

for discussion was announced: *Resolved*—"That Chinese Immigration to America should be restricted."

Mr. ROBT. JOHNSTON, B.A., of the Presbyterian College, opened the debate by a statement of the question. He favored neither total exclusion of the Chinese nor an unmodified and unrestricted welcome to them. By proper legislation and moderate restriction the best interests of both Chinese and Americans would be served. The speaker first showed that by restriction no wrong would be inflicted on the Chinese since that country was well able to support its whole population and the government was not favorable to the emigration of its people. Next he showed that since those on the field of the trouble were the best judges of its effects, the Dominion Government would be doing a constitutional wrong to British Columbia by refusing to legislate in answer to the almost unanimous cry of the inhabitants of that land. The position that the Chinese were not true immigrants but parasites preying upon the resources of the land, and giving little or nothing in return, was next advanced, and then the speaker proceeded to show that socially the Chinese were harmful to our land since large numbers of them come from the pauper and criminal classes, and that such emigrants from any European country would be returned and no fault would be found with such action. Then came what the speaker considered his strongest argument, but which he had little time to develop. He showed that the Chinese as a people of a distinct color are a non-assimilable race; that as they could never be assimilated with the people of this land their presence in it as a foreign element would, sooner or later, endanger the prosperity and life of the State. It was absolutely necessary that the people of a land should be homogeneous. Finally, it was urged that the free admittance of the Chinese to our shores did not show beneficial results for them and had the effect of arousing a hoodlum element which was dangerous to our country.

Mr. J. H. MACVICAR, B.A., of the Presbyterian College, contended that restrictive measures were a sign of ingratitude. The Chinese had done good service in America in building railways, in developing the fruit-growing industry, in working mines which but for them would have been unproductive, and in the general efficiency of their domestic service. To show their gratitude, Americans had treated them as they do the canine population of their cities—imposed a tax for the right to be at large. Then restriction was *unjust*. It was not fair to discriminate against one particular nation. A missionary in China had been sheltered from the violence of a mob by the priests of a pagan temple; during the riots at Rock Springs a Chinaman had been refused similar shelter at the door of a Christian minister. These facts, he considered pictures in miniature of the present attitude of the two countries: pagan China throwing her doors open to America, Christian America slamming her door in the face of China. Were they going to let the Chinese follow the golden rule more consistently than they did themselves? The presence of the Chinese, it was said, corrupted American Society; but was restriction the remedy? Was it not rather the Gospel of Christ? They sent missionaries to the Chinese in their heathen homes beyond the sea to work in isolation and against overwhelming odds and yet expected their missionaries to win the heathen, not the heathen to win the missionaries. But what did they do by protecting themselves with restriction? They showed themselves *afraid to be missionaries in their own homes*—in their own Christian homeland—where the opportunities