

for evangelizing these same pagan hordes were a hundred-fold more favorable than they were in China.

Mr. F. W. McCALLUM, B.A., of the Congregational College, supported the affirmative. He called attention to the fact that the immigrants were males only, and that they were content with low wages and low lives. He minutely analyzed the result of a large influx of them, showing that by their presence wealth was largely and rapidly increased and society differentiated into sharply defined classes. Thus the Chinese supplanted whites in ordinary occupations; the whites opened up new industries only to be invaded in turn by the Chinese; those white laborers who continued as laborers were dragged down to the level of the Chinese, while property owning whites were lifted immeasurably above mere laborers; and the class of property holders became fewer and richer every year. So that in the ultimate analysis there were three classes, as there were in the Southern Slave States:—1. Property-holders and professional men. 2. Chinese laborers (males only). 3. Wretched whites. As the ultimate result of all this the middle classes were obliterated, democratic institutions were destroyed, humanity—the Chinese included—in no way benefited, and the country's manifest destiny unfulfilled. A wise restriction, he contended, could alone prevent these evils.

Mr. C. E. MANNING, of the Wesleyan College, replied for the negative. He depicted the Chinaman as the most industrious, peaceful, sober and law-abiding immigrant in the land, and undertook to show that when his means allowed he lived, not on rats, but on the best in the market, and always paid his debts. He maintained that labor, not money, constituted capital, and that if the land were filled with gold while there were no laborers, the land would be poor indeed. By employing cheap labor the manufacturer could sell his goods at greatly reduced rates and this would compensate the white laborer for his low wages, as well as prove a boon to the struggling widow and helpless orphan. By preserving an attitude of friendliness toward China they would find an extensive market for their manufactures and thus reap untold wealth. Finally, the Chinaman was a brother and should be treated as such.

Mr. JOHNSON in closing the debate, said he considered that the leader of the negative had fallen into the fallacy of identifying the affirmative speakers with those who advocated exclusion and encouraged mob law, to both of which he was opposed, and both of which those favoring restriction sought to remove by proper legislation. The accusation of unfair discrimination against China he met by characterizing the immigrants as paupers, since two-thirds of those who came out had received an assisted passage, and this class of immigrants was in fairness excluded, no matter what land they came from. He dealt also with the moral argument showing that they were only carrying out the principle of the golden rule in restricting dangerous immigration and that the Chinese Government would assist them in doing so.

The CHAIRMAN, after twice calling for a show of hands, announced victory for the affirmative amid tremendous applause, during which the debaters rose and shook hands.

After a vocal duet by Messrs. Read and Lee, of the Congregational College, the Chairman made a few appreciative remarks and the meeting concluded with the L. M. Doxology, and the Benediction pronounced by Principal MacVicar.

D. L. DEWAR.