

ties. For instance, a Chinese owner of a restaurant cannot engage "white" waitresses, though this is common in other eating houses. Many factories are prohibited from employing Chinese workers, while prices are fixed in respect to agricultural products, so that the industrious Chinese farmers cannot sell their grain at slightly lower prices. The overseas Chinese now wish the merchants and others at home to realize their predicament and to bring pressure on the proper quarters for the abolition of the discriminatory measures taken against them. It is but fair that if Canada wants to make profit by selling her goods to China, she should not discriminate against Chinese within her borders nor exclude those going there on legitimate business.

Discrimination in South Africa

DISCRIMINATION abroad against the Chinese is so common and can be pursued with so much peace of mind that no country in which Chinese may be found hesitates to make living for them miserable or impossible. The country may be a Power or may be a bully, but the tactics used against the Chinese are largely the same.

We are literally "fed up" with the innumerable reports of the plight of the Chinese residing and trading in the foreign countries. In Dutch East Indies, we hear of the prohibiting taxation. In many other countries we hear of discriminating immigration measures against the Chinese traders and, more so, against the laborers. Even Chinese goods are subject to rigid restrictions. And, the latest, our attention is riveted by the appeal of the Chinese merchants trading in South Africa. For unknown reasons the British Union of South Africa has adopted a measure to stop issuing commercial licenses to Chinese merchants. Judging from the circumstances Chinese merchants abroad could be treated in whatever way the alien governments wish, regardless of treaty rights.

According to the report sent by the Chinese Consul-General in South Africa, the Chinese residing in that part of the world are

all merchants, whereas Chinese laborers had long returned to China. And according to the Commercial Treaty concluded between China and Great Britain, Chinese merchants would be accorded every facility to trade in that territory. On what legal grounds the measure was based we are at a loss to know.

China is known for her willingness to trade with Britain and her Dominions and in the treaty the latter have been accorded the "most-favoured-nation clause" and the privileges pertaining thereof. Alarmed by their threatened China market, both Britain and her Dominions have sent trade missions to investigate and China has been most sympathetic with the objects of their missions. By what incoherent turn of mind South Africa decides that Chinese merchants deserve such "reciprocal" treatment, both the Chinese Government and its people would be thankful to know.

China has shown the exporting foreigners countries, that without the help of gunboats, she could also manage to retaliate by economic weapons. Wielding of economic weapons may mean a little inconvenience to the Chinese but results reaped have many times proven the worthiness of the little inconvenience borne. The Chinese people usually take no delight in resorting to such unfriendly measures but they would always be counted upon to co-operate if circumstances were unmistakable that such should be necessary.

In addition to the protest the Chinese Government will lodge with the British Government, we would like to say this much for the Chinese merchants abroad. For the future of the British and Dominion markets in China, Chinese traders residing in the former's territories should be assured fair reciprocal treatment. Treaty rights should be respected. High-handed maltreatment must be checked. The usefulness of the trade missions sent would be greatly abridged if exasperating measures adopted against Chinese merchants were allowed to operate. For mutual benefit let there be mutual respect for trading rights. "To live and to let live": this is true also of merchants and industries.