

relatives were residing, only because he had to tranship from Hong Kong for Vancouver.

6. On a recent occasion we had, here in Victoria, a pitiable spectacle of the impotence of law and justice when opposed by prejudice and persecution. It was the case of a number of Hindus destined to Seattle, State of Washington, from Calcutta via Hong Kong (that being the only available steamer route). They were refused admission into the United States, ostensibly on account of their creed, which, as was contended "sanctioned polygamy." On this pretext they were ordered to be deported. They were brought to Victoria, where, as British subjects in a British port, they desired to have their case tested and investigated by the Courts. They were refused permission to communicate with the shore nor were their Hindu advisers and friends in this city allowed access to them on board. When they attempted to assert their rights, as British Subjects, they were promptly placed in confinement by the Japanese officials of the vessel, "Awa Maru." When finally the Courts were moved on their behalf, not only was access to the men refused to one of Victoria's leading lawyers and K. C.'s and who was treated with disrespect, *but further, the writ of Habeas Corpus, issued under the signature of one of His Majesty's Judges, was set at defiance, and the men were carried off under conditions of "technical slavery" and without a hearing. It was stated as an excuse that they were still under the United States' control, but as everybody knows, there is a limit to even American and Japanese jurisdiction, and it certainly has no status in a British port.*"

Does Imperialism mean Canada for the Empire, Australia for the Empire, India for the Empire, or can there be two definitions for subjects of one and the same Empire? If there is but one recognized definition under the flag over which the sun is supposed never to set, then it is for us to see that *no injustice shall minimize the rights or privileges of that citizenship, whether the holder is black or white.*

The question therefore, which suggests itself, is this, viz.: Is it just, is it right, is it creditable, nay, is it even politic, that we, as subjects of one and the same realm, should condemn any of our