

coal, they are clearly in the wrong. If they do not, they ought to say so now, to prevent the indulgence by certain classes of false hopes with the certain penalty of disappointment. Though it is not possible to state what the details of a proposed tariff will be, it is possible to say whether the general principle of taxing raw materials is to be adopted or rejected; and on so vital a point there ought to be no doubt or uncertainty.

IMMIGRATION TO CANADA.

While the general and several of the local governments are giving money to aid emigrants in coming hither, British Columbia has commenced a war on Chinese immigration. To the refusal to employ Chinese on the public works the Local Legislature has now added an annual tax of \$40 a head. It is obvious that these two policies, so directly opposed to one another, cannot co-exist. At the same time, it need not be denied that there is a difference between Chinese and other immigrants, social and economic. The possibility of substituting Chinese for European labor, at Chicago, is but a foretaste of one of the labor problems of the future.

At present it is not possible to discriminate between different kinds of labor that may seek employment in this country. The select committee on immigration and colonization at Ottawa, last session, deemed it a subject of congratulation that there was an increase of a little over five per cent. in the number of immigrants compared with the year 1876, the numbers being 27,032 against 25,635; and it was right to take that view. Of course this is a large decline from the 50,050 which we received in that year of big figures, 1873. While this slight increase was observable the United States had to record a decline of immigrants, from 196,886 to 138,222, which is almost 30 per cent. But here the other side of the account has to be noticed. The larger immigration of 1876 added scarcely anything to the population of the United States; for nearly as many persons left the country as came to it. This backward flow of population arose out of a superior demand for certain kinds of labor on the other side of the Atlantic. The diminished emigration to the States and the slight increase in that to Canada are not considerable enough to warrant us in concluding that they are due to the fact that the facilities for obtaining cheap lands which now remain in the former country are less than in the latter. But this is a condition which is destined to tell largely upon the future emigration to the two

countries, and the advantage will be in our favor. Besides, a direct emigration from the States to Canada must, from the respective conditions of the two countries—the cheap rich lands of the former country being nearly all taken up—soon set in; and it will greatly surpass the stream that once poured into the west from New England, as the area from which the emigrants will be drawn is so much larger.

Why do we not leave emigration to flow in its natural channels? Are we not, in this particular, influenced by the policy of other countries? Australasia spends large sums in conveying emigrants to the antipodes; and we are controlled by the conditions of competition for labor which this policy creates. If we would get emigrants that others are inviting to Australia, we must offer them some such inducements as are open to them in other directions. In the competition Australasia slightly beats us, numbers being the guide; she having received from Great Britain last year 31,071 emigrants and 33,191 the year before.

Last year the immigrants we received are known to have brought with them \$632,269 in money and effects, and it is believed that the whole amount, if it could be ascertained, would be about \$1,000,000. How do we estimate the value of immigrants to the country? A Government that pays money to aid immigration may get the return either directly or indirectly. The general Government will get a direct return in duties on taxable goods; but the local Government have not the same resource. The return they get must be indirectly, arising from the additional wealth which the new labor creates. The national strength may, in this way, be greatly increased; and this gives birth to a political motive.

A country in the condition of Canada is easily glutted with certain kinds of labor. And this was feared in mechanical employments. As a necessary result emigrant agents had to be instructed to invite only female servants and agriculturists; but Mr. Trow's committee reports that mechanics who came got employment. We fear that statement requires some qualification.

The sums expended on immigration by the Dominion Government are considerable. In 1876, the amount was \$284,065, and last year it was \$183,672. If it is good policy in a Government to pay large sums in directing the current of emigration and increasing its source, which we cannot doubt, is it not equally allowable to give that labor a particular encouragement after it has arrived?

THE CO-INSURANCE CLAUSE.

Some of our insurance contemporaries in the United States are just now advocating the adoption of the co-insurance clause in fire policies, as a wise and conservative measure to prevent the demoralization into which it is conceded by all interested, the business of fire insurance appears to be drifting. For the information of those who may not exactly understand its purport, we may say, that the object of the clause is to limit the liability of the company insuring to a proportion only of the loss, say one-half, two-thirds, three-fourths, four-fifths, or such proportion as may be agreed upon, so that in no case shall the company be called upon to pay the whole of a loss, but that the insured shall in every case bear some share of the loss, or in other words be a contributor to the amount of loss incurred. By the insertion of this clause, it is argued, the *moral hazard* will be diminished, and the amount of premium received will bear a more reasonable proportion to the heavy losses the companies are at present called upon to pay.

By its adoption, there can be no question that a very large amount of loss now borne by insurance companies would be averted; were the principle understood and admitted that insurance was never intended to completely re-imburse, but only to assist by indemnifying a portion of the loss, there would be less difficulty in applying it to fire risks. This principle prevails in marine insurance—where, the value of a hull being declared, the insurance covers only a portion thereof—the amount of such proportion being governed by the value of the vessel, and in every case, whether the loss be total or partial, the owner bears an established proportion. We cannot see why the application of the principle is not quite as equitable in fire insurance as in marine.

The great difficulty in adapting this principle to the practice of fire insurance, would be, we apprehend, in ascertaining what proportion the insured should be required to assume. In a stock of goods, for instance, worth five thousand dollars, the companies might insist on their liability not exceeding three-fourths; but if the stock amounted to say three or four hundred thousand dollars, the insured might hesitate, on his creditors' account as well as on his own, to incur so large a proportion as one-fourth or one-fifth, and hence a sliding scale would require to be adopted which would be extremely difficult to determine, and in case of a small partial loss the application of the clause would save so