

indignantly denounced. 'They are objected to,' says Mr. Gordon, 'by the saloon-keeper,' who gets no custom from them; by the indolent, whom they prevent from exacting exorbitant wages for a minimum of work; by agitators, who try to win the favour of the white working-man, and by others who are more or less influenced by those objectors. And yet, remove the Chinamen, and you disturb every industry in British Columbia; exclude their future immigration, and you increase the cost of working your future factories.' Yes, exclude them, and your factories will be 'future' for a long time. If there is one thing that British Columbia needs more than anything else in the world, it is abundance of labour. It has physical difficulties of no ordinary kind to contend with; torrents roaring for miles through gloomy canyons, seas of mountains, magnificent distances. There is no hope of its resources being developed unless abundant capital flows in; and capital will keep away while cheap labour is excluded or threatened. Can capitalists who have to pay mechanics \$5 a day compete with those who pay \$2?

The anti-Chinese cry anywhere is absurdly and fundamentally opposed to human rights; but the absurdity waxes to the zenith when we consider the very small white population of the very big Province, and the fact that those few whites are themselves comparatively recent immigrants. There are about 30,000 Indians, 10,000 whites and 5,000 Chinamen in British Columbia. There would be some show of reason in the aboriginal inhabitants saying to the others, 'you white and yellow strangers must go.' But though the red man beholds his favourite fishing grounds seized and the very graves of his forefathers grudged to him, he gives all the children of the Great Spirit kindly welcome. It is a party among the recently arrived whites that steps forward with the cry, 'this country is

ours; we cannot compete with the Chinese; the Chinese must go.' On what ground must they go? 'They are immoral,' it is piously answered. Why then do you not pass laws to exclude immoral people of every nationality? 'They work more cheaply than we.' But, though working men in former days smashed improved machinery on that ground, they do not dream of doing so now. Give then the Chinaman the same toleration that you extend to machinery. Do not smash him. Machinery is just what British Columbia needs. 'They pay in very little to the Government in the shape of taxes.' Lower Canadians have been accused of this same crime against Her Majesty's Exchequer. But both Chinamen and French Canadians pay more taxes than machinery at any rate. 'They will not become naturalized.' Do Englishmen, who go to China to seek their fortune, take out letters of naturalization there? Besides, what inducements do you hold out to tempt them to take such a step? 'They associate closely together and so control the market.' Is clannishness a crime, and rigging the market a Mongolian invention? 'They do not bring their wives with them.' If the men are insulted is it any wonder that they are slow to bring their women. I am almost ashamed to argue the question. One word on it ought to be enough. By what *right* do we propose to exclude from Canada men of any country who come offering to do honest work for us? Of all people in the world, how can we who believe in the unity of the race and the love of God for humanity listen with patience to such talk? And, with regard to what people can we entertain it with so little decency as with regard to the Chinese, who—to begin with—asked only to be let alone, and on whom we forced ourselves in the name of the rights of man. If the game of exclusion is to be played, the Chinese will be delighted. They have no doubt that they can get on better without us than