gurney, be retained in that office for a period of two years after he shall have attained the age prescribed for his retirement from office."

The motion was agreed to.

Senator WOLMARANS asked why the Auditor-General should receive different treatment from other officers. He might be wrong, but that was how he regarded the matter.

Senator Colonel STANFORD said he was glad that the Government had shown their appreciation of Mr. Gurney's services, and he trusted the Senate would agree to the motion. (Hear, hear.)

Senator GRAAFF welcomed the motion, saying that Mr. Gurney had rendered great service to the country.

Senator SEARLE said that, as one who had had a good deal to do with Mr. Gurney in the old Cape House, he quite agreed with the motion, and thought that it would be difficult to fill his place. Mr. Gurney had always done excellent work.

The MINISTER of FINANCE said that, according to clause 6 of the Financial Act, the Auditor-General might retire at the age of 60 years, but his services might be retained longer if both Houses of Parliament so decided.

The motion was agreed to.

On the following day, the amendments to the Immigrants' Regulation Bill were considered.

Senator BREBNER moved his amendment to clause 5, on page 10, to delete all words from the word "including" in line 33, to the word "Union" in line 39, inclusive.

Senator SCHREINER also moved his amendments to clause 5, viz., on page 10, line 36, to delete the words "and duly registered" and to insert the words "lawfully recognised," instead thereof; and on page 10, line 37, to delete the word "and" and to insert the word "as," instead thereof.

He said that before detaining the House with arguments in support of the amendments he would like to know if the Minister of the Interior had not something to propose which would meet the case.

The MINISTER of the INTERIOR said he had a suggestion to make, which might meet the difficulty of

both the hon. Senators. He admitted that the words "duly registered" might press hardly, and create great difficulty if registration were made the standard of proof. He would suggest that the words "to the satisfaction of an Immigration Officer" be substituted. The section would then read: "No person who has proved to the satisfaction of an Immigration Officer or in case of appeal, to the satisfaction of the Board, to be the wife, or the child under the age of 16 years, of any person exempted by paragraph F of this section, including the wife or child of a lawful or monogamous marriage duly celebrated according to the rites of any religious faith outside the Union, provided that the wife or child (as the case may be) is not such a person as is described in sub-section (1), (D), (E), (F), (G), or (H), of the last preceding section."

Senator SCHREINER said he was prepared on the whole to accept the Minister's amendment, although it did not go to the length which he (Senator Schreiner) could have wished. He withdrew his amendments with leave of his seconders.

The amendments of Senator Schreiner, with the leave of the House, were accordingly withdrawn.

Senator BREBNER said that although the amendment of the Minister did not meet his case, he would withdraw his amendment, with the leave of his seconder.

The amendment of Senator Brebner, with the leave of the House, was accordingly withdrawn.

Senator MUNNIK said that before the motion was put he thought it was time someone should ask the views of the country upon this question. Concessions were being given to Indians which he was sure the public did not agree with.

Mr. PRESIDENT: We are considering the amendments. Your remarks open up the whole question.

Senator MUNNIK: I am arguing that these amendments are granting privileges to Indians, about which if a plebiscite were taken to-morrow there would be a majority in favour of passing legislation that would clear them out of the country.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. Senator is not confining his remarks to the amendments.

Senator GRAAFF (to Senator Munnik): We will hear you on the Budget. (Laughter).

Senator MUNNIK: I say we are giving concessions to Indians which the country does not approve of.

The amendment of the Minister of the Interior was agreed to.

The clause as amended was agreed to.

The MINISTER of the INTERIOR moved that standing Order No. 70 be suspended in order that the remaining stage of the said Bill may be taken at the same sitting.

The motion was agreed to.

The MINISTER of the INTERIOR moved that the Bill be read a third time.

The motion was agreed to.

The Bill was read a third time, and transmitted to the House of Assembly.

## The Immigration Act

London, July 31.—*The Times*, in a leading article to-day, says: "None can desire to add to the cares of the Union Government in the present emergency. If we call attention to the Indian immigration question it is because the situation admits of no delay. There seems no reason why a practical compromise cannot be arranged in the time which is still available. Important interests of the Union and of the Empire prevent the resumption of passive resistance.

"There are four important points in which the Indians' objection to the Act seem well based, and which are demanding immediate consideration, namely, the perpetuation of race discrimination by the endorsement of the old Free State law, the right of entry of domiciled Indians into the Cape Province, the

invalidation of the right of domicile to Indians in Natal, and recognition of Indian marriages.

"Amendments to the Act," the article proceeds, "have been pressed by three or four members of the Opposition in the Union Parliament, particularly by Mr. Schreiner, Mr. Chaplin, and Mr. Duncan. Lord Gladstone, apparently, took no steps to call the attention of the Colonial Office to the public protests of the Indians, or to ascertain whether there were points in the Bill requiring Imperial consideration. The Colonial Office has been equally apathetic. The Union Government, however, has been so reasonable that means may surely still be found for satisfying the Indian opposition to the Act. For instance, if Ministers undertake to introduce amending legislation next session the Indian leaders might allow the Act to be enforced, and not to resist it."

## Narayansamy-Nagappan Memorial

The Secretary of the Indian Women's Association advises us that the memorial for the late passive resisters, Narayansamy and Nagappan, is to take the shape of scholarships, tenable at least for four years, at the rate of £15 per year, for education in India of South Africa-born Tamil youths. The conditions attached to these scholarships are that the male scholars should be over the age of 12 years and up to or under 18 years; secondly their qualification should be tested by a Committee to be appointed by the Indian Women's Association; thirdly the scholar or scholars that might be selected by the Committee shall remain during their educational course in India under the guidance of those whom the committee may appoint, and that any independent action on the part of the scholar shall forthwith desentitle him to any payment after the exercise of such independence. The fare for the outward and return passage shall be paid out of the Memorial Fund. The scholars shall be selected out of the children of parents who are unable to find the expenses of the education in India of their children. The character of the children will be the final test. The number of scholarships will be announced in due course. Application should be made, with full particulars, to the Secretary of the Indian Women's Association, Box 6522, Johannesburg, on or before the 31st day of August next. Parents are requested to supply all the particulars available regarding the boys whose names they wish to submit as Narayansamy and Nagappan scholars.

## A Licence Appeal

A special meeting of the Durban Town Council was held in the Council Chamber last week to consider appeals in the Licensing Officer's decision in the application of Suliman Cassim for retail licence for premises at No. 110, Queen Street. Mr. Sullivan appeared on behalf of Mr. Polak at the instance of the appellant, Mr. Molyneux, the Licensing Officer, being present. His worship the Mayor, Councillor F. C. Hollander, was present, and also Councillors Riches (Deputy Mayor), Nicolson, W. G. Brown, Hatton, Mark Miller, the Rev. H. O. Hodson, Anderson, Burman, Bishop, Baumann, Nicol, and Holmes.

Mr. Sullivan, on behalf of Suliman Cassim, said that this Indian was born in Durban, and was a person of good character, who had the ability and attainments which fitted him to carry on business. Counsel was aware of the general disinclination to increasing the number of retail dealers at present in the town, and also of the disinclination to increase, especially, the number of "Arab merchants," but

the appellant did not seek to become a new competitor in the field against the small white trader, and to contribute to the cutting down of prices; he had chosen premises in a quarter of the town which was wholly given up to Indians. The premises were, moreover, suitable, and, indeed, already had been licensed to another Indian. The appellant desired only to sell second-hand clothes, and was willing to accept his licence with a proviso restricting him to that trade.

Mr. Molyneux contended that the Council would feel bound by his former decisions in similar circumstances, and would therefore uphold his present decision.

Mr. Anderson moved that the Licensing Officer's decision be upheld.

Mr. Nicol seconded, and the Council went into committee upon the matter. Finally, Mr. Anderson's motion was upheld, and the appeal was dismissed.

—*Natal Advertiser.*

## Discussion in the House of Lords

London, July 30.—In the House of Lords this evening Lord Ampthill drew attention to the fact that the Immigration Bill of the Union of South Africa would become law on Aug. 1, and he requested the Imperial Government to ask the Union Government to suspend the operation of the Bill, until it had been amended in a manner more satisfactory to the Indians in South Africa and less injurious to the British prestige in India. He urged the Government to telegraph to South Africa frankly and freely, but firmly, the conditions which would be acceptable in this matter, which was of Imperial importance.

Lord Sydenham appealed to the Union Government to treat the Indians sympathetically.

Lord Crewe said he was quite sure that General Botha, Mr. Smuts, and Mr. Fischer keenly desired to meet the Indians as far as the public opinion of South Africa would allow them. Lord Gladstone had done his best to place the Indian claims in their fullest and fairest light. Lord Crewe added that the Imperial Government considered that the balance of improvement in the position of Indians effected by this measure was such as to make it inadvisable to refuse assent to the Bill. He doubted if it was ever wise to force on a community like the white voters of South Africa, in regard to another race, a policy which they hated.

Lord Curzon said that the Indians did not claim more rights of immigration than they at present enjoyed, and were prepared to make concessions to obtain easier conditions in South Africa.—*Reuter.*

## News in Brief

The Secretary of the Shri Hindi Jigyasa Sabha writes that the meetings of the Mayville branch have been discontinued and members are requested to attend at Sydenham.

At the final sitting of the Ladysmith Revision Board, the names of M. A. Goga, E. C. Amla, E. A. Moola, M. C. Kharva and M. E. Seedat were placed on the Voters' Roll. A string of objections brought by the indefatigable Mr. Willis against 13 Indians on the roll were disallowed.

We learn that Mr. Ismail Abdurahman, son of Dr. Abdurahman, of Capetown, has again distinguished himself by gaining a First Class Honours Certificate in Gynaecology.

Reuter cables from London that a Blue book has been published, containing correspondence between the Governor-General of the Union of South Africa, Lord Gladstone, and the Imperial Government and the Immigration Bill. It consists chiefly of informative dispatches from Lord Gladstone. Mr. Harcourt telegraphed on May 8 authorising the Union Ministers, if they considered a renewed expression of the Imperial Government's views necessary, to state that the Imperial Government considered the Bill should be passed without further postponement, and that the Imperial Government was prepared to accept it as a settlement of the Indian immigration question.

Mr. Gordon Hewart, K.C., editor of *India* from 1892 to 1905, has been returned as member for Leicester in the House of Commons.

A correspondent at Port Elizabeth, under the *nom-de-plume* of "Politico Lover," calls attention to the fact that the British Indian Association of that town has not moved in connection with the Immigrants Regulation Act.

A pleasant evening was spent by the members of "The Orion," and others who were present by invitation, in the St. Aidan's Schoolroom, last Thursday week. The proposed subject of the evening, "Active Resistance *versus* Passive Resistance," was postponed and, in its place, a spontaneous exchange of views on the relative merits of (1) The ambition to win a wife, (2) The ambition to acquire land, and (3) The ambition to become rich, ensued. Refreshments were served and those present were much impressed with the potentialities of such a gathering. It is hoped to arrange for these gatherings to be held regularly, once or twice in the month.

Numerous columns of non-militant Suffragettes have been marching towards London for weeks past (says a Reuter message from London) from all parts of the country, and holding meetings *en route*. They concluded their pilgrimage with a demonstration in Hyde Park, where 100,000 assembled, flying banners inscribed: "Reason, not force." Sixty speakers addressed the multitude from a score of platforms. The crowd was orderly and sympathetic, and presented a contrast to the recent mobbing by militant Suffragettes.

The Health Committee of the Germiston Town Council recommended:—"That the resolution adopted by the Council on the 23rd January, 1913, be amended to provide that as from the 1st July, 1913, the ordinary tariff shall apply for the rendering of municipal sanitary services to residences in the Asiatic Bazaar." This was carried.

In the *New Statesman*, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb lucidly point out why there is an insistent demand for economic equality added to political equality. "What modern industrialism, generation after generation, destroys is the soul of the people. There is a moral miasma as deadly as the physical. The dwellers in the slums of our great cities with 'life on a pound a week' (and that perpetually snatched from their grasp!) find themselves embedded, whether they like it or not, in all the ugliness, the dirt and the disorder of the mean streets. It is not in material things alone that 'the destruction of the poor is their poverty.' Breathing, from infancy up, an atmosphere of morbid alcoholism and sexuality, furtive larceny and unshamed mendacity—though here and there a moral genius may survive, saddened but unscathed—the average man is morally, as well as physically, poisoned. The destitution against which we protest is thus a degradation of character, a destruction of human personality itself."