

Indian Opinion

No. 25—VOL. XX. FRIDAY, JUNE 23RD, 1922.

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

THE DEPUTATION

THE following is the full text of the statement submitted to the Minister of the Interior at Capetown by the deputation of the Natal Indian Congress on Monday the 12th instant. The deputation was accompanied by Dr. Abdurahman and Dr. Gool and was introduced by Mr. J. X. Merryman—

We, the undersigned, have been authorised by the Natal Indian Congress as representing the Indian community domiciled in and born in Natal, to submit the following statement on certain legislation passed and being passed by the Natal Provincial Council.

Before proceeding with our statement we desire in the name of our community to thank you for affording us the opportunity to interview you.

RURAL DEALERS' LICENSING ORDINANCE

With reference to the Draft Ordinance No. 4, 1922, as read and passed a third time entitled 'To amend the Laws relating to the grant of licences to wholesale and retail dealers in the Rural districts of Natal:'

We do not propose to go into the genesis or subsequent developments of the Licensing Laws of Natal, as all this will be within your knowledge, as also that the object of the Licensing Laws from 1896 and since has been the restriction and, we fear, the extinction of us as traders. In introducing the Act of 1897, the then Attorney General, the Honourable Mr. Escombe, stated that 'the Bill originated at the instance of the three principal Boroughs of the Colony on the petitions of the Mayors of Durban, Pietermaritzburg, and Newcastle, who asked that powers might be given to the Municipalities in excess of the present powers to control the issuing of licences. There is no hesitation on their part in saying what their object is and there is no objection on the part of the Government in admitting their proposal to prevent certain persons coming into this country to compete with Europeans on unequal terms; and getting the licences to trade which are required by the Europeans.'

The Ordinance No. 4, 1922, which awaits the assent of the Governor-General-in-Council, we object to on the following among other grounds:—

(a) That the right of appeal in all cases to the Appeal Board is taken away by the said Ordinance, and this, we submit, is a deprivation of a just, existing, and inherent right.

(b) That the abolition of the present Licensing system in rural areas by the Licensing Officer being superseded by a Licensing Board for one county or for combined counties, or by Licensing Boards for different parts of a county will render it practically impossible for Indian applicants to obtain a new licence as such Board will be constituted of five persons who must be residents, owners or renters of a house or land in the county or area, and be enrolled as voters for Parliament, and such Board or Boards will be European manned without its decisions in respect of new licences being subject to an Appeal Board, and on the Board or Boards Indians will have no representation.

(c) That the provision that a suspended licence

shall not be issued till an appeal is determined is if by suspended licence is meant that a licensee shall close down his business pending such determination, unjust and inequitable to the licensee causing loss to or ruining his business.

(d) That the provision in Section 18 of the said Ordinance, providing for application by objectors for re-hearing is likely, under the rules to be framed in terms of this Ordinance, to be an instrument for the extinction of Indian traders, in that, if the rules provide that notice of intention to apply for renewal should be advertised, such requirement will put Indian applicants to unnecessary inconvenience and loss to defend their vested rights, and that there will be no security for the continuance of the Licence.

The present Licensing Act No. 18 of 1897 and its amendments are, in comparison with the Ordinance No. 4 of 1922, a better measure in that the decisions of the Licensing authority are subject to an Appeal Board specially constituted for the purpose, of which the members are at present a retired judge as a Chairman, a retired Attorney General, and a retired Registrar of Deeds, and this Appeal Board is a check on the actions of the Licensing Authority, and in the interests of both the applicant and the objector, whereas the proposed Licensing Board or Boards constituted of five Europeans will be a law unto themselves without a check from an Appeal Board or the Supreme Court except in case of renewal; or irregularities in procedure which in practice is difficult to establish.

We regret to have to say from experience, in respect of which we quote a number of cases from among the many with which the Natal Law Reports bristle, indicating the discrimination to which Indians have always been subjected to at the hands of the Licensing Authorities, even as they are at present constituted, and under the proposed Ordinance the position and existence of Indians, as traders, will be hopeless.

1. *Bodhanya vs. Estcourt Licensing Board and others*: 34 : N.L.R. page 543. The Supreme Court ordered the issue of the licence which had been refused on the ground that if such a licence were granted applicant's landlord, a European, would close down the store, and this was undesirable. The Supreme Court holding that this did not constitute a reason for refusal.

2. *Ebrahim vs. Estcourt Division Licensing Board and others*: 34 : N.L.R. page 289. The application was granted by the Licensing Officer and refused by the Board on appeal by the objectors, the grounds of the Board's refusal not being stated as grounds of objection, and no evidence having been taken thereon, and where one of the members of the Appeal Board took part in the hearing although it was proved in a case where a licence was asked for by an Asiatic, he signed an objection considering an Indian store in that vicinity would be "a demoralising influence."

3. *Naik vs. Pietermaritzburg Licensing Officer*, 39 : N.L.R. The Borough Licensing Officer after being ordered by the Town Council to issue a licence refused to do so unless and until the applicant

registered with him a thumb impression, notwithstanding the applicant was an educated Indian, and was able to read and write as well as converse in the English language. The Court held that Rule No. 7 of the Regulations under the Dealers Act providing for the taking of thumb prints was *ultra vires*.

4. *Veeramah vs. Pietermaritzburg Licensing Board*: 37: N. L. R. page 236: The Supreme Court quashed the proceedings on the ground that the Licensing Officer had refused to exercise his discretion under the Act, the reason for the Licensing Officer's refusal of the application for a Hawker's Licence was that there were already a sufficient number of Asiatic licences which entitled them to trade within the European area, and that it was undesirable that the number should be increased.

5. *Kawa vs. Licensing Officer, Pietermaritzburg*, 38: N. L. R. page 179: The Licensing Officer in this case made it clearly known that he would not transfer a licence held by any Asiatic to a firm consisting of the holder and his two sons, who had entered into partnership, the reason being that the licence would thereby be perpetuated.

6. *Karodia vs. Dundee Chamber of Commerce*: 39: N. L. R. page 237: In this case the applicant, an Asiatic applied for a transfer of a licence to the other premises in the same street. The application was opposed by the Local Chamber of Commerce which body unanimously resolved to engage an attorney to oppose applications for licences by Asiatics. The Licensing Officer granted the application, and the Chamber appealed to the Town Council. At the hearing before the Town Council a preliminary objection was taken to certain Councillors sitting, on the ground of their interest as members of the Chamber of Commerce, and parties to the resolution to oppose Asiatic Licences. With the exception of the Mayor the recused Councillors retired from the meeting, leaving a bare statutory quorum of four including the Mayor. The Council reversed the decision of the Licensing Officer, and on appeal the Supreme Court set aside the proceedings because in substance and in fact the circumstances afforded reasonable ground for suspecting the Mayor of being biased.

7. *Solman vs. Durban Corporation*, 19: N. L. R. page 70: In this case the Licensing Officer had refused the licence and on appeal to the Town Council the record and the Licensing Officer's reasons for decision were refused to the applicant. The applicant to the Court for an order to have the proceedings set aside, and in the course of the judgment Wragg J. stated: 'The question is whether the proceedings were conducted regularly or not. In my opinion the act of the Town Council was most oppressive.' Mason J. in his judgment stated: 'The proceedings are not only oppressive but are a disgrace to the Town Councillors.'

8. *Mahom Goolam vs. Pietermaritzburg Licensing Board*: 31: N. L. R. page 225: The Supreme Court set aside the decision of the Licensing Officer and the Pietermaritzburg Town Council on the ground that the requirement of the Licensing Officer, namely, that the applicant who was, at the time, in India, should appear before him within four days, was an arbitrary and unreasonable condition of the power conferred.

9. *Sadi and Ahmed Jan vs. Licensing Officer*: 30: N. L. R. page 224: The Court granted applicant a retailer's licence which had been refused by the Licensing Officer on the ground that the applicant should have applied for a retail licence.

10. *Ebrahim vs. Licensing Board, Ladysmith*: 32: N. L. R. page 140: Applicant, a hawker then absent from Natal, applied through his agent for the renewal of his Hawker's Licence. The application was refused by the Licensing Officer on the ground that the applicant had not appeared in person, and the Supreme Court ordered a renewal of his licence on the ground that there was no evidence to show that the applicant

had been required to attend.

The foregoing cases also illustrate the manner in which Licensing Authorities have exercised the unfettered discretion vested in them to the inconvenience of and loss to Indians.

Taking the present Ordinance as a whole we see no necessity for the proposed Ordinance, which interferes with the rights, and is in its principles and intentions a measure calculated to place unlimited powers in the hands of a Board or Boards of five Europeans to control the issue of licences in all Rural areas regardless of the major portion of the population of such areas being non-European. The measure tends to create a monopoly of the Licensing system in favour of Europeans among whom aliens will benefit to the exclusion of British Indian subjects.

Last year a similar measure was passed by the Provincial Council notwithstanding our opposition to the terms of it, both by petition and before the Select Committee but the Ordinance was vetoed. The Ordinance now under discussion is practically the same measure except for some amendments. We again petitioned against it a copy of which petition is annexed hereto; but the Ordinance without being referred to a Select Committee has been passed by the Provincial Council.

We would suggest that any Ordinance introduced in regard to licences should be in the direction of effecting improvements in regard to:—

- (a) The grounds on which a licence may be refused should be laid down in law.
- (b) The right of appeal in all cases should lie to the Supreme Court, and
- (c) The reasons on which a Licensing Officer forms his decision should be placed on record at the time of refusal or otherwise.

TOWNSHIPS FRANCHISE ORDINANCE

With reference to the Ordinance entitled to amend the Local Townships Law No. 11 of 1881, we object to it on the following, among other grounds, namely:—

1. The Ordinance is *ultra vires* the powers of the Provincial Council.
2. That the Ordinance discriminates on racial grounds between inhabitants who are residents and conform to the law and are subject to the same taxation, and deprives British Indians of existing and future rights.
3. The British Indians have no direct or indirect representation in the Legislatures to safeguard their rights, and if the present measure becomes law British Indians in local townships will receive little or no consideration at the hands of the town Boards, and even under the existing conditions the interests of Indians, as rate payers, are neglected.
4. The British Indians enjoying the Local Townships franchise have manifested restraint and discretion in the exercise of such franchise.
5. That the saving clauses in the said Ordinance do not in themselves justify the deprivation of the inherent rights of Indians as British subjects.

That during last year a measure in similar terms was introduced into and passed by the Provincial Council against which Indians gave evidence before the Select Committee and the Governor-General was pleased to veto it, but on the re-introduction of practically the same measure into the Provincial Council this year, we again submitted a Petition, a copy of which is annexed hereto, to the Council objecting to the passage of the said Ordinance which was not referred to a Select Committee, but Counsel on behalf of the petitioners was allowed to address the House; a copy of which address is annexed hereto.

The Ordinance notwithstanding objections raised to it was passed by the House practically without discussion.

DURBAN LAND ALIENATION ORDINANCE

With reference to the Private Draft Ordinance to grant additional powers to the Town Council of the Borough of Durban in respect of the alienation of, or other dealings with, immovable property belonging to the said Borough, we beg to object against it on the following among other grounds, namely:—

1. That the said Ordinance is *ultra vires* the powers of the Provincial Council.
2. That it is unjust and inequitable to differentiate between rate payers and burgesses in the Borough and to place extraordinary and novel powers in the hands of a Town Council.
3. That it is un-British to deprive British Indians of their existing, just and inherent rights as British subjects.
4. That the policy of racial segregation is retrogressive and detrimental to the progress of human beings in that:—
 - (a) It restricts the liberty and freedom of movement of man and his development to the highest degree.
 - (b) It treats conditions that make for the herding of human beings with the undesirable consequences of greater impoverishment, insantiation, ill-health and over-population.
 - (c) That where the power of legislation and administration is vested in a certain section of the people to the exclusion of others there more often than not follows neglect of the interests of the people excluded from representation on the legislatures and kraals within limited areas.

On the publication of the Private Draft Ordinance, notice on the 3rd. May was given to the Clerk of the Provincial Council of our desire to be informed of the date of the sitting of the Select Committee. Copies of this letter and his reply of the 5th May that we would be duly notified are attached hereto, as also of the petition against the said Ordinance, and of the guarantee for all expenses that may be lawfully charged in respect of our objection to the Durban Land Alienation Ordinance. Later developments are reflected in the letter of Mr. Harold J. Stuart, our Counsel in the matter, to which and other correspondence we beg to refer, copies of which are appended hereto.

Since our arrival in Cape Town we have been informed by our Congress that the Ordinance has passed the second reading.

We respectfully submit and urge that the procedure adopted by the Select Committee is not in keeping with the letter and spirit of the standing orders of the Provincial Council, and further, having regard to the fact that a deposit of £15 and a guarantee for all expenses in connection with our opposition to the said Ordinance had been accepted by the Provincial Council, and also specially in view of the attempt to deprive and restrict British subjects—though they be Indians—in a British country—in the enjoyment of the elementary rights in regard to land.

TO CREATE AND REGULATE CERTAIN LICENCES

In respect of the Draft Ordinance to create and regulate certain licences, we have petitioned against the said Ordinance asking for a hearing to so far as the Ordinance proposes to lay down:—

- (a) That a licence granted under Act No. 43 of 1898 shall not be capable of being transferred to any person not already named therein.
- (b) That the name of any persons shall not be added to a Licence.
- (c) That the Licences for Bakels and Bachelers are brought within the operation of Act No. 43 of 1898 and its amendment and
- (d) That the Administrator shall have the power to appoint an officer to prevent the exhibition at any theatre of any performance or scenic or pictorial representation which may, in his opinion,

be of a dangerous tendency for any class of persons which we fear may be applied on racial grounds to prohibit performances or representations which the officer appointed in terms of Sub-Section (b) of Section 10 of the said Ordinance while approving as suitable for Europeans will have a discretion to declare such performances or representations as unsuitable for Indians or any other class of persons according to his bias, whims, or fancies without any check upon his actions.

RACING AND BETTING ORDINANCE

In regard to the Draft Ordinance for the Regulation of Horse Racing and the Restriction and Regulation of Betting, and to impose certain taxation in connection therewith, we object against the said Ordinance in so far as:—

- (a) The power is given to Racing Clubs to exclude from the Course such persons or classes of persons as its rules may prescribe, and
- (b) The restriction of membership in a Betting Club to persons of European descent to the exclusion of non-Europeans.

But except for the two foregoing objections we approve the provisions of the said Ordinance which will in operation abolish 'Bucket Shops' and other forms of gambling, and place great limitations on Horse Racing and Betting.

We have lodged a petition, a copy of which is annexed hereto, and have also given evidence before the Select Committee against the said Ordinance in the manner indicated above.

We appeal in the name of the Indian Community of Natal to His Royal Highness the Governor General and his Honorable Ministers that they may be pleased to disallow the Ordinances objected to in view of:—

(a) The deprivation of and/or interference with, directly and indirectly, the just, existing and inherent rights of Indians as British Indians, being a breach of the assurances and undertakings given from time to time by the Governments in South Africa that Indians lawfully resident in the country will be fairly treated and their existing rights safeguarded, and this was also the understanding arrived at in 1914 between General Smuts and Mr. Gandhi.

(b) With the stoppage of Indian Immigration, free and restricted, and with the departures for India, and by the death of India born Indians—the Indian population will be South African born in character and that as the result of environment, education, and association Colonial born Indians (some of whom are already of the fourth generation) are becoming more and more anglicised though preserving their racial integrity and by way of analogy we would suggest that Indians given the opportunities and facilities would eventually be even as the Jews are: than whom there is no race more tenacious of its religion and yet they are South Africans for all practical purposes, identified with the progress and development of South Africa and proud of the land.

(c) The Indian Community being always willing and ready to discharge its duties and responsibilities, in peace as in War, and it will be remembered that in the Great War, as in past local Wars Indians offered to bear their share in full capacity, and that they did serve to the extent to which the Government was pleased to permit it though anxious to do more.

(d) There being no Indian representation directly or indirectly, in the legislative or administrative and we submit that the control and administration of our affairs are vested in the Governor-General, the Council, and in this regard we would mention that on the eve of the consummation of the Union of South Africa we were assured that the control and

administration of matters specially or differentially affecting Asiatics shall be vested in the Governor-General-in-Council, and we annex hereto a copy of the communication to us thereon by the then Under Secretary of Natal, Mr. A. W. Lester, dated 30th August 1909.

We again thank you, Sir, for the courtesy and patience with which you heard our representations

AMOD BAYAT, C. NULLIAH, SHEIKH AMEER,
LUTCHMAN PANDAY, SORABJEE RUSTOMJEE,
A. CHRISTOPHER.

Members of the Deputation of the Natal Indian Congress, representing the Indian community in Natal.

Cape Town,
12th June, 1922.

BOKSBURG ASIATIC BAZAAR

JUDGMENT AGAINST MUNICIPALITY

The question as to whether or not the Boksburg Municipality had a right to erect a fence around the Boksburg Asiatic Bazaar was decided by Mr. Justice Ward in the Rand High Court on the 14th instant.

The point was raised in the course of an action brought by Moosa Ismail Daya and Arjun Singh, merchants, carrying on business at the Boksburg Asiatic Bazaar, against the Municipal Council of Boksburg.

Dr. F. E. T. Krause, K. C., with him adv. H. Morris, appeared on behalf of the plaintiffs, Adv. J. van Hoytema, with him Adv. B. Smulian, representing the defendants.

The plaintiffs claimed an order compelling the defendants to remove portion of a fence erected round the Boksburg Asiatic Bazaar, and another order restraining the municipality from erecting such a fence. Further, they claimed alternative relief and the costs of suit.

Plaintiffs themselves are merchants carrying on business in the Asiatic Bazaar, which is an area set aside for Asiatics in terms of Law 13 of 1885 and Section 53 of Law 15 of 1898.

In their formal declaration plaintiffs pointed out that the area known as the Bazaar was set apart, main aimed and carried on by the defendants exclusively for occupation by Asiatics. It was controlled, in fact, and supervised by the defendant municipality in accordance with the Asiatic Bazaar Regulations.

UNDER MUNICIPAL CONTROL

On November 24th 1920, defendants assumed full control and supervision of this bazaar inspector to erect a fence across the public thoroughfares leading through the area. A fence with gates was duly erected by the inspector in accordance with his instructions.

In consequence of this, plaintiffs claimed that, should the municipality be permitted to proceed with and complete the erection of the fence and gates, they (plaintiffs) would suffer irreparable loss and damage to business. Further, their right of access to and egress from the Bazaar would be considerably curtailed and restricted. This would cause both loss and inconvenience.

On October 12 an order of court was obtained restraining defendants from proceeding with the erection of the fence until the present action should be decided.

In brief, the plaintiffs claimed confirmation of the order of court dated October 12, an order restraining defendants from erecting the proposed fence and gates, alternative relief and costs of suit.

In their plea defendants stated that the Boksburg Asiatic Bazaar was transferred to defendants under Section 10 of Ordinance 17 of 1905. In terms of Section 10 of Ordinance 17 of 1905, municipal rights for the purpose of extending the Bazaar, and per-

mission to erect a fence, were applied for and granted.

In July, 1921, defendants erected a fence around the Bazaar for the purpose of maintaining it and carrying it on exclusively for the occupation of Asiatics and also for the purpose of controlling and supervising the Bazaar in accordance with the governing regulations.

Defendants further contended that the fence was sufficiently provided with gates to admit of adequate and reasonable ingress and egress. It was denied that the plaintiffs suffered any business losses.

After argument, judgment was given for plaintiffs with costs.—*Rand Daily Mail.*

BOMBAY PROVINCIAL LIBERAL CONFERENCE

The first Bombay Provincial Liberal Conference was held in Bombay on the 6th and 7th May, the Right Hon. Srinivasa Sastri presiding. The following is the presidential address:—

THE RIGHT HON. MR. SASTRI'S ADDRESS

Mr. Sastri, who rose amid cheers said he would take as his subject the present situation, and what to do in the immediate future to relieve it. It was not his purpose at all to stir up dispute or utter a word which would embitter controversy, but certainly the Liberals had to make up their minds as to the character of the movement of which for the moment they saw the suspension. Now, the non-co-operation movement he would say at the outset had had the exceptional advantage of having from the very start functioned under the guidance of one whose character was above cavil and whose motives were beyond suspicion. (Applause). Such a movement naturally enjoyed great advantage. He must give here an unaffected tribute to the way in which his great prestige and popularity were lent, although for the time being only, to the great social causes that they had all at heart. For example, the elevation of the depressed classes, the removal of untouchability, the question of temperance including prohibition, and the old comprehensive subject, no less dear to their hearts than to those of others, of Swadeshi. This movement had caused destruction of much valuable property public and private, and the loss of many a life. It had indirectly been the means of the deprivation of the liberty of nearly twenty thousand of their fellow-countrymen. It had strengthened the hands of the executive who now employed the forces of repression almost without restraint. It had increased, rather he would say, it had given more than a decent excuse for the maintenance and increase perhaps of the military burden on the land. It had caused an outburst of ill-feeling as between races and or between communities, almost unparalleled in the history of this sore-stricken land. Then, strange to say, that so far as his own Presidency was concerned, it had not merely imperilled as it might have in other parts of the country, but had torn up by the root such friendly understanding as had existed between Hindus and Mahomedans. Then, again, it had been the indirect occasion of manifesting to the world how their people, when excited by angry passions, could be guilty of acts of cruelty and barbarity, scarcely compatible with that character, for spirituality which they wished to establish amongst the nations of the world, and scarcely compatible with the contribution which so many patriotic sons of India desired to make to the history of human civilisation. Then again, strange as it might appear, it had enormously increased such slave mentality as existed before in this country.

DOCTRINE OF NEGATION

It had demonstrated that their common people were lacking in the practical sense and political instinct which might protect them against caste and non-registration propaganda. Likewise, it had exhibited an

administration of matters specially or differentially affecting Asiatics shall be vested in the Governor-General-in-Council, and we annex hereto a copy of the communication to us thereon by the then Under Secretary of Natal, Mr. A. W. Lester, dated 30th August 1909.

We again thank you, Sir, for the courtesy and patience with which you heard our representations

AMOD BAYAT, C. NULLIAH, SHEIKH AMEER,
LUTCHMAN PANDAY, SORAJEE RUSTOMJEE,
A. CHRISTOPHER.

Members of the Deputation of the Natal Indian Congress, representing the Indian community in Natal.

Cape Town,
12th June, 1922.

BOKSBURG ASIATIC BAZAAR

JUDGMENT AGAINST MUNICIPALITY

The question as to whether or not the Boksburg Municipality had a right to erect a fence around the Boksburg Asiatic Bazaar was decided by Mr. Justice Ward in the Rand High Court on the 14th instant.

The point was raised in the course of an action brought by Moosa Ismail Daya and Arjun Singh, merchants, carrying on business at the Boksburg Asiatic Bazaar, against the Municipal Council of Boksburg.

Dr. F. E. T. Krause, K. C., with him adv. H. Morris, appeared on behalf of the plaintiffs, Adv. J. van Hoytema, with him Adv. B. Smuliac, representing the defendants.

The plaintiffs claimed an order compelling the defendants to remove portion of a fence erected round the Boksburg Asiatic Bazaar, and another order restraining the municipality from erecting such a fence. Further, they claimed alternative relief and the costs of suit.

Plaintiffs themselves are merchants carrying on business in the Asiatic Bazaar, which is an area set aside for Asiatics in terms of Law 13 of 1885 and Section 53 of Law 15 of 1898.

In their formal declaration plaintiffs pointed out that the area known as the Bazaar was set apart, maintained and carried on by the defendants exclusively for occupation by Asiatics. It was controlled, in fact, and supervised by the defendant municipality in accordance with the Asiatic Bazaar Regulations.

UNDER MUNICIPAL CONTROL

On November 24th 1920, defendants assumed full control and supervision of this bazaar inspector to erect a fence across the public thoroughfares leading through the area. A fence with gates was duly erected by the inspector in accordance with his instructions.

In consequence of this, plaintiffs claimed that, should the municipality be permitted to proceed with and complete the erection of the fence and gates, they (plaintiffs) would suffer irreparable loss and damage to business. Further, their right of access to and egress from the Bazaar would be considerably curtailed and restricted. This would cause both loss and inconvenience.

On October 12 an order of court was obtained restraining defendants from proceeding with the erection of the fence until the present action should be decided.

In brief, the plaintiffs claimed confirmation of the order of court dated October 12, an order restraining defendants from erecting the proposed fence and gates, alternative relief and costs of suit.

In their pleas defendants stated that the Boksburg Asiatic Bazaar was transferred to defendants under Section 10 of Ordinance 17 of 1905. In terms of Ordinance No. 17 of 1905, Art. 14 of 1905, all the rights as the owners of the Bazaar, and per-

mission to erect a fence, were applied for and granted.

In July, 1921, defendants erected a fence around the Bazaar for the purpose of maintaining it and carrying it on exclusively for the occupation of Asiatics and also for the purpose of controlling and supervising the Bazaar in accordance with the governing regulations.

Defendants further contended that the fence was sufficiently provided with gates to admit of adequate and reasonable ingress and egress. It was denied that the plaintiffs suffered any business losses.

After argument, judgment was given for plaintiffs with costs.—*Rand Daily Mail*.

BOMBAY PROVINCIAL LIBERAL CONFERENCE

The first Bombay Provincial Liberal Conference was held in Bombay on the 6th and 7th May, the Right Hon. Srinivasa Sastri presiding. The following is the presidential address:—

THE RIGHT HON. MR. SASTRI'S ADDRESS

Mr. Sastri, who rose amid cheers said he would take as his subject the present situation, and what to do in the immediate future to relieve it. It was not his purpose at all to stir up dispute or utter a word which would embitter controversy, but certainly the Liberals had to make up their minds as to the character of the movement of which for the moment they saw the suspension. Now, the non-co-operation movement he would say at the outset had had the exceptional advantage of having from the very start functioned under the guidance of one whose character was above cavil and whose motives were beyond suspicion. (Applause). Such a movement naturally enjoyed great advantage. He must give here an unaffected tribute to the way in which his great prestige and popularity were lent, although for the time being only, to the great social causes that they had all at heart. For example, the elevation of the depressed classes, the removal of untouchability, the question of temperance including prohibition, and the old comprehensive subject, no less dear to their hearts than to those of others, of Swadeshi. This movement had caused destruction of much valuable property public and private, and the loss of many a life. It had indirectly been the means of the deprivation of the liberty of nearly twenty thousand of their fellow-countrymen. It had strengthened the hands of the executive who now employed the forces of repression almost without restraint. It had increased, rather he would say, it had given more than a decent excuse for the maintenance and increase perhaps of the military burden on the land. It had caused an outburst of ill-feeling as between races and or between communities, almost unparalleled in the history of this sore-stricken land. Then, strange to say; that so far as his own Presidency was concerned, it had not merely imperilled as it might have in other parts of the country, but had torn up by the root such friendly understanding as had existed between Hindus and Mahomedans. Then, again, it had been the indirect occasion of manifesting to the world how their people, when excited by angry passions, could be guilty of acts of cruelty and barbarity, scarcely compatible with that character for spirituality which they wished to establish amongst the nations of the world, and scarcely compatible with the contribution which so many patriotic sons of India desired to make to the history of human civilisation. Then again, strange as it might appear, it had enormously increased such slave mentality as existed before in this country.

DOCTRINE OF NEGATION

It had demonstrated that their common people were lacking in the practical sense and political instinct which might protect them against crude and restricted propaganda. Likewise, it had exhibited the

experience and most sober judgment, to form a convention to which the Imperial legislature also contributed, and to charge it with the duty of framing a new constitution of India on the basis of the present one without the necessity of scrapping it, so that when it did produce a scheme it would represent the best wisdom and statesmanship available in India. When such a scheme came out of the ordeal of public discussion and criticism it would be really a wise, well-constructed scheme fitting in so admirably with the constitution that they already possessed, that it stood every chance of being accepted as practicable, proper and wise. Supposing further, to clinch the whole matter, if the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State acting together chose a deputation consisting of about ten men, whose names would command influence in English Parliamentary circles and if they went up with a scheme of that kind, he knew of no statesman in England or of a political body of any eminence who would treat their representation either lightly or contemptuously.

FAILURE OF DIARCHY

They all knew that the principle of diarchy was accepted by them under a sense of necessity. The system worked best in those provinces of India where the safeguards and the correctives upon which they insisted were most scrupulously observed. But in some places Governors, carried away by extra consciousness of their abilities, did not bring the two offices of the Government together as often as they should have done. Moreover, there was one thing, above all, which drew the harsh character of this dual government out and exhibited in a most glaring form. That was the visit of the Prince of Wales. He did not think there was any one there who desired it most enthusiastically. He certainly did not. He counselled against the visit as long as he could, but the visit came and what happened when the boycott of that visit was proclaimed by the non-co-operators? The result was that Government in order to make it a success against this opposition had to use all the arms in their control. They used all the repressive laws they could think of. The result was that even the liberal public and the moderate party stood out of that co-operation with Government in all that went to maintain law and order for which they had previously pledged their word. This had drawn into prominent relief the odious feature of diarchy. He mentioned this to show that through the action of Government itself the bad nature of diarchy had been brought out to the knowledge of everybody. Coming next to the Central Government, Mr. Sastri said he was one of those who pressed with the greatest insistence on the introduction of a certain element of responsibility in that Government, and he very much wished at that time that the Government had yielded to their wishes and placed the Imperial and Provincial Governments on a more or less paralled footing. During the eighteen months that the reforms had been actually in operation the Government had not been using the weapon of safety administration which they had been allowed under the Act even in highly provocative conditions and the Viceroy had gone out of his way to assure people that he would not use this weapon. Where the Viceroy had a discretion he always exercised it in favour of extending the power of the legislature. The system therefore of no responsibility in the Central Government had had this extraordinary result, that instead of confining the power to one item or two as it would have been if they had had responsibility, their power extended over the whole range of the functions of the Central Government. Now this was a development which he had not drawn from his ingenuity. It had been drawn in from official quarters in England where their constitution, young as it was, was being studied with attention and sympathy. (Applause.)

ANJUMAN ESHA-A-TUL ISLAM

The above Anjuman calls for tenders of their property at 230 Crabbe Street for Lease of a period of two years, from 1st September 1922. All tenders to be addressed to the Secretary on or before the 15th July 1922. For further particulars and a permission to inspect the premises apply to the Secretary Mr. S Emmamally, 113 May Street, Durban.

Indian Opinion

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

The subscription rate is 15s. od. for South Africa and 15s. 6d. for over sea.

‘ઈન્ડિયન ઓપીનીયન’ ના લેખકોને દર ત્રણ મહિના માટે રૂ. ૧૫-૦ અને દરિયાપારને માટે રૂ. ૧૫-૬ રાખવાનો આંવે છે. આ ફેરફાર હાલની કામગીરી અહત અને મારવાની લીધે કરવામાં આવ્યો છે

શ્રી ડીરા ઇન્ડિયા સ્ટીમ નેવિગેશન કંપની

સ્ટીમરોની ખબર

સ્ટી. “કોરોબા” તા. ૨૬ મી જુનના અરસામાં ઉપડશે
 સ્ટી. “કારાગોલા” તા. ૧૦ મી જુનના અરસામાં ઉપડશે.

વધુ ખુલાસો

શેખર હામિદ, ૩૭૦ પાર્કન સ્ટ્રીટ, બ્રમ્બર

ન સ્થળે મળવાથી અથવા મળવાથી મ મી કુશી.

અઠવાલિક પંચામ

ક્રમ	ખીરતી	હોલિ	મુસનમાન	પારતા	મુવત્તવ	કા. ની.
૧૯	૧૬૨૨	૩૬૭૮	૧૩૪૦	૧૨૬૨	ક. ની.	૦.
	જુન	જેઠ	સરાથ			
		અ.પ.ક	શ્રવશક			
શુક	૨૩	૧૬	૨૬	૧૭	૬-૫૬	૫-૭
કની	૨૪	”	૨૭	૧૮	૬-૫૬	૫-૭
સી	૨૫	શુક	૨૮	૧૯	૬-૫૬	૫-૭
સોમ	૨૬	”	૨૯	૨૦	૬-૫૬	૫-૭
મંગળ	૨૭	”	૩૦	૨૧	૬-૫૭	૫-૮
બુધ	૨૮	”	૩૧	૨૨	૬-૫૭	૫-૮
ગુરુ	૨૯	”	૧	૨૩	૬-૫૭	૫-૮