

[045]

B. C. PRESS CLIPPING BUREAU
VICTORIA, B. C.

VANCOUVER DAILY PROVINCE

29/1-12

WOULD SUE TORONTO PAPER FOR LIBEL

Dr. Sunder Singh Objects to
Statement that Hindus
Are Seditious.

Toronto, Jan. 29.—Dr. Sunder Singh intends taking advice with a view to obtain legal redress for a statement appearing in a Toronto paper on Saturday charging members of his race in British Columbia with sedition.

"I am ignorant of your laws," he states, "but I was born a British subject, and I have faith in the teachings of my father that wherever the Union Jack waves there is justice. I propose to find out if loyal British subjects can be charged with sedition with impunity."

"A tissue of lies," and "absolutely false" was Dr. Singh's characterization of the majority of the statements published. It was as illegal, he said, for marriages to be solemnized, under the age of twelve in India, and as absurd for the writer to say that children are contracted for as early as three, as it is ignorant for him to speak of the "Jats" as a race separate from the Sikhs. The word "Jat" means farmer, and is applicable to all Hindus.

"All that we Sikhs are asking," he said, "is that those who have been here for years may be allowed to bring our wives and families. It can not be expected that a man will settle in Canada permanently if his wife is not allowed to join him."

Sikh women, stated their champion, have equal religious and voting rights with the men, in which respect he remarked that they were somewhat ahead of Canadians.

B. C. PRESS CLIPPING BUREAU
VICTORIA, B. C.

VANCOUVER DAILY PROVINCE

6-2-12

HINDU BONDSMEN
NOT ACCEPTABLE

Toronto, Jan. 29.—Dr. Sunder Singh intends taking advice with a view to obtain legal redress for a statement appearing in a Toronto paper on Saturday charging members of his race in British Columbia with sedition.

"I am ignorant of your laws," he states, "but I was born a British subject, and I have faith in the teachings of my father that wherever the Union Jack waves there is justice. I propose to find out if loyal British subjects can be charged with sedition with impunity."

"A tissue of lies," and "absolutely false" was Dr. Singh's characterization of the majority of the statements published. It was as illegal, he said, for marriages to be solemnized, under the age of twelve in India, and as absurd for the writer to say that children are contracted for as early as three, as it is ignorant for him to speak of the "Jats" as a race separate from the Sikhs. The word "Jat" means farmer, and is applicable to all Hindus.

"All that we Sikhs are asking," he said, "is that those who have been here for years may be allowed to bring our wives and families. It can not be expected that a man will settle in Canada permanently if his wife is not allowed to join him."

Sikh women, stated their champion, have equal religious and voting rights with the men, in which respect he remarked that they were somewhat ahead of Canadians.

B. C. PRESS CLIPPING BUREAU
VICTORIA, B. C.

VANCOUVER DAILY PROVINCE

6-2-12

HINDU BONDSMEN NOT ACCEPTABLE

Magistrate Shaw Voices Dis- approval of This Method of Securing Bail.

In the police court this morning the charge of taking part in an unlawful assembly, which was preferred on Monday against Leon Lotzcar and three other men, was amended and they are now charged with obstructing the police in the performance of their duty. The cases of three of the men were adjourned until next Tuesday and the bail was reduced from \$1500 to \$500. Bail in Lotzcar's case was not granted until after he had given his undertaking that while his case was pending in the court he would not take part in any public street meeting or attempt to speak in public.

"There must be good bondsmen on his bail," said Magistrate Shaw. "I may not be right, but I will not accept two Hindu bondsmen. It looks like an attempt to provide professional bondsmen and I do not approve of it."

John Simpson, the other man who was arrested on Sunday, appeared before Magistrate South on a charge of obstructing the police. He was arrested by P. C. Barker, who swore that the prisoner had refused to move on when requested to do so. The prisoner refused to take the oath in giving evidence in his own behalf. The magistrate will dispose of his case tomorrow.