

Indian Opinion

No. 24—VOL. XX. FRIDAY, JUNE 16TH, 1922.

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper
Price Fourpence

NOTES AND NEWS

SPEAKING at a civic reception to Mr. Sastri, (says Reuter, Adelaide), Mr. Gunn, the local Labour leader, said that the policy of white Australia was not founded on prejudice against Indians, but Labour felt that the breaking down of the barrier would lead to the exploitation of Indians in a similar manner as was now being done in South Africa and Java. Mr. Sastri, replying, said that he did not criticise the policy, which, in the circumstances, India accepted, but he dissented from the argument that that policy was in the interests of India or even the Empire. He was already confident of the ultimate success of the claim of equality.

Thus the *Natal Mercury* on the above:—

Truth to tell, a desire to be polite to a distinguished visitor is more conspicuous than sincerity in the Adelaide explanation of Australia's policy of excluding Asiatic immigrants, and it would have been absurd to expect Mr. Sastri to accept it at face value. A desire prompted by humanitarian motives to save the poor Indian immigrant from being "exploited" to his own disadvantage may have played a small part in removing the doubts of some Australians regarding the Imperial aspects of the "White Australia" policy; but it has certainly not played any important part in commending that policy to public opinion generally. White South Africans almost universally will sympathise with the desire of Australia for an unmixed European population; but it should be recognised at once that patently insincere gestures of politeness will not help to reconcile India to the acceptance of that policy. By all means let the public men of Australia show as much politeness as possible to their honoured guest and as much consideration as possible for the susceptibilities of Indians; but it is a poor sort of politeness to ask their guest to accept a palpably evasive explanation of their national attitude towards his nation.

In the course of an interview at Adelaide (Australia) Mr. Sastri declared himself at a loss to explain the sudden change from unrest to peace which had recently come over India. He believed there was no prospect of serious disturbance, and did not think the malcontents were planning in secret.—Reuter.

By the death of Mr. John Taylor, M.A., L.L.B., O.B.E., the Durban Town Clerk, who passed away at the Sanatorium last Wednesday after a short illness, Durban has suffered no small loss. "Though it is barely two years since he came among us," says the *Natal Mercury*, "he has played so large a part in the eventful municipal history of the intervening period that it is difficult to think of any department of municipal activity without thinking of him. He has left his mark not only upon the department which was directly in his charge but also upon the corporate life of the town in its larger aspects." The Indian community will no doubt join the other sections of the burghesses in mourning the loss of the late Town Clerk. We extend to the bereaved family our sincere sympathy as also to the Durban Municipality for the sad loss they have sustained.

A Reuter's message from Lucknow dated June 8 says:—

The Working Committee of the National Congress has rejected a proposal to start mass civil disobedience in September, and has also rejected a proposal to boycott British goods, on the ground of its unfeasibility.

There is nothing to be surprised at if a proposal to start mass civil disobedience is rejected, nor is it a sign that the movement in India is dying out. Mass civil disobedience was postponed even before when it was thought that India was not quite prepared for it. Perhaps the same consideration has postponed it again. As regards boycotting "British goods," we know of no such item in the Non-co-operators programme. Non-co-operators' programme says all *foreign cloth* should be boycotted and the cottage industry at Home should be supported in order that the starving millions in India may get food to eat and clothes to cover their bodies. We believe, therefore, that the proposal of boycotting British goods could not have come from a non-co-operator, and there is nothing wonderful if it is rejected. The *Natal Mercury* considers this a "sign of return to reason" but we would inform our contemporary, if it does not know, that neither of the above things mentioned by Reuter signify that India has retraced the step she has taken. They were new proposals and they were rejected. No right-thinking man in the world who knows the wrongs that have been done to India will say that there is anything for India to come to reason. If anyone has to come to reason it is the British Government. Any retracing on the part of India would lead to its damnation.

Since the above was in print the following Reuter's message comes from London dated June 13:—

It is reported from Lucknow that, unlike the Working Committee of the Nationalist Congress, which last week decided to reject the proposal to start "mass civil disobedience," and also a boycott of British goods, the Khilafat Committee has passed a resolution expressing the opinion that civil disobedience is unavoidable, but postponing aggressive measures until August 15. Meanwhile a sub-committee has been appointed to tour India and report regarding the advisability of again starting the civil disobedience campaign.

It is also reported that Mr. Shuaib Qureshi who succeeded Mr. Gandhi as editor of *Young India* has been arrested in connection with "seditious articles."

There is little doubt left in the minds of Indians and all right thinking men that the British authorities in India are not out to do justice by removing the cause of the unrest, but are bent upon suppressing the unrest under any circumstances. All foolish doctors do so with regard to diseases but they ultimately fail; and statesmanship which strives to suppress an evil without removing the cause thereof is no statesmanship and it is sure to fail in the case of India.

Mr. Hulett (London) in a message dated June 18th says:—

A big Khilafat meeting, presided over by Pandit Motilal Nehru, ex-President of the Congress, who was released from gaol on June 6, protested against Mr. Chamberlain's recent statement in the House of Commons in regard to the alleged Turkish atrocities, as based on "Britain's anti-Islamic policy." The meeting declared that the proposed inquiry into the atrocities would not satisfy India unless the Commission included representatives of the Indian Khilafat Committee and the Moslem independent States. It also demanded the publication of the International Commission's report in regard to "the Greek atrocities in Smyrna."

LAND ALIENATION ORDINANCE

ONLY the other day we performed the painful task of criticising the action of the Natal Provincial Council in passing the Townships Franchise Ordinance notwithstanding all the protestations by the Indian community. Now they have mshed through the "Durban Land Alienation Private Draft Ordinance" and ere one has time to breathe, the Ordinance has passed through its third reading. Some members in the House considered the Ordinance to be not racial and Mr. G. H. Hulett in moving the second reading is reported to have remarked that "the Indian community had not brought forward their objections to the measure although it had been published for over a month." If this is not deliberate falsehood perhaps Mr. Hulett will explain what it is. We do not know what his purpose was in making that statement. Was it to impress the House and the public that Indians were satisfied with the Ordinance? If that is so we are afraid it is a false impression. A mass meeting of Indians under the auspices of the Natal Indian Congress held in Durban on the 14th May, under the chairmanship of Mr. R. E. Chetty, protested, amongst other Ordinances, also against the "Durban Land Alienation Ordinance." A petition dated 3rd May, 1922, protesting against that Ordinance and praying "to be heard in person or by counsel in support of that petition, or be permitted to give evidence before a select committee" was sent by the Natal Indian Congress to the Chairman and members of the Provincial Council. But, what amazes us, however, is that while in the case of all other Ordinances the protestants were given due notice to appear before the Select Committee, in the case of the Ordinance in question, we are informed that, the Congress was notified when evidence on behalf the Council was already being led. The Congress, we understand, took exception to such procedure and rightly chose not to take part in the Select Committee. The Council, however, it would appear, took no notice, and coolly went on with their work, and finally, to attempt to right a wrong Mr. Hulett comes out with the statement quoted above. Lengthy correspondence has taken place in connection with the above matter between the Council and the Congress, which we hope to publish in due course for the information of our readers.

We, however, attach little importance to this. This is but a small injustice in comparison to the injustice done by passing wholesale measures aimed at entirely riling the Indian community in this country. The Council's attitude has proved beyond doubt that they are not going to be moved by any arguments however

sounded. They know they are doing wrong, they are out to do the wrong and they are going to do it come what may. If there had been the slightest desire to be just on the part of the Council, the Council would have adopted Captain Birn's amendment, during the committee stage, to the effect that, where any sale took place suitable land should be set apart for Asiatics or Natives. But even this they were not prepared to do. Of course, if it had been done it would, by no means, have satisfied the Indian community who are against the Ordinance which is based on racial grounds. As we have stated before, to get justice from this source is entirely hopeless. Our hopes are now only with the Union Government and His Excellency the Governor-General, the representative of H. M. the King. If no justice is to be had from there the condition will be disastrous.

NATAL PROVINCIAL COUNCIL

VOTE FOR INDIAN EDUCATION

On June the 7th when the Council went into committee on the estimates the vote for Indian Education is reported to have been subjected to the following treatment:—

Mr. W. Cox moved a reduction in the vote for Indian education to £20,000.

Colonel Retman supported the motion.

This was defeated by 13 votes to 7.

Mr. Cox said the was sure members of the House were prepared to make some reduction, and moved that it be reduced by £1,000.

The Administrator said he thought it a pity that this vote should be singled out for treatment. If the amendment was adopted it would mean that the services of some members of the staff would have to be dispensed with.

Mr. Hulett contended that the Provincial Council was not called upon to give Indians more than primary education.

Mr. Cox explained that his reason for the motion was that he was one of those who did not want Indians here, and was not afraid to say so.

Mr. A. E. Green said that they should not fight Indians hip and thigh as several measures dealing with Indians had been dealt with this session. He pointed out that it was no fault of the Natal Indians that they were born here, and that they should be fairly treated by the Provincial Administration.

Capt. Byron said a reduction of the vote for Indian education would not reduce the number of Indians in South Africa.

Mr. Cox's further amendment that the vote for Indian education be reduced by £1,000 was defeated by 15 votes to 3.

LAND ALIENATION ORDINANCE

The *Mercury* reporter reports on June 8th that Mr. G. H. Hulett moved the second reading of the Durban Lands Alienation Private Draft Ordinance, which he pointed out restricted the sale of properties in Durban by the Town Council to members of the different classes of the community, and gave power to Corporation to say that land might not be acquired by Europeans in one area, by Asiatics in another or by Natives in another. If the Bill were adopted the Council intended to restrict the occupancy certain areas by Europeans and of other areas by Indians and Natives respectively. He did not think any complaint could be made on the grounds of class legislation.

Col. Retman seconded the motion for the second reading, which was agreed to.

At the Committee stage of the Durban Lands Ali-

nation Private Draft Ordinance, Captain Byron said the Borough boundaries were involved in this question, and pointed out that the mere declaration by the Town Council of Durban that they intended to set aside a certain area for particular sections of the community was insufficient. He thought a proviso should be inserted that where any sale took place suitable land should be set apart for Asiatics or Natives, and moved an amendment to that effect.

The amendment was negatived without a division, and the Ordinance passed through Committee without any amendment.

On Wednesday the Ordinance was read the third time and passed through the Provincial Council.

RURAL LICENCES

When the House was in Committee on the Rural Licences Regulation Draft Ordinance Mr. G. H. Hulett moved an addition to Clause 4, that licences for Native and Indian eating houses should be issued by a duly constituted Licensing Board, his objection being that licensing officers in country districts issued such licences indiscriminately.

Captain Byron proposed the deletion of the whole of Clause 4, contending that the three-mile limit in respect to Native and Indian eating houses should not be reduced to one mile.

Mr. Nicolson supported the amendment.

Mr. Hollander said that when the three-mile limit was imposed it was proposed by the municipalities to cope with the illicit liquor traffic, and now industries had grown up in these districts, with the result that many Natives had to walk three miles to get a meal, and representations had been made as to the necessity for this, and no objection had been made to the proposed reduction by either the police or other authorities.

Mr. Fabey saw no necessity for the existence of eating houses, and said he considered that a good deal of trekking by Natives into town was for beer.

Mr. Hulett's amendment was adopted, but Captain Byron's amendment for the deletion of Clause 4 was negatived on a division by 8 votes to 6.

RACING AND BETTING ORDINANCE

CONGRESS STATEMENT BEFORE SELECT COMMITTEE

The following statement was submitted on behalf of the Natal Indian Congress by Messrs S. Emmamally (chairman committee), V. S. C. Pather (Hon. Treasurer), B. A. Meghraj and M. Beephasee Maharaj (members) who went to give evidence before the select committee on the above Ordinance which sat last week in Maritzburg:—

In the absence of our worthy President, Vice-Presidents and the secretaries who have had to suddenly leave for Cape Town to interview the Prime Minister and the respective Ministers in matters affecting the community we have been requested, a representative the Natal Indian Congress, which body represents the British Indian community in the Province of Natal, to humbly submit that gambling of any nature whether connected with Horse Racing or Lottery is a vice and a scourge same should not be the work of the State or Church. Our religion strongly forbids gambling of any description and we welcome the proposed Ordinance as it will make the abolition of Bucket St. and other forms of gambling which have become a curse to the poorer sections of the Indian and other communities. At the same time, we note from the sad fact that it does not entirely forbid gambling but that the Government intends allowing this vice to survive by the assistance of legalisation, hence the Indian community while approving the Draft Ordinance for the Regulation of Horse Racing and the Restriction and Regulation of Betting and to impose taxation in connection therewith, strongly but humbly protests

against the power given to a Racing Club in Sub-Section (c) of Section 7 of the said Ordinance to exclude from the Course such persons or Classes of persons as its Rules may prescribe, which power, we venture to submit may be used to exclude British Indians from the Course; and against Section 18 which restricts membership in a Betting Club Room to persons of "European descent" to the exclusion of Indians on racial grounds.

The British Indian community who are not represented in the Legislature of the Province wishes to avail itself of this opportunity given to them to appeal to your sense of fairness and justice in that it may please you not to give wide and arbitrary powers to Clubs or institutions who may draw the line on racial grounds. We humbly suggest that Sub-Section (c) of Section 7 is entirely deleted or so amended as to give us relief and that the words "European descent" in Section 18 are entirely erased.

Messrs. Shaikh Ameer, Charlie Nallich, S. R. Naidoo and L. Panday, who were included in the deputation that went to Capetown to interview the Minister of the Interior have returned last Thursday evening and were received at the Durban Station by a crowd of representative Indians. Mr. Amod Bayat is expected to come via Johannesburg. Messrs. A. Christopher and S. Rustomjee are expected to arrive on Sunday.

Indian Opinion

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

The subscription rate is 25s. od. for South Africa and 25s. 6d. for over sea.

આવક-વચન ચોખીનીઓના જ સ્વાખબને દર સાઉથ આફ્રિકાને માટે શી. ૧૫-૦ અને ઈરેન્ડાખરને માટે શી. ૧૫-૬ રાખવામાં આવ્યો છે. આ ફરકાર હાલની કમ્પાની અહલ અને ચોખરાની વધ કરવામાં આવ્યો છે.

સંસ્કૃતિ સંસ્થા

ક્રમ	પ્રીતી	દીક	વ. સનમાલ	પાત્રી	સુવીલ	કુપીલ
૧	૧૯૨૨	૨૭૮	૨૪૦	૧૯૨૧	૬-૫	૬-૫
૨	૨૩	૩૦૬	૨૪૩	૧૯૨૦	૬-૫	૬-૫
૩	૨૪	૩૧૬	૨૪૬	૧૯૧૯	૬-૫	૬-૫
૪	૨૫	૩૨૬	૨૫૬	૧૯૧૮	૬-૫	૬-૫
૫	૨૬	૩૩૬	૨૬૬	૧૯૧૭	૬-૫	૬-૫
૬	૨૭	૩૪૬	૨૭૬	૧૯૧૬	૬-૫	૬-૫
૭	૨૮	૩૫૬	૨૮૬	૧૯૧૫	૬-૫	૬-૫
૮	૨૯	૩૬૬	૨૯૬	૧૯૧૪	૬-૫	૬-૫
૯	૩૦	૩૭૬	૩૦૬	૧૯૧૩	૬-૫	૬-૫
૧૦	૩૧	૩૮૬	૩૧૬	૧૯૧૨	૬-૫	૬-૫