

Indian Opinion

ઇન્ડિયન ઓપિનિયન

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN ENGLISH AND GUJARATI

No. 29—Vol XI.

SATURDAY, JULY 26TH, 1913.

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper
Printed by the Proprietor

IMMIGRATION ACT REGULATIONS

REGULATIONS under the Immigrants Regulation Act were gazetted on the 15th instant. They are divided into 31 Sections.

Of these, Sections 1 to 6 deal with the examination and control of vessels.

Sections 7 to 15 deal with the examination of passengers.

Section 7 provides that all passengers for ports of the Union shall ordinarily be examined at the ship's first port of call in the Union.

Section 8 provides that the examination of passengers shall be conducted by the Immigration Officer on board a ship or at such other place as may be convenient. Every person, before being permitted to land, shall be required to complete a declaration in the form set out in the second annexure.

Section 9 empowers the officer to require the passenger to write out the declaration himself as also to call in the aid of an interpreter.

Section 10 requires the officer to give notice to the master of the ship of those who have been found to be prohibited immigrants and thereafter the master is responsible for their safe custody.

Section 11 provides that all examinations shall be reduced to writing.

Section 12 authorises the officer to postpone examination in case of doubt.

Section 13 enables the officer to accept evidence that a passenger, on landing, can be supported by friends as sufficient proof that he will not become a public charge.

Section 14 reads as follows:—

"The immigration officer may require for the purpose of an application made in respect of a wife or child, under paragraph (g) of section five of the

parentage of the child, and that such testimony and such evidence is attached to such certificate together with such officer's finding thereon.

"The immigration officer may require any certificate mentioned in this regulation to be supplemented by satisfactory evidence as to the identity of the persons referred to in the certificate, and the immigration officer may, in any case of doubt, require such further evidence as may be necessary to satisfy him that any wife or child referred to in the certificate is such a wife or child as, under paragraph (g) of section five of the Act, is exempted from being considered a prohibited immigrant."

Section 15 authorises the officer to obtain a warrant for the arrest of a person who may be suspected of being a prohibited immigrant.

Section 16 to 18 deal with diseases and medical examination.

Section 19 is a long one, dealing with the procedure on appeal. It gives the form of notice of appeal. Pending appeal, the appellant may be received at a detention depot.

Sub-section (3) of Section 19, being rather important, we give in full as under:—

"If there be no board which ordinarily sits or is sitting or about to sit at his station the immigration officer shall also communicate with the immigration officer in charge by telegraph, and shall inform the appellant that if he desires to be present at the hearing of his appeal he will be required himself to pay for his passage by sea, or for this transport by land subject to such conditions as may be imposed and under escort approved by the immigration officer, and paid for by the appellant to and, if necessary, from the place at which the board having jurisdiction is to sit. On arrival at such place the appellant shall be dealt with as provided in sub-section (2) of this

Section 14 reads as follows:—
"The immigration officer may require for the purpose of an application made in respect of a wife or child, under paragraph (g) of section five of the Act, that such testimony and such evidence is attached to such certificate together with such officer's finding thereon."
Section 15 authorises the officer to obtain a warrant for the arrest of a person who may be suspected of being a prohibited immigrant.
Section 16 to 18 deal with diseases and medical examination.
Section 19 is a long one, dealing with the procedure on appeal. It gives the form of notice of appeal. Pending appeal, the appellant may be received at a detention depot.
Sub-section (3) of Section 19, being rather important, we give in full as under:—
"If there be no board which ordinarily sits or is sitting or about to sit at his station the immigration officer shall also communicate with the immigration officer in charge by telegraph, and shall inform the appellant that if he desires to be present at the hearing of his appeal he will be required himself to pay for his passage by sea, or for this transport by land subject to such conditions as may be imposed and under escort approved by the immigration officer, and paid for by the appellant to and, if necessary, from the place at which the board having jurisdiction is to sit. On arrival at such place the appellant shall be dealt with as provided in sub-section (2) of this section."
Section 20 provides that the immigration officer may require any certificate mentioned in this regulation to be supplemented by satisfactory evidence as to the identity of the persons referred to in the certificate, and the immigration officer may, in any case of doubt, require such further evidence as may be necessary to satisfy him that any wife or child referred to in the certificate is such a wife or child as, under paragraph (g) of section five of the Act, is exempted from being considered a prohibited immigrant.
Section 21 authorises the officer to obtain a warrant for the arrest of a person who may be suspected of being a prohibited immigrant.
Section 22 to 24 deal with diseases and medical examination.
Section 25 is a long one, dealing with the procedure on appeal. It gives the form of notice of appeal. Pending appeal, the appellant may be received at a detention depot.
Sub-section (3) of Section 25, being rather important, we give in full as under:—
"If there be no board which ordinarily sits or is sitting or about to sit at his station the immigration officer shall also communicate with the immigration officer in charge by telegraph, and shall inform the appellant that if he desires to be present at the hearing of his appeal he will be required himself to pay for his passage by sea, or for this transport by land subject to such conditions as may be imposed and under escort approved by the immigration officer, and paid for by the appellant to and, if necessary, from the place at which the board having jurisdiction is to sit. On arrival at such place the appellant shall be dealt with as provided in sub-section (2) of this section."
Section 26 provides that the immigration officer may require any certificate mentioned in this regulation to be supplemented by satisfactory evidence as to the identity of the persons referred to in the certificate, and the immigration officer may, in any case of doubt, require such further evidence as may be necessary to satisfy him that any wife or child referred to in the certificate is such a wife or child as, under paragraph (g) of section five of the Act, is exempted from being considered a prohibited immigrant.
Section 27 authorises the officer to obtain a warrant for the arrest of a person who may be suspected of being a prohibited immigrant.
Section 28 to 30 deal with diseases and medical examination.
Section 31 is a long one, dealing with the procedure on appeal. It gives the form of notice of appeal. Pending appeal, the appellant may be received at a detention depot.
Sub-section (3) of Section 31, being rather important, we give in full as under:—
"If there be no board which ordinarily sits or is sitting or about to sit at his station the immigration officer shall also communicate with the immigration officer in charge by telegraph, and shall inform the appellant that if he desires to be present at the hearing of his appeal he will be required himself to pay for his passage by sea, or for this transport by land subject to such conditions as may be imposed and under escort approved by the immigration officer, and paid for by the appellant to and, if necessary, from the place at which the board having jurisdiction is to sit. On arrival at such place the appellant shall be dealt with as provided in sub-section (2) of this section."

Out of (European)
year of 1910, £3,557 for Indian
in increase of £368; and £6,462 for the
of coloured children (an increase of £109).
100,000,000 gallons of beer, wine and
whisky is annually consumed in different countries.
That does this huge figure mean? asks a writer in
the *Indian Review*. It means that about ten billion
barrels of pure lead, the life blood of farmers,
is converted into poison, not for the good of the
society but for degradation and ruining it. What a
vast amount of capital and labour must be engaged
for producing this poison. The value in money of
this vast quantity of drink is at least £6,000,000,000.
A man should never be ashamed to own he has been
in the wrong, which is no sin; he may in other words be
wiser to say than to deny it. — Emerson.

the interests of the people of South Africa as a whole. He made these remarks in order that the hon. Senator Schreiner might, if he thought fit, reply to them, because, although one might differ from him, it was always interesting to hear him. (Hear, hear.)

Senator WOLMARANS asked why the Senator, in his amendment, had not stated "born in the Cape Province" instead of "born in South Africa," because the Cape Act was not intended to apply to the whole of South Africa. He agreed with Senator Potgieter that the amendment came to the same effect as the previous one moved by Senator Schreiner. He did not understand where Senator Schreiner found such a great difficulty; and he (Senator Wolmarans) must vote for the Minister's amendment.

Senator Colonel SANDGEMISTER said that the Cape law was clear that any person born in South Africa should be allowed to enter South Africa, and they must be slow to alter any law by which they might take away existing rights. Natal Indians had been allowed to enter Griqualand East, a part of the Cape Province, without hindrance.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR said he did not propose to trouble the House with a lengthy argument as to what constituted "vested rights." That question had been thoroughly gone into in the lower Courts and on appeal fully settled before a full appellate Court. The Minister went on to quote from the case referred to in order to prove that his (the hon. Minister's) amendment was framed in accord with the judgment of the Higher Court, as it there stated that the beneficiary under an Act must have availed himself of his privilege or it was not his "vested rights." He could not accept the amendment of Senator Schreiner, because it went too far. They would be having people come and say: I was not there at the time, but I might have been, therefore I claim the benefits of which I have not hitherto availed myself. He did not believe there was a single person otherwise than those who were under restricted conditions in Natal that would be affected by the Bill. It was not the intention to deprive them of any rights they may have acquired. Now, did the Cape want to include these coolies who would never have applied for such beneficiary rights unless their attention had been called to the fact? He did not think it would be fair to saddle the Cape with these people whom their own fellow countrymen here did not want—nor anybody else, except those large-hearted people who had a warm heart for the whole human race alike. He hoped the Senate would agree to his (the Minister's) amendment and in doing so they would be deciding in accordance with the highest Court of Law.

Senator POWELL said he did not think the vested rights of anyone in Natal were going to be affected or that the Minister's amendment was going to do an injustice there to coolies or anywhere else. Because a tradesman had been accustomed to import goods under a 10 per cent. tariff he could not reasonably plead that he had acquired trading rights, and complain that they were being taken when the tariff was increased. He thought they had to look at the matter from a common sense point of view. And for that reason he was sorry he could not support Senator Schreiner's amendment but would vote for the hon. Minister's amendment.

Senator SCHREINER said he appreciated the line of argument used by Senator Potgieter. He would like to point out, however, that in the case of a woman not domiciled here and who gave birth to a child: such child would have the full advantage of the rights given in the Bill, because the child born was at fault in regard to domicile and that was what the Bill contemplated when it was gazetted. Now that was to be altered and the Minister brings in the words "of parents domiciled in the Union." The principle of the Bill was being altered, because a child, although parents might be without rights when born in the Union, had in the first draft of the Bill those rights. It had now been altered and made to read:

"if the parents are domiciled in the Union." He spoke with a sense of responsibility from the communications he had received from certain quarters. That was one of the matters of importance in the Bill, and on it depended the quiet acceptance of the measure by the people who were affected—not only by the Indian and Mahomedan but everyone.

The CHAIRMAN then put the Minister's amendment, which read as follows: On page 10, line 21, to delete paragraph (e), and to insert the following new paragraph instead thereof: "(e) Any person born before the commencement of this Act in any part of South Africa included in the Union whose parents were lawfully resident therein and were not at that time restricted to temporary or conditional residence by any law then in force, and any person born in any place after the commencement of this Act whose parents were at the time of his birth domiciled in any part of South Africa included in the Union."

The amendment was declared carried.

(To be continued)

News in Brief

The following contributions to the Bazaar were unfortunately overlooked: Mr. Thambi Naidoo, a quantity of electroplate; Mr. Bharoochie, knitted bags.

The *Natal Mercury* understands that the Chief Immigration Restriction Officer (Mr. H. Colborne-Smith) relinquishes office at the end of the present month, after an uninterrupted period of service at the post in numerous responsible capacities approaching 32 years.

Germiston has now got an Indian Young Men's Association of which Mr. Bhawani Dayal is the President, Mr. R. Naidoo Secretary and Mr. C. R. Swami Treasurer.

Discussing the Government's troubles, a Pretoria correspondent to the *Natal Mercury* adds: And now Mr. Gandhi judges the time ripe to exert pressure on behalf of his fellow-Asiatics; and I have reason to believe he is politely intimating a revival of passive resistance in the event of a general strike, unless, of course, the Government concede what, from his point of view, are satisfactory terms.

[NOTE: As a matter of fact, Mr. Gandhi as has already been stated, has, in accordance with General Smuts' wish, refrained from taking any action because of the unexpected troubles of the Government.—Ed. I. O.]

In the Estimates of Expenditure of the Province of Natal for the year ending March, 1914, we find that the total vote for Education is £191,492. Out of this sum, £106,134 is allotted to primary (European) education; £83,557 for Native education (an increase from the last year of £6,450); £8,557 for Indian education (an increase of £868); and £6,462 for the education of coloured children (an increase of £109).

About 20,000,000,000 gallons of beer, wine and alcohol are annually consumed in different countries. What does this huge figure mean? (asks a writer in the *Hindustan Review*). It means that about ten billion bushels of pure food, the life blood of farmers, is converted into poison, not for the good of the society but for degrading and ruining it. What a vast amount of capital and labour must be engaged for producing this poison. The value in money of this vast quantity of drink is at least £6,000,000,000.

A man should never be ashamed to own he has been in the wrong, which is to say in other words that he is wiser to-day than he was yesterday. — POPE.

would swamp those already in the Province. He personally had told the Cape Indians that while he would protect their existing rights, he would not countenance the influx of any further Indians into the Cape Colony. The Indians were at one with him there, because they recognised that it was not to their interests to have more of their compatriots in the country.

Senator Dr. VILJOEN said he was of the same opinion as Senator Powell. In the Cape Parliament their idea was to protect the existing rights of the Indians already in the Cape Colony. He wanted to know whether a child born in Natal of Indian parents, after going to India, would be re-admitted to the Union. The hon. Senator put also a second point, which was inaudible.

Senator SCHREINER said that in 1904 the law in the Cape was that the restriction should not apply to persons, "domiciled in South Africa," and in 1906 it did not apply to those "born in South Africa." In 1906 the Cape Parliament had made that important alteration, and the right had been given, not by candidates for Parliament by means of election promises, but by an Act of Parliament.

Senator POWELL said that, with all deference, he did not see how an Act passed by the Cape Parliament, established the rights of coolies in Natal. He could vote for the amendment of the Minister with a perfectly clear conscience, although his hon. friend did not seem to believe it. (Laughter.)

Senator STUART said that Senator Schreiner's amendment wanted to maintain the rights of the Indians at the Cape.

Senator CHURCHILL said that he did not follow the Minister in one particular point, and that was the question of domicile; and he asked if an Indian, who bought a plot of property in Natal, raised a family there, paid his licence every year, and intended living and dying there, was not domiciled in Natal. Were there not two classes of Indians, to one of whom the amendment applied, and to the other of whom the amendment did not apply? It was calculated that about half the coolies in Natal had come prior to 1895.

Senator Colonel STANFORD said it was quite clear that the words "South Africa" were used in the Cape Act, and he believed they were put in with the full knowledge of what they meant.

THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR said that what he wanted was to introduce a little common sense into the Bill, and he thought the common sense had been put by Senator Powell. The Cape made it perfectly clear that they would protect the rights of certain people, but was it to be thought that when they used the term "South Africa" they meant the whole of the country? They would not legislate for the rest of the country. The Cape was safe because they had the key to the door. The class of men who came into the Cape were of a superior class to the Natal indentured Indians, who were uneducated workers in the field. They would not have been allowed in the Cape. (Hear, hear.) He contended that there was nothing in the Bill that touched the Cape Indians, because they had been allowed to enter unrestricted and possessed full rights. There was a similar class also in Natal and other parts of the Union, who had been allowed in unrestricted, and they also would not be affected. But Senator Schreiner wished to give rights to people who hitherto possessed no rights.

Senator SCHREINER wondered whether any hon. Senator could boast of conviction after listening to the Minister. He was sure the Minister could not convince himself. The Minister contended that South Africa meant the Cape Colony as it appeared in the Cape Act. He would advise the Minister to deal with a large number of His Majesty's subjects in a more sensible way than that. In 1902 the Cape Parliament took the view that domicile should be the qualification, but in 1906 it took the wider view, and decided that birth should be the qualification. Under the Act of

prohibition. A person born in South Africa was exempted.

The House resumed in Committee on the Immigrant's Regulation Bill (clause 5 under consideration).

Senator SCHREINER said he had thought over the amendment, and would suggest the Minister's proposal with the addition of "In respect of the Cape province, any person born before the commencement of this Act in any part of South Africa included in the Union who has acquired rights under the provisions of Act No 30 of 1906, section 4, South Africa." He said this would protect the rights of the people whom they wish to protect, and would simplify matters.

Senator POTGIETER said that, as this clause dealt with the important principle of protecting the existing rights of people, and as it had become more important by reason of the debate and the introduction of Senator Schreiner's amendment, he thought it best not to record a silent vote on the matter, but to indicate the direction in which he was going to vote. He had not had much time to consider the present amendment handed in by Senator Schreiner, but it appeared to him that it really had the same object in view which it was intended to obtain by his previous amendment. If he followed the hon. Senator correctly yesterday, he thought his interpretation of the present law of the Cape Province was that any child—more especially he alluded to an Indian child—born in South Africa after that particular date had, by virtue of that birth, obtained a right of residence in the Cape Province.

Senator SCHREINER: No. Any child born in that time of parents who are not prohibited immigrants.

Senator POTGIETER: Yes, consequently it has the right of entry into the Cape Province. Proceeding, he said, therefore, it followed that in case, or, for instance, where an Indian couple, or an Indian woman, had illegally resided in any of the neighbouring colonies or States, and had a child born, that child, though the parents had no permanent right of residence in that particular colony or State where the child was born, and had even not the right to enter the Cape Province, would have obtained such a right. Well, with all due deference to the opinion of Senator Schreiner, he really could not associate himself with the interpretation. In the first place, he thought it was an accepted rule in explaining any law that one should make sure of that which was intended by the Legislature. Well, he could not, for one moment, conceive that the worthy legislators of the old Cape Assembly—liberal as they were in protecting the rights of and giving rights to people—had that idea of legalising or giving the right to anybody to enter the Cape Province who was considered illegal by the Legislatures of the colony or State in which such a person lived. He thought the hon. Senator was rather too extensive in his interpretation. He thought that they were certainly justified in using a little more common sense in taking into account the circumstances, and to act rather in the spirit of that law, and not exactly according to the letter of that law, and that was that the legislators of the Cape Province intended to say that whenever a child was born in the neighbouring provinces, or, as they were at that time, colonies or States, and even in the Cape Province, whether that child had the right of permanent residence in that particular colony or State, where it was born, such right would be respected by the Legislature of the Cape Province, and, consequently, that such a child would have the right to enter the Cape Province. He would go further, and say that if the law to which the hon. Senator referred was not so explicit on that point, the legislators of the Union Parliament, as he ventured to say, worthy successors of the legislators of the Cape Province, not only had the right, but were in duty bound to amend that law accordingly, and, consequently to act according to the wish and in the interests of the people of the Cape Province, including the Indian merchants and Indian electors, and generally thereby stu-

Senator GRAAFF was understood to say that the Imperial Government were satisfied with the previous Bill.

The MINISTER of the INTERIOR said that was so in regard to the main principle, but not as it applied to the clause in question.

The amendment was agreed to.

The clause as amended was agreed to.

On clause 5, Persons who are not to be deemed prohibited immigrants,

The MINISTER of the INTERIOR moved, on page 10, line 21, to delete paragraph (e) and to insert the following new paragraph instead thereof: "(e) Any person born before the commencement of this Act in any part of South Africa included in the Union whose parents were lawfully resident therein and were not at that time restricted to temporary or conditional residence by any law then in force, and any person born in any place after the commencement of this Act whose parents were at the time of his birth domiciled in any part of South Africa included in the Union."

Senator SCHREINER moved, on page 10, line 21, to delete paragraph (e), and to insert the following new paragraph instead thereof: "(e) Any person born before the commencement of this Act in any part of South Africa included in the Union, or born therein after the commencement of this Act if the parents of such person were there domiciled at the time of his birth." He submitted they were not justified in accepting the proposals of the hon. Minister, because it might be argued that the children of a coolie domiciled in Natal would be excluded from the provisions of the Act. They were born in South Africa, and as such had the privilege of going into the Cape Province without let or hindrance. His hon. friend's (the Minister of the Interior) amendment did not preserve the existing rights of those people. A child born here and whose parents might merely have been passing through the country with no intention of becoming domiciled was nevertheless South African born and as such could demand the privileges of citizenship. He (Senator Schreiner) maintained that they were bound to recognise existing rights under the law which the present legislation was to supersede. He could not accept the hon. Minister's amendment, because he thought they ought to err on the side of retaining the rights of the people. He did not wish it to go forth that the Union Government were taking away the rights of those who were in possession of them before the Bill was passed. It was one of the points on which Indian opinion was dwelling and he would ask his hon. friend not to press his amendment.

Senator POWELL said he would be glad if the hon. Minister would inform the Senate what persons or classes were contemplated by the words "residence."

Senator SCHREINER said he could not say because it

was it proposed now that these rights should be taken away? He thought that was what Senator Schreiner's words came to. Was it proposed that if these children had been born, and lived, in the Union for a few years and had acquired certain rights, these rights were to be taken away under that Bill?

Senator STUART said he was quite at one with the object of the Minister, and he believed Senator Schreiner was also. His difficulty was in regard to the wording of the amendment. He thought the Minister meant by "lawfully resident," domiciled; and he therefore thought the Minister should substitute "domiciled" for "lawfully resident." That would meet the case.

Senator WOLMARANS agreed with what the Minister had said, and observed that that Bill was not even strict enough. He could only agree that those who had existing rights should have them preserved to them, but considered that no rights should be given to those who did not now possess them. He would, therefore, vote for the Minister's amendment.

Senator LANCE could not understand why the Minister could not be a little more liberal, and give a fairer interpretation to the words. It was perfectly clear that under the Cape Act anybody born in this country, whether European or not, had the right of entry into this country. If they repealed that Act they were depriving some people of their rights. He could not see why the Minister could not go further than he intended. As regarded the indentured Natal Indians, under clause 6 of the Natal Act, 17 of 1895, such persons could go on living in the country on payment of an annual licence of £3. Why should their children be penalised? The amendment of the Minister deprived people of existing rights.

Senator SCHREINER said he did not hear the Minister say that there were no existing rights. He confined himself to showing that his (Senator Schreiner's) proposal might be construed as giving rights. There was point in the Minister's criticism that persons under his proposal would have rights in Natal that they did not possess hitherto. He would only say that the Bill as gazetted gave them still greater rights. He was quite willing to amend his amendment so as to protect existing rights only, and to that end he would move the prefixing of "in the Cape Province" to his amendment. It would then only apply to the rights held by persons in the Cape Province. Proceeding, the hon. Senator pointed out to Senator Stuart that the Cape Act exempted "persons born in South Africa." That, he thought, might be considered too wide now, as "South Africa" would be taken to mean the whole of the Union. His words "In respect of the Cape Province" would make it clear that he did not wish to interfere with other Provinces. The proposal of the Minister did deprive people of existing rights. It would deprive the Natal indentured Indian who was paying the licence of his right to re-enter the Union. He felt sure that the Minister had paid no attention to that aspect of the matter when he made a solemn declaration that the State was consenting to the Bill, and that all other provinces, not only in the Union but throughout the Free State.

Senator SCHREINER said that his four women of Bloemfontein go to gaol, rather than submit a day's imprisonment of their children to the gaol.

Our readers will be glad to learn that Miss S. Schreiner was the recipient during the week of a gold medal from the Johannesburg Shorthand Writers Association, for her services.

From the Editor's Chair

MAN AND BRUTE

"The Law of the survival of the fittest is the law for the evolution of the brute, but the law of self-sacrifice is the law of evolution for the man."

A KIND friend has sent the above quotation from Huxley. At the present moment it is very seasonable. We see on every hand that the law, so far as it is applicable to the human family, is being systematically broken. To go no further than the boundary of the Union, Labour is just now engaged in a deadly struggle with Capital, the British party (practically) against the Boer party, an extreme section of the Boer party against the moderate section. None of the opposing parties show any spirit of self-sacrifice. That yielding to fear and force, one or the other may, indeed will, have to give up something, is a fact. But that compulsory giving up is no self-sacrifice. The latter means a voluntary surrender. Jesus laid down the same law in much more forcible and graphic language. He said that, if a man took away one's coat, one was to give up one's cloak also, or that, if a man smote one on the right cheek, the left was also to be turned to him. Again, the same law is given in different terms in the Song Celestial thus:—

"Spike PRAJAPATI:—In the beginning when all men were made, and, with mankind, the sacrifice—"Do this! work! sacrifice! Increase and multiply with sacrifice. This [sacrifice] shall be your Cow of Plenty, giving back her milk of all abundance."

Tested, then, by this law, it seems clear that modern civilization (for the condition of Europe and America which are the repositories of that civilization is no better, if it is not worse, than that of South Africa) is based, not upon the human law of self-sacrifice, but, upon the brutal law of the survival of the fittest (the fittest here evidently meaning physically the strongest) and that, therefore, it is inherently defective.

The basis of self-sacrifice is love. A mother loves her child and sacrifices herself for it. Jesus bade us love our enemies—a hard task! But there is no escape from it. A mother's love for her child may be selfish. The Asian prophet did not flinch from the logical consequences of the truth he gave us. To him, Love embraced the whole of humanity. Family affection and national patriotism were not enough. He, therefore, took an extreme illustration, so that we

not sophistically get out of what might to us be awkward situations. It does not seem to be a case of the Union, who had been...

country in five minutes' walk, and had few wants, almost no furniture for instance, and no servants, and studied the (difficult) arts of enjoying life, and finding out what they really wanted: then I think we might hope civilization had really begun!"

The Senate Debate

We give below the full report, from the *Cape Times* of the 10th June, of the debate in the Committee and Consideration stages of the Immigrants' Regulation Bill in the Senate.

The House went into Committee on the Immigration Regulation Bill.

On clause 3, Restriction of jurisdiction of courts of law in respect of detention or removal of alleged prohibited immigrants,

Senator SCHREINER moved as an amendment, in line 18, after the word "may" where it occurs for the first time, to insert the following words, "call for further information to be supplied by the Board if the Court shall deem such information necessary and may"; in line 18, to delete the word "thereon," and to insert the words "on such case, supplemented by such information, if any," instead thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The clause as amended was agreed to.

On clause 4, Who are prohibited immigrants,

Senator SCHREINER moved as an amendment, in line 11, after the word "Minister," to insert the words, "or by an immigration officer acting pursuant to directions from the Minister."

The amendment was agreed to.

The clause as amended was agreed to.

Senator GRAAFF said that he would like sub-section (2) of clause 4 deleted. It read as follows: "Nothing in sub-section (1) (a) contained shall be construed as enabling a person to be deemed a prohibited immigrant in the Cape of Good Hope or Natal if, being at the commencement of this Act lawfully entitled to reside in any Province, he shows or has shown that he is able to comply with the requirements described in section 3 (a) of Act No. 30 of 1906 of the Cape of Good Hope, or of section 5 (a) of Act No. 30 of 1903 of Natal." He said that he could see great difficulty arising in future in the Cape Province if that sub-section went through, because, if under that part of the Bill there was a great influx of Asiatics, it would have a very serious effect indeed. If they wanted to safeguard the Cape Province, they should not let that part of the clause remain. The Orange Free State had been safeguarded.

The MINISTER of the INTERIOR said that the great bulk of Indians in Natal would be the condition set by the Cape, although... at... educated Indians might... should... that... provi... states, and... d be... and he... are... resp...