

the Mother Country should have been depopulated long before the present time, through the rush of laborers to protectionist countries. That the opposite has been the fact, to a marvellous extent, everyone knows. The fallacy probably lies in the assumption that those to whom employment would be given by the industry established through the operation of the protective tariff, were doing nothing before the passing of the tariff, and would have continued to do nothing had that tariff not been passed, which is manifestly absurd. The very fact that importation is increased when the tariff is lowered or abolished proves that in its absence some other industry, more natural to the country, flourishes and produces the articles, of whatever kind they may be, which are sent out of the country in exchange for the imported commodities. Otherwise the importation could not be kept up. Instead of there being less employment in the country in consequence of importation, it is evident that there must be more, to the extent, at least, of the increase of labor caused by the exchange of productions. This is, of course, a very elementary bit of political economy, but it seems necessary to keep repeating it.

In his recent speech at Bangor, Maine, Governor McKinley, the author of the tariff which bears his name, seems to have involved himself in a maze of contradictions, which did not, however, prevent his party from gaining an overwhelming victory. At one moment he dwelt bitterly upon the fact that, for the first time in many years, the revenue, under the Democratic rule, had fallen below the expenditure; at the next he made capital out of the Democratic doctrine that reduced taxation means increased importation, and, consequently, increase of revenue. He denounced the free trade tendencies of the new tariff and proceeded to show how small was the increase in the free list. He pointed out how far the Act falls short of fulfilling the pledges of the party and meeting the views of the President, and yet vehemently denounced the Democratic leaders for proposing to continue the struggle for the improvement of a bill with which, he shows, they have every reason to be dissatisfied. But, above all, he takes a most pessimistic view of the effects to be wrought by the new tariff. He has no hope of prosperity during its continuance. In singular contrast with this are the cheerful views of Mr. Chauncy M. Depew, another leading Republican and probably the most influential man in the ranks of the party. Mr. Depew confidently predicts that the "settlement" of the tariff question is "the beginning of a new era of prosperity." He predicts, moreover, that no great change will be made in the tariff for long years to come. In this case, as in so many others, it will very likely be found that the truth lies between the extremes. It is improb-

able that any sweeping changes in the tariff will be made, or even agitated for in the near future. But it is pretty certain that what are, from the revenue-tariff point of view, very serious blemishes in the present schedule, will be fought against and removed one by one, until the whole is made less inconsistent and more scientific.

The armies of the Chinese and Japanese, which have been so long facing each other in Corea, have at last, it seems, come to close quarters. A battle of some magnitude has been fought, and the Japanese have been victorious. This is only what was to be expected, seeing that, to say nothing of the probably superior fighting qualities of the Japanese, and their more modern ideas and methods, they have the advantage in Corea, in every respect, saving, perhaps, the preference the native Coreans seem to cherish for the Chinese. As a matter of fact, it appears to be pretty well established that the Japanese rulers have been preparing for this war for many years, with the result that they are now able to confront their enemy with overwhelming odds in their favour, in respect not only to numbers, but also to military preparations of every kind. Their facilities for landing troops in Corea, and their promptness in doing so, even before war had been formally declared and their knowledge of the topographical character of the country, gave them, with other advantages, a superiority in numbers which seems to have enabled them to outflank and almost surround the Chinese force. But to whatever cause the victory is due, the fact—for we suppose this must be accepted as a fact, however reports from Chinese sources may modify or minimize it—that so complete a victory has been gained, and that the Japanese are, in consequence, enabled to fortify themselves in the country which is the bone of contention, will almost certainly give the Japanese an immense advantage in the future, especially so far as the possession of that country is concerned. It will be very difficult for China now to pour sufficient troops into the country to dispossess the victors. If Japan's real object was only to establish her claims in Corea, she may now content herself with completing her victory there, and acting mainly on the defensive until her antagonist is ready to come to terms. But it is likely that she is actuated by a much larger ambition and that China may yet be compelled to fight on her own soil for the integrity of her own kingdom.

The United States have made a treaty with China in which the Chinese Government consents—perhaps because it was useless to do otherwise; perhaps because it is not itself anxious for the expatriation of millions of its own people—that no Chinese shall be permitted to enter United States territory for a term of years. Such a treaty, no less than the harsh legislation which preceded it, opens some large ques-

tions of right and wrong. The same questions underlie the legislation of our own Parliament, which imposes a tax of fifty dollars upon every native of China who enters the Dominion. Rev. Principal Grant protested warmly against the latter, the other day, as unchristian, and so unworthy of a Christian country or nation. From the latter point of view there is seemingly a glaring inconsistency in the conduct of the man who, as a Christian, subscribes to a fund for the purpose of sending missionaries to China, to carry to its people the blessings of the religion which is believed to underlie and support our so-called Christian civilization, and, at the same time, as a politician, votes for the enactment of a law whose clear purpose is to prevent the Chinese from entering our country where they may enjoy to the full the blessings of this religion and this civilization. So far as we can see, the only ground on which this exclusion, for the American and the Canadian legislation have the same end in view, could possibly be defended on Christian principles, would be that the harm that would result to the people of these countries from the free admission of the Chinese would be greater in kind or degree than any loss that can result to the Chinese from their arbitrary exclusion. The Christian doctrine of human brotherhood, and its law of love would quickly settle the question.

Taking for the moment a wider, or as many will deem it, a narrower view of the question, and regarding it from the point of view of what we call natural right or justice, what conclusion shall we reach? We are not at all sure that any such distinction as we here attempt to make, is ethically valid. But let us assume, as so many seem to do, that a people in their organized capacity as a nation are justified in pursuing a policy of selfishness, such as would be repugnant to every higher notion of morality in an individual, by legislating simply for the promotion of their own interests in utter disregard of the effect upon others. Does it follow that any and every people are justified in the exclusion of immigrants from other countries, if they are persuaded, rightly or wrongly, that such exclusion will promote their own well-being? The question is a living one, for the American Congress is now restricting foreign immigration from every land, and many of its influential citizens are openly advocating measures for the still more rigid exclusion of incomers from other parts of the American continent and from Europe as well as from Asia. To many the question will scarcely seem an open one. Is not all our tariff legislation, for instance, based upon this same selfish view? And do not we in Canada carry it to such an extreme that we refuse to consider the effects of our tariff even upon our brethren in the Mother Country, for whom we are never tired of protesting our affection? And yet the theory logically