

It is suggested that in the event of Canadian seamen replacing the Chinese, the subsidy be increased, failing which it would be better for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to relinquish the subsidy altogether. The "brief" as published in "Harbour & Shipping" the official organ of the "Merchant's Exchange" is silent on the amount of subsidies paid to the C.P.R. although it does state the figures of that paid to the smaller fry. Therefore before we could pass an opinion on this question it would be essential to have the figures. Further the question of abandoning the C.P.R. trans-Pacific services is raised, and a note of concern sounded for Canada in general and the port of Vancouver in particular should such an event happen. We do not think this would happen even without subsidies. The business is too profitable.

It is claimed the "employment of orientals" is not merely a Canadian question, and the plea advanced that orientals are employed on services from Europe to the Orient. We state this is no argument, that the question here is purely Canadian-C.P.R.-Oriental. We may state that no orientals are employed on the ships of the following European nationals:—Norway; Sweden; Finland; and Italy. Britain is the most extensive employer of oriental seamen, yet our information at present is that Britain is in the process of eliminating the orientals to some extent.

It is claimed that American ships employ Filipino and Negroes, the implication apparently being that this is cheap labour. Such is not the case, for where these co-operate with organized labour, they are paid the same wages as White American seamen, therefore the question of cheap labour does not arise.

It is further contended that the Orientals employed on C.P.R. ships are "British subjects" being engaged in "Hong Kong," this is a question that is open to serious doubt, our information is that these "Chinese" come to Hong Kong from various parts of China and pass themselves off as "Hong Kong Chinese." This being facilitated by Chinese employment agents at Hong Kong.

The "brief" continues "we have reserved as our final argument the strongest pleas which can be adduced—namely the probable harmful effect on Canada's relations with China if the proposed restriction were imposed."

What does this mean? Is it an admission that the Oriental seamen in question are Chinese subjects. We so think, in view of the previous contention that they are "British Subjects." If they are, we fail to see how their replacement by Canadian seamen would in any way disrupt Canadian relations with China. With regard to the boycott of Japanese by China some years ago it arose out of extraordinary conditions, which are in no way relevant to the present question.

The "brief" continues: "We very much fear (in fact it is almost certain) that were Canada to affront China by refusing to employ Chinese on the vessels concerned" it would have some ill effect on trade between the two countries. It is difficult to understand how such a situation could come about, and still more difficult to reason that "China" would consider the employment of Canadian seamen on trans-Pacific ships an "affront" to her or her nationals in view of the large number of her nationals already employed in Canada. Seemingly the sponsors of the "brief" under review, are reluctant to, and apparently careful not to affront the Chinese, but have no hesitation in affronting Canadian seamen by virtually telling them they should starve quietly on the beach, that is all the argument amounts to.

The "brief" continues: "A service such as this must be regarded as international and not national in character." "Chinese patronize it as well as Canadians" both as passengers and as shippers." We will reverse some of this by saying, "Canadians patronize it as well as Chinese." But seemingly