

DP  
2827124

# Indian Opinion

No. 26—Vol. XXII.

Friday, July 4th, 1924.

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

## NOTES AND NEWS

**R**EPRESENTATIVES of the Natal Indian Congress met Mr. Colenbrander, the Chief Magistrate of Durban, and Dr. Fernandez, the Port Medical Officer, on the question of Indians being quarantined on Indian boats on which infectious diseases occur or are suspected, and as a result of the discussion that then took place there is every possibility that a via media will be arranged bearing less hardly on Indian passengers on such boats.

Mr. Parseo Rustomjee who is under the personal care and treatment of Dr. A. H. Gool at his residence at 48 Scarle Street, Capetown, is slowly recovering from his recent serious illness. Mr. Rustomjee wishes to thank through these columns the many friends who have kindly sent messages of kindness and affection by wires and letters.

Mr. C. F. Andrews writes in the *Muslim Hostel Magazine*, on the Evolution of Liberty in Europe:—

"When we return from the picture of the History of Freedom in Europe to India at the present day, there is more to encourage us than at first sight appears. It is a common-places to speak of the Government of India as a benevolent despotism or as the bureaucracy of a single class; and in a sense, and a very important sense, such a definition is true. But it is not sufficiently realised how self-limited by its very conditions of existence that despotism is. First of all one immensely important result of the British connection has been that religious neutrality has become the settled policy of the State. That religious liberty which was only obtained in Europe through centuries of civil war; that liberty which in past centuries brought fire and sword to the north of India in a vain struggle for its maintenance, has come with a stroke of the pen along with the British occupation, and has been on the whole scrupulously observed. In a country such as India where religion forms three-fourths of practical and philosophic life of the people the value of this area of liberty, still left open, can hardly be over-estimated. Secondly, in the social sphere an area almost wholly free from governmental interference is still in the hands of Indians themselves. If it is true in England that each home is a castle, in the sense that there is no interference from without, it is true in India also. I do not forget the recent house-searches and police interference. But the very indignation they have aroused shows by itself how abnormal the conditions are. Thirdly, there are gradually coming into existence now and wider areas in which a measure of self-Government may even now be exercised. The municipal and district boards and legislative councils are, it is true, still largely officialised, but they contain within themselves the germs at least of a growing independence."

Colonel Wedgwood, the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, speaking at Swindon on March 10, said:—

We had tried to govern America too long, and the folly of George III and Lord North had cut us off from American Union. We had tried to govern Ireland too long, and a stupid and brutal war had left hatred between the races where concord and respect should have prevailed. Were we going to sacrifice our future relations with In-

dians also, through the blindness of those who would not learn from history? Thanks to the vision and understanding of another great, though hated, Liberal—Mr. Montagu—we had set India on the peaceful path towards Self-Government. The die had been cast; nothing that the old governors could do now could stop India securing some day Dominion Home Rule; all parties were pledged to it. But the relations between the two races during the testing time would influence vitally the manner and temper of the separation. We were distrusted in India. We must get into touch again. We did not want to be governors; we wanted a union of free peoples. They did not want to be governed; they wanted to develop in safety and be sure of our goodwill. It could not be beyond the wit of man to devise satisfactory assurances and friendly relations between two equally inexperienced and equally struggling democracies. But if this was to be done all men of goodwill must play their part. If Indians sneered at all English as tyrants and blood-suckers, the wolf in us would meet the wolf in them. And if English M.P.'s sneered at Indians as being cowardly and dirty in their habits, even our best friends in India might be excused a desire for Non-Cooperation.

### THE NEW CABINET

**T**IME brings many changes. General Hertzog who was yesterday in opposition is to-day in power! And there is no doubt that by the establishment with the Labour Party of the Pact, he has become the Prime Minister of South Africa. He has shown strength and discretion in the formation of his Cabinet. We wonder whether we can take the present attitude of General Hertzog as an indication that he will show like restraint and discretion in dealing with matters differentially affecting Asiatics or Natives or other non-European peoples. We have not forgotten that at a meeting he addressed in the Durban Town Hall some months ago he declared in favour of segregation of Asiatics as was being done with Natives, but in fairness to the gallant-General, it must be said that he then qualified his declaration with the provision that the Asiatic and the Native in their respective areas should have everything that the white man had in his area. The impossibility of giving effect to such a provision, then, suggested to our mind that he was not serious. There is much said from the platform especially during election times. And whoever does attach any weight to such utterances!

General Hertzog is a man with considerable experience of the world and is too good a lover of his people to bring suffering upon them. It is possible that in his idea of people, the Afrikaner, he may include all peoples born and brought up on the South African soil, who are in the first instance South Africans; no matter to what race they belong.

We appreciate the difficulties in the country and we sympathise with General Hertzog, as we did with other-

in power, who were faced with conflicting interests to reconcile, so long as we are assured that those in power are doing everything possible to adjust matters on a basis honourable to all peoples concerned.

While as Indians we are particularly interested in the attitude of the Prime Minister and in Dr. D. F. Malan who is in charge of the Ministry of Interior which particularly affects our countrymen, we are also interested in the other Ministers, whose departments in some way or other comes in contact with our countrymen, and in the Cabinet itself, for its acts with the Governor-General in matters affecting us, and we take this opportunity in congratulating General Hertzog upon his coming into power and the several Ministers of his Cabinet, in the hope that they will, remembering that our countrymen are a disenfranchised people in this country, do the big and humane thing in holding the balance of justice between them and others who as a franchised people have the power to bear upon the Government.

We can assure General Hertzog and his colleagues that our countrymen will in the future, as in the past, endeavour to co-operate with the Government in all matters affecting not only their welfare but the welfare of the country as a whole.

#### "WHAT INDIA WANTS"

The April number of the *Yale Review* contains an article by Professor P. M. Buck of Nebraska University headed "What India Wants." Professor Buck was in India for six months. He was for many weeks working in the Baroda College. He delivered a series of lectures in the Bombay University on "American Literature." He was present at the Gaya Congress. In these and other ways, he had ample opportunities of coming into contact with representative Indians and to study their view-point. Judging from the article in the *Yale Review*, it would appear that the result of Professor Buck's intercourse with Indians has not predisposed him to a favourable view either of their capacity or of their aspirations. He even seems disinclined to give them credit for sincerity. On the whole, his presentation of the Indian point of view is largely a reflection of the view held by most Anglo-Indians in this country. He seems to think that political agitation in India is almost entirely the creation of English-educated Indians who are exploiting the millions of peasants, villagers and the workers in the city who are entirely absorbed in their own daily affairs. He writes:

"With an intelligentsia stuffed with doctrinaire enthusiasms and a peasantry wavering constantly between good-natured content and economic distress, and as yet entirely untouched by political ideas, it is a bit difficult to define what India wants. The peasant wants to be let alone so far as is possible, to have decent crops and to sell in a decent market. The leaders of the National Congress wish to devote their lives to "selfless" labour for India, which at present for most of them means little more than endless speeches, interviews in the press, committee meetings, and resolutions."

We are surprised that such a cultivated observer as Professor Buck does not see that the million or two million English-educated men could not make any impression on two hundred millions of peasants who have no thought for politics and whose sole thought is about the crops and their prices, unless the latter feel in some way that the present system of Government operates to their disadvantage. This is precisely where the Anglo-Indian fails to understand the true inwardness of the situation. It was at one time common for historians to attribute the French Revolution to the writings of the Encyclopedists. We know that the writings of the Encyclopedists were merely the spark that fired the vast

amount of inflammable material spread all over the country by the unconscionable exactions of the French monarchy. The English traveller, Arthur Young, who rode through France a few years before the Revolution and observed with his own eyes the condition of the peasantry, prophesied in his book that France was heading towards a revolution. As a Professor of History, Professor Buck must have aspected *a priori* the theory which attributed the present acute situation in India to the writings and speeches of a handful of English-educated men. It is quite true that there is much vagueness about the precise form of self-government that India wants. It is to a large extent inevitable that this should be so. People who have been sedulously kept out for a long time from the central machinery of Government, cannot be expected within a few years to present a cut-and-dry scheme of self-government for a large country like India. If Professor Buck had brought the same amount of sympathy to the study of the Indian political movement as he has to the Anglo-Indian administration, he would have found that the difficulties interposed in the way of Indians acquiring political and administrative training have been without precedent in the history of any other country.

Professor Buck, however, is not blind to the other side, notwithstanding that he is predisposed to put the best interpretation upon the motives and measures of the Anglo-Indian administration. The system of dyarchy, he admits, is open to the sharpest criticism. He repeats the conventional praise of the Indian Civil Service, but recognises that it is at best anomalous, "that the splendid machinery of this Service is in no way linked to the new legislative machinery planned by the Government of India Act. In other words, the executive arm of the Government of India is still appointed by imperial authority while the legislative arm is in part responsible to the electors in India." Professor Buck seems to be under the impression that it was an oversight in the Government of India Act to have excluded "all Indians in administrative positions from the Legislature." Surely, Professor Buck does not suggest that the Legislature should be filled by placemen, salaried servants of the Government. The Government of India Act, if it had left the door open to the officials to seek election, would have been a ridiculous farce, and we are astonished that Professor Buck who knows that in the Congress of his own country, even Ministers of State have only a right of audience, can put forward such a suggestion. We may assure Professor Buck that the Indianisation of the services has not been proceeding as rapidly as he seems to think. But he is perfectly right in thinking that the Indian nationalist does not view the mere Indianisation of the services as of any importance in the absence of a substantial measure of self-government. We are sorry that, in his estimate of Mahatma Gandhi's position in the national movement, Professor Buck has committed the usual mistake of confounding Mahatmaji's views about western materialism, western machinery, western medicine and hygiene and so on, with his immediate objective as a political leader. It would be as fair to try to discredit Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's statesmanship because the British Prime Minister happens to be a believer in the "Sermon on the Mount." Mahatma Gandhi might have his own views on many matters. But he has clearly declared that he would be satisfied immediately with the parliamentary form of self-government in India, and to drag in his views about medicine and machinery to prejudice the movement for self-government is, we think, hardly fair. Professor Buck, we are sorry to say, has entirely misunderstood Mr. Das's presidential address to the National Congress at Gaya in its reference to "law and order." A system under which "law and order" can be preserved only by imprisoning thousands of fairly educated and intelligent men who do not belong to the criminal classes, is, on the face of it, a very unsatisfactory system, and that is what Mr. Das was elaborating in his address. Professor Buck seems to think that British India is more economically administered than Indian states because the Viceroy's salary is

only two and a half lakhs of rupees a year while the Gaekwar of Baroda and the Nizam of Hyderabad draw two and five million rupees respectively from their states. The Gaekwar and the Nizam are hereditary rulers of their states while the Viceroy is employed by the British Government for five years. There is no fair basis for the comparison between them. It is more to the point that, while the Viceroy of India receives over 200 thousand dollars a year, the President of the Great Republic of which Professor Buck is a citizen, draws only 75 thousand dollars. Professor Buck is surprised that he heard no criticism of any ruling prince so far as his income from the state is concerned, but we are surprised that the comparison between the salary of the Viceroy and the President of the United States did not occur to the Professor. We can assure Professor Buck that his description of the personal contact between the officials and the subjects of Indian States is highly idealistic. We quote the following without comment from his article:—

"I went with the Superintendent of Prisons through one of the large prisons in Hyderabad. It was most efficiently administered. But what was most noticeable was the ease with which a prisoner could get the ear of the officer in charge and have his wants attended to or his grievance adjusted on the spot. There was no prison board, no hearing, or impersonal rendering of judgment. The case was heard and answered by a wave of the hand and a word. It was personal rule: and India likes it."

We find some difficulty in believing that Professor Buck could seriously imagine that this system of "personal touch," would be welcomed by any people Western or Eastern. All that we can say is that any attempt to introduce the Hyderabad system in British India would meet with very great opposition. Apart from his general views, Professor Buck's estimate of the present situation is fairly correct. "The fact is," he writes, "that Great Britain and India have come to an impasse." He goes on to say, "for the present at least—and here is a hard saying—it (Government) is not trusted. Any promises it might now make, with the most honest intentions of fulfilment in the world, would be certainly discounted in the most respectable circles of the Indian intelligentsia. It is difficult for any Government to persist that has, wittingly or unwittingly, deservedly or undeservedly, gained the distrust of the people. And this is precisely what has happened in India." Professor Buck does not believe that the setting up of parliamentary government in India would ease the situation. He thinks that "what India wants and needs is a return to the personal understanding between the Government and the people." The personal understanding of the kind that exists between the Superintendent of Jails in Hyderabad and his prisoners, we may assure Professor Buck, will not solve the problem in British India. What, then is the kind of personal understanding that can be established? Professor Buck has not left us altogether without a hint as to his meaning. "In the first place," he writes, "the English should co-operate with the Indian National Congress and not boycott it." This is a wise suggestion, which, in our opinion, makes up for much of the imperfect understanding displayed in the rest of the article. If Government act upon it, there is every chance that a solution of the Indian problem can be found without difficulty.—*Indian Social Reformer.*

TO SUBSCRIBERS

The subscription rate for INDIAN OPINION is 15s. od. for South Africa and 15s. 6d. for oversea.

'ઈન્ડિયન ઓપીનીયન' ના લઘુજામનો દર સાઉથ આફ્રિકા માટે રૂ. ૧૫-૦ ફરીયાપારને માટે રૂ. ૧૫-૬.

NATAL COLONIAL-BORN INDIAN ASSOCIATION

A mass meeting of the above Association will take place on Sunday the 13th day of July, 1924, commencing at 2-30 p.m. at the Tamil Institute, Cross Street, Durban.

Members only allowed to participate in the deliberations.

Business :

1. Election.
2. General.

Roll up ye Colonial-born Indians and join the Association and exercise your rights.

S. L. SINGH,  
Pro Tem Secy.

Box 1770,  
Durban.

અઠવાડીક પંચાંગ

શ્રીસ્તી વાર	હીંદુ આષાઠ	મુસલમાન ૧૩૪૨ જલકાદ જલહજ	પારસી ૧૨૬૩	સુર્યાદય ક. મી.	સુર્યાસ્ત ક. મી.
શુક્ર	૪ સુદિ	૨	૩૦	૨૬	૬-૫૭ ૫-૧૦
શનિ	૫ "	૩	૧	૩૦	૬-૫૭ ૫-૧૧
રવિ	૬ "	૪	૨	૧	૬-૫૭ ૫-૧૧
સોમ	૭ "	૫	૩	૨	૬-૫૭ ૫-૧૨
મંગળ	૮ "	૬	૪	૩	૬-૫૭ ૫-૧૨
બુધ	૯ "	૭	૫	૪	૬-૫૭ ૫-૧૩
ગુરુ	૧૦ "	૮	૬	૫	૬-૫૭ ૫-૧૩

શ્રી ઈન્ડિયન સ્ટીમ નેવીગેશન કંપની

સ્ટીમરોની ખબર

સ્ટી. "કરોઆ" જુલાઈ તા. ૬ થી અરસામાં ઉપરશે.

સ્ટી. "કારાગોલા" જુલાઈ તા. ૨૦ થીના અરસામાં ઉપરશે.

વધુ ખુલાસો શેખર હીમેદ, ૩૭૦ પાર્કન સ્ટ્રીટ, ડરબન, એ સ્થળે મળવાથી અથવા લખવાથી મળી શકશે.

in power, who were faced with conflicting interests to reconcile, so long as we are assured that those in power are doing everything possible to adjust matters on a basis honourable to all peoples concerned.

While as Indians we are particularly interested in the attitude of the Prime Minister and in Dr. D. F. Malan who is in charge of the Ministry of Interior which particularly affects our countrymen, we are also interested in the other Ministers, whose departments in some way or other comes in contact with our countrymen, and in the Cabinet itself, for its acts with the Governor-General in matters affecting us, and we take this opportunity in congratulating General Hertzog upon his coming into power and the several Ministers of his Cabinet, in the hope that they will, remembering that our countrymen are a disenfranchised people in this country, do the big and humane thing in holding the balance of justice between them and others who as a franchised people have the power to bear upon the Government.

We can assure General Hertzog and his colleagues that our countrymen will in the future, as in the past, endeavour to co-operate with the Government in all matters affecting not only their welfare but the welfare of the country as a whole.

#### "WHAT INDIA WANTS"

The April number of the *Yale Review* contains an article by Professor P. M. Buck of Nebraska University headed "What India Wants." Professor Buck was in India for six months. He was for many weeks working in the Baroda College. He delivered a series of lectures in the Bombay University on "American Literature." He was present at the Gaya Congress. In these and other ways, he had ample opportunities of coming in contact with representative Indians and to study their view-point. Judging from the article in the *Yale Review*, it would appear that the result of Professor Buck's intercourse with Indians has not predisposed him to a favourable view either of their capacity or of their aspirations. He even seems disinclined to give them credit for sincerity. On the whole, his presentation of the Indian point of view is largely a reflection of the view held by most Anglo-Indians in this country. He seems to think that political agitation in India is almost entirely the creation of English-educated Indians who are exploiting the millions of peasants, villagers and the workers in the city who are entirely absorbed in their own daily affairs. He writes:

"With an intelligentsia stuffed with doctrinaire enthusiasms and a peasantry wavering constantly between good-natured content and economic distress, and as yet entirely untouched by political ideas, it is a bit difficult to define what India wants. The peasant wants to be left alone so far as is possible, to have decent crops and to sell in a decent market. The leaders of the National Congress wish to devote their lives to "selfless" labour for India, which at present for most of them means little more than endless speeches, interviews in the press, committee meetings, and resolutions."

We are surprised that such a cultivated observer as Professor Buck does not see that the million or two million English-educated men could not make any impression on two hundred millions of peasants who have no thought for politics and whose sole thought is about the crops and their prices, unless the latter feel in some way that the present system of Government operates to their disadvantage. This is precisely where the Anglo-Indian fails to understand the true inwardness of the situation. It was at one time common for historians to attribute the French Revolution to the writings of the Encyclopedists. We know that the writings of the Encyclopedists were merely the spark that fired the vast

amount of inflammable material spread all over the country by the unconscionable exactions of the French monarchy. The English traveller, Arthur Young, who rode through France a few years before the Revolution and observed with his own eyes the condition of the peasantry, prophesied in his book that France was heading towards a revolution. As a Professor of History, Professor Buck must have suspected *a priori* the theory which attributed the present acute situation in India to the writings and speeches of a handful of English-educated men. It is quite true that there is much vagueness about the precise form of self-government that India wants. It is to a large extent inevitable that this should be so. People who have been sedulously kept out for a long time from the central machinery of Government, cannot be expected within a few years to present a cut-and-dry scheme of self-government for a large country like India. If Professor Buck had brought the same amount of sympathy to the study of the Indian political movement as he has to the Anglo-Indian administration, he would have found that the difficulties interposed in the way of Indians acquiring political and administrative training have been without precedent in the history of any other country.

Professor Buck, however, is not blind to the other side, notwithstanding that he is predisposed to put the best interpretation upon the motives and measures of the Anglo-Indian administration. The system of dyarchy, he admits, is open to the sharpest criticism. He repeats the conventional praise of the Indian Civil Service, but recognises that it is at best anomalous, "that the splendid machinery of this Service is in no way linked to the new legislative machinery planned by the Government of India Act. In other words, the executive arm of the Government of India is still appointed by imperial authority while the legislative arm is in part responsible to the electors in India." Professor Buck seems to be under the impression that it was an oversight in the Government of India Act to have excluded "all Indians in administrative positions from the Legislature." Surely, Professor Buck does not suggest that the Legislature should be filled by placemen, salaried servants of the Government. The Government of India Act, if it had left the door open to the officials to seek election, would have been a ridiculous farce, and we are astonished that Professor Buck who knows that in the Congress of his own country, even Ministers of State have only a right of audience, can put forward such a suggestion. We may assure Professor Buck that the Indianisation of the services has not been proceeding as rapidly as he seems to think. But he is perfectly right in thinking that the Indian nationalist does not view the mere Indianisation of the services as of any importance in the absence of a substantial measure of self-government. We are sorry that, in his estimate of Mahatma Gandhi's position in the national movement, Professor Buck has committed the usual mistake of confounding Mahatmaji's views about western materialism, western machinery, western medicine and hygiene and so on, with his immediate objective as a political leader. It would be as fair to try to discredit Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's statesmanship because the British Prime Minister happens to be a believer in the "Sermon on the Mount." Mahatma Gandhi might have his own views on many matters. But he has clearly declared that he would be satisfied immediately with the parliamentary form of self-government in India, and to drag in his views about medicine and machinery to prejudice the movement for self-government is, we think, hardly fair. Professor Buck, we are sorry to say, has entirely misunderstood Mr. Das's presidential address to the National Congress at Gaya in its reference to "law and order." A system under which "law and order" can be preserved only by imprisoning thousands of fairly educated and intelligent men who do not belong to the criminal classes, is, on the face of it, a very unsatisfactory system, and that is what Mr. Das was elaborating in his address. Professor Buck seems to think that British India is more economically administered than Indian states because the Viceroy's salary is

only two and a half lakhs of rupees a year while the Gaekwar of Baroda and the Nizam of Hyderabad draw two and five million rupees respectively from their states. The Gaekwar and the Nizam are hereditary rulers of their states while the Viceroy is employed by the British Government for five years. There is no fair basis for the comparison between them. It is more to the point that, while the Viceroy of India receives over 200 thousand dollars a year, the President of the Great Republic of which Professor Buck is a citizen, draws only 75 thousand dollars. Professor Buck is surprised that he heard no criticism of any ruling prince so far as his income from the state is concerned, but we are surprised that the comparison between the salary of the Viceroy and the President of the United States did not occur to the Professor. We can assure Professor Buck that his description of the personal contact between the officials and the subjects of Indian States is highly idealistic. We quote the following without comment from his article:—

"I went with the Superintendent of Prisons through one of the large prisons in Hyderabad. It was most efficiently administered. But what was most noticeable was the ease with which a prisoner could get the ear of the officer in charge and have his wants attended to or his grievance adjusted on the spot. There was no prison board, no hearing, or impersonal rendering of judgment. The case was heard and answered by a wave of the hand and a word. It was personal rule; and India likes it."

We find some difficulty in believing that Professor Buck could seriously imagine that this system of "personal touch," would be welcomed by any people Western or Eastern. All that we can say is that any attempt to introduce the Hyderabad system in British India would meet with very great opposition. Apart from his general views, Professor Buck's estimate of the present situation is fairly correct. "The fact is," he writes, "that Great Britain and India have come to an impasse." He goes on to say, "for the present at least—and here is a hard saying—it (Government) is not trusted. Any promises it might now make, with the most honest intentions of fulfilment in the world, would be certainly discounted in the most respectable circles of the Indian intelligentsia. It is difficult for any Government to persist that has, wittingly or unwittingly, deservedly or undeservedly, gained the distrust of the people. And this is precisely what has happened in India." Professor Buck does not believe that the setting up of parliamentary government in India would ease the situation. He thinks that "what India wants and needs is a return to the personal understanding between the Government and the people." The personal understanding of the kind that exists between the Superintendent of Jails in Hyderabad and his prisoners, we may assure Professor Buck, will not solve the problem in British India. What then is the kind of personal understanding that can be established? Professor Buck has not left us altogether without a hint as to his meaning. "In the first place," he writes, "the English should co-operate with the Indian National Congress and not boycott it." This is a wise suggestion, which, in our opinion, makes up for much of the imperfect understanding displayed in the rest of the article. If Government act upon it, there is every chance that a solution of the Indian problem can be found without difficulty.—*Indian Social Reformer.*

TO SUBSCRIBERS

The subscription rate for INDIAN OPINION is 15s. od. for South Africa and 15s. 6d. for oversea.

'ઈન્ડિયન ઓપીનીયન' ના લખવાનો દર સાઉથ આફ્રિકા માટે રૂ. ૧૫-૦૦ દરિયાપારને માટે રૂ. ૧૫-૬૦

NATAL COLONIAL-BORN INDIAN ASSOCIATION

A mass meeting of the above Association will take place on Sunday the 13th day of July, 1924, commencing at 2-30 p.m. at the Tamil Institute, Cross Street, Durban.

Members only allowed to participate in the deliberations.

Business:

1. Election.
2. General.

Roll up ye Colonial-born Indians and join the Association and exercise your rights.

S. L. SINGH,  
Pro Tem Secy.

Box 1770,  
Durban.

અઠવાડીક પંચાંગ

વાર	ખ્રીસ્તી ૧૯૨૪ જુલાઈ	હીંદુ ૧૯૮૦ આષાઢ	સુસલમાન ૧૩૪૨ જલકાદ જલકાદ	પારસી ૧૨૬૩	સુર્યાક્રમ ક. મી.	સુર્યાસ્ત ક. મી.
શુક્ર	૪	સુદિ ૨	૩૦	૨૯	૬-૫૭	૫-૧૦
શનિ	૫	" ૩	૧	૩૦	૬-૫૭	૫-૧૧
રવિ	૬	" ૪	૨	૧	૬-૫૭	૫-૧૧
સોમ	૭	" ૫	૩	૨	૬-૫૭	૫-૧૨
મંગળ	૮	" ૬	૪	૩	૬-૫૭	૫-૧૨
બુધ	૯	" ૭	૫	૪	૬-૫૭	૫-૧૩
ગુરુ	૧૦	" ૮	૬	૫	૬-૫૭	૫-૧૩

શ્રી ઈન્ડિયન સ્ટીમ નેવીગેશન કંપની

સ્ટીમરોની ખબર

સ્ટી. "કરોઆ" જુલાઈ તા. ૬ કી અરસામાં ઉપડશે.

સ્ટી. "કારાગોલા" જુલાઈ તા. ૨૦ મીના અરસામાં ઉપડશે.

૧૬ જુલાઈ

ચેમ્બલ હીમેટ, ૩૭૦ પાર્કન સ્ટ્રીટ, દરબન,

એ સ્થળે મળવાથી અથવા લખવાથી મળી શકશે.