

Look at the Southern States—says B. C.—a country of rich fertility and five crops a year! Why does white immigration refuse to go to the South? Why is land there the cheapest in America—cheaper than in B.C.? Because of a black shadow over the land. Do you want a black shadow in Canada?

As to the missionary argument, B. C. can hardly take that seriously. Missionaries do not go to India to colonize. They do not introduce white vices. They go at Canada's expense and give free medical and educational service to India.

"Why should a Sikh not marry a white woman?" There, again, you are up against a side of the subject that is neither violet water nor pink tea; but believe me—it is the vital side of the subject. The answer is—for the very same reason that the South objects to and passes laws against mixed unions among the races. These laws are not the registration of prejudice. They are the registration of terrible lessons in experience. It is not a matter of opinion. It is a matter of fact. When Booker T. Washington dined with President Roosevelt and the South raised great uproar, many people, (myself among them), in the North grieved and wondered. Why should a cultured gentleman and philanthropist, who happened to be black, not dine with the president? The South did not object to Booker T. Washington dining at the White House. *What the South feared was the effect of this fact on the lewd mind.* Was the fear justified? I had some women friends go to a theatre party in a Southern city the night that the news came out in the papers. There was a great deal of jostling among a noisy crowd of blacks at the door, when the ladies came out. When these women reached home and could see themselves in the light, they found their light dresses and opera cloaks soaked and covered with tobacco wads. That was the lewd man's way of showing that the great colored leader having dined with the great white leader, the great colored mob was as good as the great white mob. For the first time, I understood that rooted Southern prejudice. The same of the Sikh and the Saxon marriage! *What is feared is not the marriage of a Sikh who is a well-educated man, to a white woman, who knows what she is doing. What is feared is the effect of that union on the lewd Hindu, the effect on the safety of the average (not cultured) white woman and white girl;* and there is no one on the Coast, who has lived next to Asiatics, who does not know what that means in terms of fact that cannot be set down here. Are there two sides to this question also? Have the English not carried vices to India—"social garbage for our own lust and crimes"—as the labor leader put it? Yes—but what is that to Canada? We do not purpose poisoning the new young life of the province for the sake of the English soldier's vices—says B. C.

If Canada shuts her door to the Hindu, let the Hindu shut their door to Canadians. When we begin colonizing your country with "teeming millions"—says B. C.—shut the door! If you shut out our medical missionaries and our educators and our agricultural scientists—is that your loss or ours? We do not fear *your* educators and financiers and students from India—says B. C. We do not shut them out! We