

Indian Opinion

NO. 11—VOL. XX. FRIDAY, APRIL 27th, 1922.

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

NOTES AND NEWS

BY the death, on last Friday morning, of Mr. George Mackcurtan K.C., a prominent figure has been removed from the life of Durban. As he was loved by his own people, so was he loved by the Indians. In the late Mr. Mackcurtan the Indians had a friend whose sympathy they could always rely upon. He was a true Englishman—a true Britisher, who knew not what prejudice was. Whether black or white, poor or rich, all were alike welcome to him and he had his sympathy for them all. Indians have but few friends in this country amongst Europeans of the type of the late Mr. Mackcurtan and this was the reason why he was loved so much by them, and they mourn his loss together with the Durban European public. We extend our heart-felt sympathy to the bereaved family.

The following appears in the *Natal Witness* :—

The members of the South Africans' League and other fervid anti-Asiatics are certainly "keeping their end up." If their influence goes on spreading at the present rate it will not be long before every misfortune that happens under the sun will be attributed to Indians! In the Insolvency Court records there is the case of a storekeeper who surrenders with a deficiency of only £370. He attributes his failure to underselling by Asiatic competitors, and other things, including the loss of 60 cattle by disease and accidents. As 60 cattle could not have been worth less than the whole of his difference between assets and liabilities, it seems as though the Asiatic question is scarcely germane.

A recent Reuter's message from Delhi states :—

The Maharaja of Alwar, speaking at a banquet in honour of the Viceroy at Alwar, said their goal was to form a United States of India, in which every State would work out its own destiny in accordance with its environment and traditions. He declared that the Prince of Wales came to India as a British Prince, and returns as a Royal Prince of India. Lord Reading, in the course of his reply, said he looked forward with hope and confidence to India's future when she would count, as she should count, in the Councils of the Empire, but he wished to utter a warning against undue haste.

A Nairobi message dated March 27 says :—Indian representatives to-day sat in the Legislative Council for the first time.—Reuter.

Pretoria, March 29 (Reuter).—The Union Government has been officially advised that all restrictions on the export of rice from India will be removed as from April 1st.

A Reuter's message from London states :—

In the House of Commons, replying to C. I. Wedgwood (Lab., Newcastle-under-Lyme), in regard to the resolution passed by the Indian Legislative Assembly protesting against any departure from the equality of status of Indians in Kenya Colony, Lord Winterton

said Viscount Peel (Secretary for India) had not yet had the opportunity of studying all the details of the matter involved, and that they were still being considered. Lord Winterton emphasised that no effort would be spared to secure a satisfactory settlement. Concluding, Lord Winterton declared that the policy of the India Office was not changed in the slightest degree by the resignation of Mr. Montagu.

The well-known Point case of Messrs. Ismail Gora, Sorabjee Rustomjee and Manilal Gandhi has again been adjourned to the 25th of April.

We understand that Mr. H. S. L. Polak is leaving England on a visit to India where he will remain until the end of July. His address in India is c/o J. B. Petit Esq, 6 Hornby Row, Bombay, India.

The Indian Legislative Assembly has passed a motion, (says Reuter), requesting the Governor-General to telegraph to the Imperial Government expressing its deep regret at the resignation of Mr. Montagu, and expressing profound gratitude to Mr. Montagu for his invaluable services to India and the Empire, and its unabated confidence in his policy, as the only policy which wise statesmanship dictated in the best interests of the Empire. Sir William Vincent (a Home member) declared that the resignation of Mr. Montagu was not connected with the arrest of Gandhi. Mr. Montagu, he added, loyally supported the Government of India in dealing with the non-cooperation movement.

THE INDIAN DEPUTATION

It would appear from Reuter's recent cable messages that a deputation consisting of members of the Indian Legislature and five South African delegates headed by Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy waited on H. E. the Viceroy of India in connection with the grievances of Indians in South Africa. It is not clear from the message what actually was stated by the deputation but they appear to have given the "assurance that the Indians were prepared to be educated and raise their standard of life." Little do the Indian people or the Viceroy know that those who have raised their "standard of life" so far as it was in their power to do, under the circumstances they have been placed in this country, have to suffer just as much, if not more, as those whose standard of life is considered to be lower. The high standard of life, as it is evidently understood by the ruling race in this country, is to live luxuriously and waste the money on intoxicants, entertainments etc. The well-to-do Indians have not been able to do all that is required, to be done to raise the standard of life, for, practically all avenues that lead to luxury have been closed to them; they are reserved for

those possessing fair skins only. But these Indians have tried to raise their standard of life by living decently in accordance with their earning capacity. And for this reason, instead of being admired, they have become an eye sore to the white man who looks on them grudgingly for driving motor cars and living in residential quarters similar or better than his own. "Standard of life," therefore, though it is constantly brought forth as an argument against the Indian, the real reason for the hatred towards him is his economy, a virtue and not a vice that he possesses. It is not, therefore, that the Indian does not wish to raise his standard of life, hence any assurance as to his preparedness to do so is superfluous.

The Viceroy is reported to have announced that the Indian Government was communicating with the Union Government regarding the measures recommended by the Asiatic Commission. "He agreed that the success of the Cape's liberal and statesmanlike policy afforded strong argument in favour of similar policy elsewhere in the Union." It should be noted that the Asiatic Commission came to quite the contrary conclusion. They have in their report gone to the extent of "tightening the screw" in those Provinces where no such liberal policy, as in the Cape, exists and have recommended a uniform policy for all the Provinces. That is to say that the somewhat liberal policy existing in the Cape should also exist. While the Indian community in this country acknowledges with gratification the announcement made by the Viceroy that he has "firmly and vigorously championed the Indian cause" it certainly feels grieved to learn of His Excellency's ignorance of the fact that the scheme of voluntary repatriation is being used to drive Indians from the Union. It might perhaps not be so in the letter, but in deed and in intention there is not the least doubt that it is so. The number of statements, published in the Indian papers of repatriates who were enticed to leave this country, are sufficient to convince anybody that they were being packed off without the true position being disclosed to them. And besides, people, who were once brought to this country, for the interests of this country and who having earnestly performed their gruesome task have made this a Garden Colony, and who have spent their life-time in this country with their children and their children's children, having made this their home, should now be asked to leave this country and be sent to a land that has become strange to them, with not the ghost of a chance of returning, and to be induced with a paltry sum to sacrifice their own and their children's birth-right in this country; where comes the justice—the righteousness in this act we entirely fail to see. It is in our opinion the height of ingratitude. It is a thousand pities that this should be encouraged by the Indian Government and tolerated by the Indian people. In order to realise that the scheme is intended to get this country rid of Indians we only need to quote the words uttered by Mr. Duncan recently in the Union House of Assembly while speaking on the additional vote of £16000 for the repatriation of Indians. They were as follows:—"I trust the members fully realise what the presence of a large number of Indians in this country would mean, and that the money spent in returning them to their own country, is money well-spent." After this, it is hardly necessary to elaborate

on the subject to prove what the motive of this scheme is.

Indians fully realise that this "deep rooted prejudice could not be expected to be removed in a day." But what Indians did expect was that this public prejudice would not receive the support of the authorities nor would it be given room in the law. But their expectations have fallen to the ground and this has been the most disappointing element in the whole question.

The Viceroy has expressed the hope that "the difficulties in the way of an acceptable solution of the Indian question would not be insurmountable to a statesman like General Smuts, who had solved more obstinate problems, and who had a clear insight into the bearings of these claims on the strength and solidarity of the Empire as a whole." If our Prime Minister would but only act in his own home as he has preached from platforms outside, there would not be the slightest cause for British Indians in the Union to complain of any grievances.

NATAL PROVINCIAL COUNCIL

TWO NEW ORDINANCES

TO BE INTRODUCED BY LABOUR PARTY

Two draft ordinances are to be introduced into the Provincial Council this Session by the Durban and District Committee of the South African Labour Party. One is intended to amend the law relating to the election of Councillors of the town of Durban, and the other to amend the law relating to the making and levying of rates on assessments by the Durban Town Council.

The main provisions in draft Borough of Durban Elections Ordinance (for Durban only) are:—

(1) The abolition of Ward system: The Borough to vote as one ward, and all municipal elections to be according to the principle of proportional representation.

(2) Plural voting to be abolished; one person to be given one transferable vote only.

(3) Every person, male or female, of 21 years and upwards, of European descent, resident in the Borough, to be eligible for enrolment as an elector.

(4) The irritating restriction upon women in the matter of enrolment as electors is to be removed, and present enrolment arrangements for men to be applicable to women.

(5) Non-Europeans to be disqualified from enrolment as electors, subject to the proviso that no non-European at present enrolled as an elector shall have his name removed from the roll, if otherwise eligible, by reason only of any disqualification based on race or colour.

(6) While Aliens, as at present, are to be eligible for enrolment as electors, they are for the future to be disqualified from being elected as Councillors.

(7) All Councillors holding office at the end of current municipal year (July 31, 1922), to vacate their seats at that date, an election to be held for a new Council of 18 members, nine of whom shall hold office for two years and the remainder for one year. Each succeeding year, the Borough, voting as one ward, shall elect nine Councillors.

This ordinance is to be introduced by Mr. J. W. Coleman, M. P. C.

The Draft Borough of Durban Rating Ordinance (for Borough of Durban only) provides for:—

(1) The abolition of system of rating land and buildings and institution of rating of land only (excluding buildings and improvements.)

(2) Sporting and recreation grounds not run for private profit (race courses excepted) are to be exempted from rating.

(3) The value of liquor business is to be made rateable.

This ordinance will be introduced by Mr. F. J. Fahey, M.P.C.

INDIAN QUESTION IN SOUTH AFRICA

DEPUTATION TO THE VICEROY

Delhi, March 23.—The grievances of the Indians in South Africa were submitted to the Viceroy by a deputation of members of the Legislature and five South African delegates, headed by Sir Jamoetjæ Jeejeebhoy, the Deputy President of the Legislative Assembly.

The delegation waited on Lord Reading with a view to enabling his Excellency to address the Union of South Africa direct in this matter. The deputation, in the course of a lengthy exposition, of the existing Indian disabilities, gave an assurance that the Indians were prepared to be educated, and to raise the standard of their life, but they claimed equal freedom, as one of the fundamental rights of humanity for which the Empire stood.

The Viceroy, in replying announced that the Government was communicating with the Union Government regarding the measures recommended by the Asiatic Commission. The Viceroy added, amid applause, that he had firmly and vigorously championed the Indian cause. He agreed that the success of the Cape's liberal and statesmanlike policy, afforded a strong argument in favour of a similar policy elsewhere in the Union. While the Indian Government was determined to press the application of broad principles and of equal citizenship, they must respect the principles of non-interference in a Dominion's domestic affairs, which are not conducive to the welfare of the Indians there. No evidence had reached him to justify the fear that the scheme of voluntary repatriation was being used to drive the Indians from the Union. He counselled the Indians not to expect the removal in a day of deep rooted prejudices, and he hoped that the difficulties in the way of an acceptable solution of the Indian question were not insurmountable to statesmen like General Smuts, who had solved more obstinate problems, and who had a clear insight into the bearings of these claims on the strength of the solidarity of the Empire as a whole.—Reuter.

VREDEDORP STANDS

INDIAN OCCUPATION

PRIVY COUNCIL DECISION

[FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT]

London, March 2nd, 1922.

The Appeal of the Madrasa Anjuman Islamia of Kholwad against the Municipal Council of Johannesburg was heard in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on January 23rd and 24th last, before a Board consisting of Viscount Haldane, presiding, Viscount Cave, Lord Dunedin, Lord Shaw, and Lord Phillimore.

The Counsel for the Appellants were Mr. A. C. Clauson, K.C., and Mr. Dube, and for the Respondent Municipality, Mr Mark L. Romer, K.C., and Mr. Warwick Draper.

Judgment was reserved, and was today delivered by Viscount Cave. I append the full text:—

This is an appeal by special leave from a judgment and order of the Supreme Court of South Africa (Appellate Division) which affirmed a judgment and order of the Supreme Court of South Africa (Witwatersrand Local Division.)

The facts giving rise to the appeal are stated in the judgment of the Acting Chief Justice as follows:—

"The appellants are members of the board of management of the Madrasa Islamia of Kholwad, a limited liability company incorporated in the Transvaal Province, which is registered as the owner of Stand No. 320, Vrededorp. This stand is held subject to the conditions laid down in Section 4 (b) of the Vrededorp Stands Act, 1907, one of which is that the owner shall not permit any Asiatic, native or coloured person (other than the *bona fide* servant of a white person for the time being residing on the stand) to reside on or occupy the stand or any part thereof. In breach of this condition the said company allowed one of the appellants, Dangor, to reside on and occupy the stand in question, having leased it to him for the purpose of carrying on a general business. An interdict was thereupon obtained restraining the company from allowing Dangor or any other Asiatic or coloured person to reside on or occupy the stand. Three days after the making of the application in June, 1917, and before the interdict had been granted, Dangor converted his business into a limited liability company, with a registered capital of £5,000 divided into 5,000 shares of the value of £1 each. Dangor himself is the sole director and manager of the company, and holds the majority of the shares, the remaining shareholders being all Asiatics or coloured persons. After the interdict had been granted the appellant company gave a lease of the stand to Dangor, Limited, and Dangor continues to carry on business there as before, his employees being all Asiatics or coloured persons. In these circumstances an application was made to the Witwatersrand Local Division alleging that the appellants had been guilty of contempt of Court in failing to comply with the order interdicting them from allowing Dangor or any other Asiatic or coloured person to reside on, or occupy, the stand, and praying that they be punished by fine or committal, or in such other manner as to the Court might seem fit. Upon this application the Court declared the respondents to have committed contempt of Court, and ordered them to pay the costs of the application."

An appeal to the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court against the order last mentioned was dismissed, and thereupon the present appeal was brought.

The facts are not in dispute. On the one hand it is not alleged that Dangor (who is an Asiatic) or any of his Asiatic or coloured subordinates reside on the stand; but on the other hand, it is admitted that they carry on business there daily, Dangor being in sole management and control, and that this takes place with the knowledge and permission of the appellants. In these circumstances the question to be determined is whether the stand is occupied by Dangor, either alone or with his Asiatic or coloured servants, within the meaning of Section 4 (b) of the Vrededorp Stands Act, 1907.

The word "occupy" is a word of uncertain meaning. Sometimes it denotes legal possession in the technical sense, as when occupation is made the test of tenability; and it is in this sense that it is said in the rating cases that the occupation of premises by a servant, if such occupation is subservient and necessary to the service, is the occupation of his master. (*Queen v. Spurrell*, 1865, L.R. 1 Q.B. 72.) At other times "occupation" denotes nothing more than physical presence in a place for a substantial period of time, as where a person is said to occupy a seat or pew, or where a person who allows his horses or cattle to be in a field or to pass along a highway is said to be the occupier of the field or highway for the purposes of Section 68 of the Railway Clauses Act, 1825 (*Dawson v. The Midland Railway Company*, 1890, L.R. 8 Exchequer, 8; *Lascombe v. Great Western Railway Company*, 1899, L.R. 2 Q.B. 313); and the meaning in any particular statute or document must depend on the purpose for which, and the context in

which, it is used. In the present case it appears reasonably clear that the word is used in the second or more popular sense above-described. The Vrededorp Stands Act, 1907, commences with a recital that the Government of the late South African Republic had by certain resolutions authorised the issue of stand licences on open stands on Government ground in the township of Vrededorp to indigent persons for the purpose of occupation by such persons, and proceeds to transfer the ground in question to the Municipal Council of Johannesburg and to entitle the registered holder of any stand to receive a grant of the freehold upon certain conditions, of which one is the condition above referred to. There is also a provision (Section 13) which prohibits an Asiatic, coloured or native person (with the exception above mentioned) from residing on or occupying any stand. It appears by the judgments of the South African Courts that the object of these provisions was to prevent any Asiatic, native or coloured persons, for sanitary and other reasons, from dwelling or being habitually among the indigent white population to whom the stands were granted; and that the converse aspect of this policy appears in the provisions of other statutes which exclude Europeans from occupying, trading or settling in the native or similar locations. However this may be, it is plain, from the fact that the prohibition is made to depend on race or colour, that it is the physical presence of the persons described, and not their right of possession in a legal or technical sense, which the statute has in view. To use the words of the Acting Chief Justice, "what was objected to, was the habitual physical presence of such persons on the stands"; and it is in this sense that the provision against "occupation" must be read. This conclusion is supported by the exception which is contained in the Act in favour of the *bona fide* servant of a white person for the time being residing on the stand, and also by the fact that the owner of a stand is prevented by another condition from subletting to any Asiatic, native or coloured person; for if "occupation" meant occupation as a tenant, this further condition would be superfluous.

This being the meaning of the condition in question and of the order founded upon it, it is plain that the order was infringed. Dangor, Limited, having no corporal existence, could not occupy the stand in the above sense. It was occupied as well after as before the injunction, by Dangor with his coloured staff. While Dangor was lessee he occupied it on his own behalf; when Dangor, Limited, became the lessee, Dangor continued to occupy it, but as manager and agent for Dangor, Limited, and on their behalf. The legal title to possession shifted, but the physical occupation was unchanged. There was, therefore, an infringement of the injunction, and the attempt to evade it was ineffective. Their Lordships concur on this point with the judgment of the Appellate Division.

Having regard to the above conclusion, it is unnecessary to consider the further question raised in the South African Courts—whether the conversion of Dangor into a limited company was ineffective according to the Roman-Dutch law, as being *in fraudem legis*. They, therefore, express no opinion upon this point.

For the above reasons, their Lordships will humbly advise His Majesty that this appeal fails and should be dismissed with costs.

GANDHI'S NON-CO-OPERATION

The *Irish Press* of Philadelphia writes thus on "Gandhi's Non-co-operation":—

The Hindoo movement is both national and economic. It is aimed at both the individual exploiters and the army of occupation. Its national aim is not radically different from the programme of the Sinn Fein prior to the adoption of physical force, except

that religion plays a large part in the Indian case. The very movement itself seems to be a religion, but a religion based on love and brotherhood. Gandhi's policy is non-violent, and this seems to be his strongest point, for Gandhi is a saint and a revolutionary all in one. He realises the hopelessness of an appeal to arms under present conditions, to wit: "We have no alternatives, to fight passively or actively. If we fight actively we shall be killed like flies—by the millions; we lack bodily energy, ammunition and guns. If we fight passively, we have a chance to win by prolonging the ceremony, tiring them out, and scandalising them." There is very considerable truth in this. The death of MacSwiney reaped more odium on Britain and British institutions than would three Amritsars.

The organ of the Irish Americans thus describes the non-co-operation programme:—

The non-co-operation programme consists of, (a) Rejection of all government titles, honors and honorary offices, (b) abstention from drink, (c) withdrawal of all boys and girls from a system of education which has reconciled the best of Indians to slavery under foreign domination, without feeling the sting of it, and which has made of them parasites sucking the blood of the classes that produce and work, (d) establishment of such schools and colleges as will give a secondary place to the study of English and other European literature, reserving the first for the spoken language of India and for manual training, (e) boycott of English firms of "justice," their courts and their lawyers, (f) boycott of foreign cloth and the rehabilitation of Swadeshi (i. e., Indian-made cloth), (g) withdrawal of Indians from the service of the British Government and from service in the British army and the British police, (h) non-payment of taxes.

The similarity of the Sinn Fein and Gandhi programmes are then pointed out, the difference, too, being noted.

How like the Sinn Fein policy in Ireland in its early stages, Gandhi maintains that no usurping power can rule in any country where the people are unitedly opposed and fail to lead the necessary co-operation. And no truer statement was ever made. British power in Ireland declined from the day that the Irish people first refused their help to England in governing the country. While England could buy Irishmen to govern the country for her, her rule was secure, but once they failed to co-operate, once they spurned the British Parliament and threw her empty honors in her face—her power started to decline.

That "Gandhi's boycott of British goods" has succeeded is, in the opinion of the Irish paper, "borne out by the fact that Lancashire imports were reduced by 75 per cent in nine months."

The greatest obstacle Gandhi has to contend with is the attitude of the so-called intelligentsia, or moderates, whose business it seems is to water down demands in general and lay stress on economic well-being. Their game is generally one of bluff, as they are just as much a part of the Imperial machine as the Viceroy and his satraps. They are very easily pleased and go into raptures over the merest crumb that is flung to the crowd.

Every new demand is preposterous until it is conceded, and then it is really splendid, and they would not part with it for anything.

There seems to be no doubt but that non-co-operation will win for India. There is also a feeling that it would have sufficed to clear Ireland of the enemy, eventually, even had no other means been taken to expel them. And when out, they would stay out, in as much as they would have no reason or inducement for returning.—*Modern Review*.

MR. GANDHI'S ARREST DECIDED UPON

Long before we read in Reuter's telegrams that it had been settled, in London, that Mr. Gandhi was to be arrested but that the decision was not given effect owing to the suspension of civil disobedience *sine die*, (says the *Modern Review*), we expressed the opinion that Mr. Gandhi was the greatest power in the land making for peace. We are glad to note that *The Catholic Herald of India* has expressed a similar opinion in the following sentences:—

We frankly confess it is difficult to see whether Mr. Gandhi's arrest will bring about peace or let loose a revolution.

Though Mr. Gandhi captained the present campaign, he also regulated it. There are in his camp strong elements in favour of force and violence, which induced the leader to go faster than he meant to, yet on the whole obeyed his dictates, and it remains to be seen whether the leader's removal will not paralyse the brake. It is significant that Europeans living isolated in the mofussil are more hesitant on the subject than those living in the towns.

Mr. Montagu's declaration that "if the existence of our Empire were challenged and demands were made that we contemplated to retreat from India, then India would not challenge with success the most determined people in the world" has the merit of informing us where we stand, but even within the limits of a vigorous outline of policy, there is room for goodwill and mutual understanding. Mr. Gandhi's arrest backed up by a good show of force may possibly reduce non-cooperation to safer dimensions, but they will not kill it, for the spirit that animates it will remain and burst out in some other form, unless both sides approach each other in a spirit of reconciliation. The atmosphere is electrical in both camps, but that will not carry us very far.

**ALL-INDIA CONGRESS COMMITTEE
RESOLUTION AT DELHI**

The following is the full text of the resolution, moved by Mr. Gandhi at the meeting of the All-India Congress Committee on February 24 at Delhi:—

"The All-India Congress Committee, having carefully considered the resolutions passed by the Working Committee at its meeting held at Bardoli on the 11th and 12th instant, confirms the said resolutions and further resolves that "individual civil disobedience, whether of a defensive or aggressive character, may be commenced in respect of particular places or particular laws" at the instance of, and upon the permission being granted therefor, by the respective Provincial Committees, provided that such civil disobedience shall not be permitted, unless all the conditions laid down by the Congress or the All-India Congress Committee or the Working Committee, are strictly fulfilled.

PICKETTING OF FOREIGN CLOTH

Reports having been received from various quarters that "picketing regarding foreign cloth is as necessary as liquor-picketing," the All-India Congress Committee authorises such picketing of a bonafide character on the same terms as liquor picketing mentioned in the Bardoli resolutions

NO ABANDONMENT OF CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

The All-India Congress Committee wishes it to be understood that "the resolutions of the Working Committee do not mean any abandonment of the original Congress programme of non-co-operation, or permanent abandonment of mass civil disobedience," but considers that an atmosphere of necessary mass non-violence can be established by the workers concentrating upon the constructive programme framed by the Working Committee at Bardoli. The All-India Congress Committee is of opinion that the Congress has attained considerable success in every item of non-

co-operation and that the spirit of non-co-operation which pervades the atmosphere has strengthened the country, and full non-co-operation alone will lead ultimately, to real friendship and equality.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE THE RIGHT AND DUTY OF PEOPLE

The All-India Congress Committee holds civil disobedience to be the right and duty of the people to be exercised and performed whenever the state opposes the declared will of the people. Individual civil disobedience of orders or laws by a single individual or an ascertained number or group of individuals. Therefore, a prohibited public meeting where admission is regulated by tickets and to which no unauthorised admission is allowed is an instance of individual civil disobedience, whereas a prohibited meeting to which the general public is admitted without any restriction is an instance of mass civil disobedience. Such civil disobedience is defensive, when a prohibited public meeting is held for conducting a normal activity, although it may result in arrest; it would be aggressive if it is held not for any normal activity, but merely for the purpose of courting arrest and imprisonment.—*Modern Review*.

NOTICE

NATAL INDIAN CONGRESS

The annual general meeting of the Natal Indian Congress will be held on Sunday the 3rd April, 1922 at 2-30 p. m. at Rawat's Hall, Victoria Street, Durban.

Business:—

1. Report and Financial Statement
2. Election of officials

N. B. Members and intending members must in terms of the Rules pay their subscriptions at once to take part in the meeting.

A. CHRISTOPHER
SORAJEE RUSTOMJEE
Hony. Secretaries,
Natal Indian Congress.

અડવાસીક પંચામ

સર	ખ્રીસ્તી	હિંદુ	મુસલમાન	પારસી	સુવૈદ્ય	સુવર્ણ
	૧૯૨૨	૧૯૨૦	૧૩૪૦	૧૨૬૧	ક. મી.	ક. મી.
	મે પ્રીલ	મે	સામાન			
કુલ	૭	૧૦	૮	૩૦	૬-૧૩	૫-૫૧
ક્રી	૮	૧૧	૯	૧	૬-૧૪	૫-૪૯
રસી	૯	૧૨	૧૦	૨	૬-૧૪	૫-૪૮
સોમ	૧૦	૧૩	૧૧	૩	૬-૧૪	૫-૪૭
મંગળ	૧૧	૧૪	૧૨	૪	૬-૧૬	૫-૪૬
બુધ	૧૨	૧૬	૧૩	૫	૬-૧૬	૫-૪૫
ગુરુ	૧૩	૧૭	૧૪	૬	૬-૧૭	૫-૪૪