

Indian Opinion

No. 40—Vol. XXIV.

Friday, October 1st, 1926.

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

NOTES AND NEWS

THE Rev. C. F. Andrews, interviewed by Reuter at Bombay prior to his departure for South Africa, stated that he was thankful that England had wisely kept in the background and left India and South Africa to settle their own dispute. In the present state of feeling in South Africa this attitude of England would very likely help towards bringing about a settlement. He felt the necessity for India keeping the South African question as a great national issue outside the range of party politics, and at the same time to show the world that the Indians and Europeans in India were of one mind thereanent. Mr. Andrews said he considered it to be of the utmost importance to obtain accurately, and in detail, on every debateable point the trend of the mind of the Indian community in South Africa. The desire for a friendly settlement was now apparent on both sides, and that was half the battle.

Speaking at Windsorton General Smuts referred to the Indian question and intimated that the Indian Bill would be dealt with. "The Indian question is solvable. You cannot solve it for ever. The question of East and West will always crop up, and only the future will be able to tell what will be the result. But you can make arrangements and compromises, and I do feel that a settlement can be arrived at which will safeguard the rights of everyone, and that we shall not have any great trouble about this matter."

The exhaustive analysis of the Premier's Native Bills and the comment thereon has been written by General Smuts whose memorandum has the following paragraph headed "The Exclusion of Indians":

The Bill dealing with this subject provides that the political rights of Indians shall remain as at present, unaffected by the proposals embodied in the new Bills. There are 2,034 Asiatics registered as voters in the Cape Province, and 26 in Natal, none in the other two provinces. There are 20,657 coloured people registered as voters in the Cape Province, 326 in Natal and none in the other two provinces. The vast bulk of the Indian population of the Union is resident in Natal and the Transvaal, where they are without political rights, and the question arises on what principle political representation is to be given to the natives and coloured people in those provinces, but not to those Indians (about 60 to 70 per cent. of the total Indian population) who have been born there and are permanently settled there. We have to consider the new policy with open eyes and from all points of view, and with a view not only to the actual present proposals, but also their implications for the future. If the coloured people and the natives obtain political rights in the northern provinces, on what principle could we in the long run defend the exclusion of South African born Indians from such rights? Whatever we do now should be done with a full appreciation of the inevitable future consequences. It may be too late to try and retrace our steps hereafter. In this respect the present proposals raise very serious questions, especially for Natal.

A meeting of 300 natives, under the chairmanship of Keable Mote, was held at the Ficksburg location recently for the purpose of forming a branch of the I.C.U., with a view of "rescuing African democracy from the incubus of capitalistic oppression," and, finally, of establishing a commonwealth of workers, irrespective of colour or nationality. Mote, in his address, said he wanted to have a strong and intelligent membership in order to fight the segregation policy of the Government. The coloured workers, he remarked, viewed with alarm the Bill presented by the Premier to withdraw the franchise in the Cape. The natives were amazed at and objected to the proposal to eliminate the Union Jack from the flag in the Government's Flag and Nationality Bill. The speaker protested with regard to clauses 1 and 2 of the Sedition Bill and measures taken against Clements Kadalie.

In the course of a speech of thanks, says Reuter, to the Anjuman Islam which gave a garden party in honour of the Union Deputation at Poona, Mr. Beyers said: "Our country is very poor, and has not all the resources and beauties of your country. We have to work, and even though we may think of prolonging our stay, we cannot do so, as we have to return home to attend to our duties. However, when the time to return comes, we will always remember the hearty reception given the deputation."

A Reuter's message from Jamshedpur dated Sept. 26 states:—

The South African deputation en route to Calcutta arrived here this afternoon, after a pleasant journey from Madras. They were received at the station by Sir Dorab and Lady Tata, Sir Pheroze Sethna (Director of the Tata Iron and Steel Works), and other European and Indian officials of the works. Subsequently the distinguished visitors drove round the various factories in the town. After tea with the directors and tennis at the local club, the deputation was entertained at dinner by Sir Dorab and Lady Tata. The party left for Calcutta late in the night.

A Reuter's message from Calcutta dated Sept. 27 states:—

The South African Union deputation had a busy day since their arrival here this morning. They were received on the platform by the Mayor and Corporation, the Sheriff of Calcutta, Mr. Harry Lindsay, representing the Government of Bengal, Sir Devaprasad Sarvadhikary, and representatives of various public bodies, and after having luncheon with the Governor, they visited the University College of Science, where they were received by Sir P. C. Roy, and also visited the Research Institute founded by the eminent scientist, Sir Jagadis Bose. In the afternoon the visitors were entertained at tea by Mr. B. L. Mitter (Attorney-General), and at this gathering, they mixed with prominent Indians and Europeans. At night they attended a dinner given by Sir R. N. Mookerjee, a leading Indian merchant and industrialist. The guests included the Govern-

or, high European and Indian officials, and prominent non-officials.

All eyes are now turned towards London where the Imperial Conference to be held on the 19th instant is likely to discuss the various thorny problems concerning the Dominion status raised by Canada and backed up by the Irish Free State and South Africa.

The Union Government, says the *Star*, has received a cable from the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, stating that he has taken over the Canadian Government, to which Mr. Tielman Roos, Acting Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa, has replied, expressing good wishes and giving him the assurance that the Union Government wishes to co-operate right heartily with the Canadian Government.

Dr. Nanji the well-known Physician and Surgeon, has commenced practice at 144 First Avenue, Durban. Patients could consult him at the above address. No. 3371 Central is Dr. Nanji's Telephone Number.

Interesting Licensing Appeal

Sophia Bhayla v. Estcourt Licensing Officer

Judgment of Appellate Division

The following is the text of the judgment delivered by the Chief Justice Sir J. Rose Innes in the Appellate Court in the case of an appeal by Sophia Bhayla from the decision of the Supreme Court (Natal Provincial Division) which upheld the refusal of the Estcourt Licensing Officer to grant to the applicant the renewal of her baker's licence:—

The Appellant, who had for some years held a baker's and confectioner's licence from the Town Council of Estcourt, applied in December 1925 to the Local Licensing Officer for a renewal. That officer also held the positions of Town Clerk and Town Treasurer. There had been a dispute between the applicant and the Council as to the payment of water rates and she appears to have been considerably in arrear. Of these facts the Licensing Officer by reason of his multifarious activities was cognizant. He notified her, therefore, that she would have to show cause why her application should not be refused upon the ground that she was either using for her business purposes water from the Corporation mains without authority, or was obtaining it from other sources not satisfactory to the Sanitary Inspector. She appeared before him and admitted that she was using Corporation water for her bakery, but stated that there was a dispute as to the amount payable. As the result he refused her application. She appealed to the Town Council but that body upheld the Licensing Officer. The matter was then taken to the Provincial Division which refused to interfere. And special leave is now sought to appeal against that refusal.

Now the consideration of applications for trading licences and the issue of such licences, are in essence administrative matters. And such rights of appeal as exist from the decision of a licensing officer are governed by statute. An appeal lies in all cases to the local authority; and a further appeal to the Provincial Division when the appli-

cation is for the renewal of a licence. But it was held in *Durban Chamber of Commerce vs. Malcomes & Co.*, (1917 n.d. p. 557) that the decision of the Provincial Division was in all such cases final. Notwithstanding that ruling, however, we are asked by Mr. Janion to exercise our inherent right to grant leave to appeal in cases outside the special provisions of the South Africa Act, a right which we have repeatedly stated would only be exercised where it appeared that, by a disregard of the forms of legal process, or by some violation of the principles of natural justice, or otherwise, substantial and gross injustice had been done. The contention is that the Licensing Officer acted capriciously and in disregard of the principles of natural justice by not applying his mind to the merits of the application, and by refusing it on grounds which were irrelevant to the issue before him, and which showed that his decision was influenced by his own official interests. In the result, it was suggested, grave injustice had been done.

It will be observed that the alleged irregularities were the irregularities, not of the tribunal whose order it is sought to challenge, but of the Licensing Officer, upon an appeal from whose decision the finding of the Provincial Division is conclusive. The complaint against that Division is not that it acted irregularly or capriciously, but that it refused to interfere when it should have done so. A brief reference to the statutes will elucidate the position. The effect of the relevant clauses of Act 18 of 1807 may be thus stated:—

A licensing officer shall have a discretion to issue or refuse a licence the exercise of which shall not be liable to review, reversal or alteration by any Court of Law, save in the manner and by the Courts specially particularised as follows:—

- (a) An appeal shall lie in all cases from the Licensing Officer to the Town Council or Divisional Board which may direct that the Licence which is the subject of appeal be issued or cancelled; and
- (b) where the application is for a renewal an appeal may be made against the decision of the local authority to the Provincial Division or the Circuit Court, which may order that the renewal be granted or not granted, or may remit the matter for re-hearing.

So that the Superior Court, in regard to an appeal duly before it, is given the same power as the local authority. Its jurisdiction is not confined to setting aside irregular proceedings and ordering a re-hearing; it may deal directly with the application itself. The Provincial Division has decided however, that its statutory appellate jurisdiction only justifies an interference in cases where it is of opinion that the administrative discretion has not been exercised, either duly or at all; and that in dealing with appeals it should follow the rule laid down in *Shiddiack v. Union Government* (1912 A.D. p. 652). In other words, that its appellate authority enables it to do no more than it might have done without such authority. A startling result indeed. But unless we are entitled to adjudicate upon the matter it is not desirable to pronounce upon its correctness. And neither under our express or under our inherent jurisdiction are we so entitled. The statute excludes the interference of any Court save those tribunals upon whom appellate jurisdiction is expressly conferred. As was pointed out in *Durban Chamber of Commerce vs. Malcomes & Co.* the decision of the Provincial Division is invested

with finality. And that being so, we cannot destroy the quality which the legislature has seen fit to confer upon it. The real difficulty in the way of the applicant is not that the matter falls outside the provisions of section 105 of the South Africa Act, but that the decision which she challenges is a final decision. It was laid down in *Rohrs vs. New March* (1915 A.D. p. 108) that this Court was precluded from granting special leave under its inherent jurisdiction in a case where the decision complained of had by the Legislature been invested with finality. That ruling is of decisive application here. However important the matter at issue may be the Legislature has seen fit to exclude it from the consideration of any Court of Law, save the Court specified in the statute. And we cannot by granting leave assume an appellate jurisdiction which we do not possess.

The application must therefore be refused.

(Sgd) J. ROSE INNES.
Chief Justice.

Bloemfontein,
23-9-26.

New Slavery In Kenya

(BY NORMAN LEYS)

Our country is often blamed for exploiting the people of India. But whatever the wrongs we have done them, we at least never deprived them of the ownership of the soil of India.

This is what we have done to the people of Kenya, a large country in Eastern Africa. Neither any tribe nor any member of any tribe in that country has any legal right to a single acre of land.

The courts of law have decided that the natives of Kenya are merely tenants at will of the Crown. Most of the land in Kenya is impossible to cultivate because there is not enough rain. Of the parts that are capable of cultivation the Government has given at least half to Europeans.

The Landholders

The census just taken shows that there are 1,700 European landholders in the country. The land that has been left to the natives is so overcrowded that many families have only three or four acres each.

An official paper just published proves that one European got 100,000 acres to begin with. Since he got them, at least another 200,000 acres have passed through his hands or remain in them, and he has sold nearly all his original grant for a profit of more than £200,000.

The estates are of no use to their owners unless they can get the natives of the country to work for them. The Government has made them to do that. It could do so because the natives had no votes and were, in fact, powerless to resist any order the Government gave them.

It admits now that this policy of making the natives leave home to work for Europeans was unjust, and claims both that the natives have been made free to earn their living by selling what they grow at home if they prefer doing that to working for wages, and that arrangements are being made to the land that still remains to the natives to be perfectly secure to them.

False Claims

Both these claims are false. Instead of making the tribes themselves the owners of their own land, as they are in Nigeria, in British West Africa, the Government is putting each tribe's land into the

hands of a board or committee, of which one member is to be a native and the rest either officials or European employers.

So that when a native asks who the land belongs to under these new arrangements, he will find out that it belongs partly to the people who, he believes, have robbed him and partly to the receivers of the property that has been stolen from him. And in truth these boards will be just as likely to continue the robbery.

The claim that the native producer is being given an equal chance with the European planter is also untrue. For example, the Government makes those natives who prefer to live at home make their own roads and bridges. The men who are forced to do the work are not even paid for it.

But outside these reserves, in the parts where the Europeans live, these public works are paid out of the taxes. And these taxes are for the most part paid by the Africans of Kenya.

The average African man in Kenya pays 30s. in direct taxation. The richest European in Kenya pays no more—and many are very rich. So that the Africans in Kenya not only have to pay the cost of public works—that is roads, bridges, railways, official buildings of all sorts, and so on—in the parts of the country where the land belongs to Europeans, but also have to make their own roads and bridges for nothing; and if they want to avoid this unpaid work—which, of course, they all do—they can only do so by going to work for Europeans. Yet the Government claims that native agriculture gets as good a chance as plantation agriculture!

The New Slavery

In any ordinary country the poorest people have no direct taxation to pay. The workmen of this country would feel it hard if each of them on an average had to pay over in cash thirty shillings to the Government every year. What would they say if they only got fourteen shillings a month to pay it out of? That is the standard wage of a labourer in Kenya to-day.

The fact is that up to five years ago the Africans of Kenya were slaves. The slavery was of a new kind. People in this country would not have tolerated the old kind, so as the Government wanted to satisfy the landlords, it had to invent a new one. A few years ago the truth began to come out. The Colonial Office demanded reform from the Government of Kenya. Real reform, real liberty for the Africans of Kenya, would probably have meant rebellion by the European colony. So that up to now, that Government has merely made the worst of both worlds.

Kenya at present is half a slave-State and half a free-State. It cannot stay like that. It is a part of the duty of the labour Movement, and it ought to be part of the programme of the Labour Party to make it all free.—*The Daily Herald*.

Kenya's Slave Drivers

Writing on Kenya, that East African colony of aristocrats, composed chiefly of titled land-grabbers and the treeless litter of public schools, Mr. Norman Leys has this to say, in his "Land Law and Policy in Tropical Africa":—

"In no country in the world is the unskilled worker so heavily, the large landowner so lightly taxed. Natives pay most of the 20 per cent. import duties. The European pays a uniform poll-tax of a pound. An income tax has fallen through, and there is no land-tax. The average able-bodied native pays in direct taxation for himself and his relations about a quarter of his total earnings. Taxation, in fact, is so high and wages so low, and alternatives to wage-earning so completely absent,

that other means of inducing natives to accept employment have been abandoned as unnecessary."

Yet, despite the fact that the Government has poured out money on bolstering up this pack of incapables, the thing is a financial failure. The attempt to levy an income-tax had to be abandoned because the colonists had no income on which to levy; and the last several hundred Europeans who since the end of the war received land grants have had their rents remitted and been given their land for nothing, except the cost of surveying it. As Mr. Leys says:

"A few large fortunes were made, indeed, by men who bought thousands of acres for a penny or twopenne an acre from the Government, and sold it for from two to ten or more pounds an acre. And a number made fortunes during the war out of fibre growing. But now it appears that the average European landowners, in spite of artificially cheap wages, in spite of machinery imported free of duty, in spite of produce carried on the State railway at less than cost, is making no profit at all."

The fact is, of course, that these colonists do not themselves expect to work, but do expect the native to work for them; and the native, an unspoiled child of Nature, will not work for wages if he can avoid it. By every means in its power the Government has got to make him do it. It has made desertion a criminal offence. It has compelled every labourer to carry evidence of identity and proof of industry. It has co-operated with employers in fixing wages, which are now at about a halfpenny an hour—the lowest in the world. In one recent year there were over 3,000 prosecutions for desertion and other breaches of the law governing employees. And within the last twenty years the population has fallen by at least one-fifth.

—*Commentary.*

News in Brief

A Reuter's message from Calcutta states:—

More than 170 people, including women and children, were drowned in the Bay of Bengal when a squall struck and capsized a native craft. The vessel was carrying 200 passengers. A steamer later sighted the wreck and rescued 26 survivors.

An Associated Press message from Simla states:—

Mr. Lala Lajpat Rai and Sir Darcy Lindsay have been declared by the Indian branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association to proceed as delegates of the Association to Australia to attend the Empire Parliamentary Conference invited by that Dominion. Mr. Lala Lajpat Rai secured the largest number of votes, while there was a tie between Sir Darcy Lindsay and Mr. Shanmukam Chetty which was settled by drawings *los*. In case however of the inability of either of the two elected delegates to proceed to Australia, Mr. Chetty will take the vacant place.

In a recent speech at the London University, Mr. H. A. L. Fisher reviewed the present trend of events in world-politics and said: "The peace of Europe at present is the offspring of accident; we must make it the child of reason and goodwill, in which the schools have a great function to perform. It is sinister that the Chinese Republic, formerly peace-loving, is now supplied with arms for civil war, owing to the failure to ratify the Treaty of Saint Germain regulating the export of arms. When we consider the power of armament firms, the barbaric circumstances of many nations and the widespread interest in the technical arts of destruction, we cannot feel confident that better times are in store for posterity."

The Story of My Experiments With Truth

[BY M. K. GANDHI]

XVIII. Shyness—My Shield

I was elected to the Executive Committee of the Vegetarian Society, and made it a point to attend every one of its meetings, but I always felt tongue-tied. Dr. Oldfield once said to me: "You talk to me quite all right, but why is it that you never open your lips at a Committee meeting? You are a drone." I appreciated the banter. The bees are ever busy, the drone is a thorough idler. And it was not a little curious that whilst others expressed their opinion at these meetings, I sat quite silent. Not that I never felt tempted to speak. But I was at a loss to know how to express myself. All the rest of the members appeared to me to better informed than I. Then it often happened that just when I had mustered up courage to speak, a fresh subject would be started. This went on for a long time.

Meantime a serious question came up for discussion. I thought it wrong to be absent, and felt it cowardice to register a silent vote. The discussion arose somewhat in this wise. The President of the Society was Mr. Hills, proprietor of the Thames Iron Works. He was a puritan. It may be said that the existence of the Society depended almost on his financial assistance. Many members of the Committee were more or less his proteges. Dr. Allinson of vegetarian fame was also a member of the Committee. He was an advocate of the then new birth control movement, and preached its methods among the working classes. Mr. Hills regarded these methods as cutting at the root of morals. He thought that the Vegetarian Society had for its object not only dietetic, but also moral reform, and that a man of Dr. Allinson's antipuritanic views should not be allowed to remain in the Society. A motion was therefore brought for his removal. The question deeply interested me. I considered Dr. Allinson's views regarding artificial methods of birth control as dangerous, and I believed that Mr. Hills was entitled, as a puritan, to oppose him. I had also a high regard for Mr. Hills and his generosity. But I thought it was quite improper to exclude a man from a vegetarian society, simply because he refused to regard puritan morals as one of the objects of the society. Mr. Hills' view regarding the exclusion of antipuritans from the Society was personal to himself and it had nothing to do with the declared object of the Society, which was simply the promotion of vegetarianism, and not of any system of morality. I therefore held that any vegetarian could be a member of the Society irrespective of his views on other morals.

There were in the Committee others also who shared my view, but I felt myself personally called upon to express my own. How to do it was the question. I had not the courage to speak and I therefore decided to set down my thoughts in writing. I went to the meeting with the document in my pocket. So far as I recollect, I did not find myself equal even to read it, and the President had it read by some one else. Dr. Allinson lost the day. Thus in the very first battle the losing party. But I had comfort in the thought that the cause was right. I have a faint recollection that after this incident I resigned from the Committee.

This shyness I retained throughout my stay in England. Even when I paid a social call the presence of half a dozen or more people would strike me dumb.

I once went to Ventnor with Mr. Mazumdar. We stayed there with a vegetarian family. Mr. Howard, the author of "The Ethics of Diet" was also staying

at the same watering place. We met him and he invited us to speak at a meeting for the promotion of vegetarianism. I had ascertained that it was not considered incorrect to read one's speech. I know that many did so to express themselves coherently and briefly. To speak extempore would have been out of the question for me. I had therefore written down my speech. I stood up to read it, but could not. My vision became blurred and I trembled, though the speech hardly covered a sheet of foolscap. Mr. Mazumdar had to read it for me. His own speech was of course splendid and was received with applause. I was ashamed of myself and sad at heart for my incapacity.

My last effort to make a public speech in England was on the eve of my departure for home. But this time too I succeeded only in making myself ridiculous. I invited my vegetarian friends to dinner in the Holborn Restaurant referred to in these chapters. 'A vegetarian dinner could be had,' I said to myself, 'in vegetarian restaurants as a matter of course. But why should it not be possible in a non-vegetarian restaurant too?' And I arranged with the manager of the Holborn Restaurant to provide a strictly vegetarian meal. The vegetarians hailed the new experiment with delight. All dinners are meant for enjoyment, but the West has developed the thing into an art. They are celebrated with great eclat, music and speeches. And the little dinner party that I invited was also not unaccompanied by some such display. Speeches therefore there had to be. When my turn for speaking came, I stood up to make a speech. I had with great care thought out one which would consist of a very few sentences. But I could not proceed beyond the first sentence. I had read of Addison that he began his maiden speech in the House of Commons, repeating 'I conceive' three times and when he could proceed no further, a wag stood up and said, 'the gentleman conceived thrice but delivered nothing.' I had thought of making a humorous speech taking the anecdote as the text. I therefore began with it and stuck there. My memory entirely failed me and in attempting a humorous speech I made myself ridiculous. 'I thank you gentlemen for having kindly responded to my invitation,' I said abruptly, and sat down.

It was only in South Africa that I got over this shyness, though I never completely overcame it. It was impossible for me to speak *impromptu*. I hesitated whenever I had to face strange audience and avoided making a speech whenever I could. Even to-day I do not think I could or would even be inclined to keep a meeting of friends engaged by talking on nothing.

I must say that beyond occasionally exposing me to laughter, my constitutional shyness has been no disadvantage whatever. In fact I can see that on the contrary it has been all to my advantage. My hesitancy in speech which was once an annoyance is now a pleasure. Its greatest benefit has been that it has taught me the economy of words. I have naturally formed the habit of restraining my thoughts. And I can now give myself a certificate that a thoughtless word hardly ever escapes my tongue or pen. I do not recollect ever having had to regret anything in my speech or writing. I have thus been spared many a mishap and waste of time. Experience has taught me that silence is part of the spiritual discipline of a votary of truth. Proneness to exaggerate, suppress or modify the truth, wittingly or unwittingly, is a natural weakness of man, and silence is necessary in order to escape from it. A man of few words will rarely be thoughtless in his speech; he will measure every word. We find so many people impatient to talk. There is no Chairman of a meeting but is pestered with notes for permission to speak. And whenever the permission is given the speaker generally exceeds the time

limit, asks for more time, and keeps on talking without permission. All this talking can hardly be said to be of any benefit to the world. It is so much waste of time. My shyness has been in reality my shield and buckler. It has allowed me to grow. It has helped me in my discernment of truth.

NATAL INDIAN CONGRESS

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Annual General Meeting of the Natal Indian Congress will be held at the Rawat's Bio Hall, Victoria Street, Durban, on Sunday, the 10th day of October, 1926, at 2 p.m., for the transaction of the following business:—

1. Secretary's Report.
2. Treasurer's Financial Statement.
3. Revision of Rules.
4. Election of Officials.

Members are kindly requested to attend.

AMOD BAYAT,

President.

V. S. C. PATHER,

SORABJEE RUSTOMJEE,

Jt. hon. Secretaries.

P.O. Box 360,
Durban.

N.B. Members are requested to pay in their subscriptions (2s. 6d.) to enable them to take part in the meeting.

નાટાલ ઇન્ડિયન કોંગ્રેસ

વાર્ષિક બનરલ મીટિંગ

આથી જાહેર કરવામાં આવે છે નાટાલ ઇન્ડિયન કોંગ્રેસ વાર્ષિક સભા, રવિવાર તા. ૧૦મી ઓક્ટોબર ૧૯૨૬ ના બપોરે બે વાગે રાવટ બાયરકોપ હોલમાં નીચેના કામો માટે બરાબે.

૧. સેક્રટરીના રીપોર્ટ.
૨. ટ્રેઝરરનો હિસાબ.
૩. ધારામાં સુધારા વધારા.
૪. કાર્યવાહકોની ચુંટણી.

દરેક મેમ્બરને હાજર થવા મિનતી છે.

અહમદ લેખાલ,

પ્રમુખ.

વી. એસ. સી. પથર

નો. એન.

સોરાબજી રુસ્તમજી

સેક્રટરી.

પી. એ. બોક્સ ૩૬૦,
ડરબન.

તા. ૩. દરેક મેમ્બરને વિનતી કરવામાં આવે છે વાર્ષિક રી. ૨-૬ મેમ્બર શી ભરી દેવી કે નેથી સભામાં ભાગ લઈ શકાય.

"INDIAN OPINION"

Subscription Rates.

WITHIN THE UNION :

Yearly	20	0
Half-Yearly	10	6

OUTSIDE THE UNION and OVERSEAS

Yearly	20	0
Half-Yearly	10	0