

necessity of making their bread; and that the chiefs of commerce, on whom the stress of the situation falls, are, as a class, our best and strongest men.

A WRITER in the *March Overland Monthly*—himself a Knight of Labour—states the case of the Knights, as representing the whites, against the Chinese on the Pacific Coast. In one sentence the whole complaint is that the Chinese cheapen labour. Other objections there are, such as the patriarchal and monarchical form of the Chinese system of government, from which some hidden danger to the Republic seems to be apprehended, and the frugality of the Chinaman, who constantly “produces, but consumes nothing”; but these objections are used more as garnishment than argument, and the one reason for the expulsion of the Chinese remains, that their employment, “for the purpose of cheapening or underbidding our native muscle, is an outrage on civilization, Christianity, and political economy.” If this be so, then the same objection may be urged with equal justness against labour-saving machinery of all kinds. But do the Knights propose, when they have expelled the Chinese, to carry on their crusade and forbid all further improvements in machinery? If so, and this is the logical sequel to their position, it is fortunate for the working-classes that the Order did not rise a few decades back. Many hand-loom weavers, for instance, suffered once dire distress through the saving of labour effected by improved machinery; but would the condition of the poorer classes be so good as it is to-day if employers had been obliged by an Order of Knights to discard all improvements, and keep their people at work under the old methods? By saving human labour and using improved machinery, a modern cotton or woollen mill is able to produce goods at such a low price that a greater proportionate demand is created, the poorest backs can be covered, and more workpeople are employed than ever. Yet to arrest the movement is what the Knights would appear to aim at. Manufactures have of late made good progress on the Pacific Coast; and whatever hold they have taken there is due to Chinese labour, just as the progress of cotton manufactures elsewhere is due to the cheapening of cost through improvements in machinery. But the progress on the Pacific Coast must cease if the Knights are to have their way, and the Chinese be expelled. That country needs cheap labour, especially to develop its mineral wealth, which without it must remain buried in the earth. As an instance of the folly of the present agitation against the Chinese, take the case of certain coal mines situated at Puget Sound. Their only market is San Francisco, but coal must be laid down in that market at \$5.50 per ton; and this can only be done from these mines by means of Chinese labour, the Chinese being employed to sort the coal and load the cars, while the white miners are paid full rates. In this way the companies operating the mines have been able till lately to develop their property by marketing their produce, paying out in wages some \$10,000 a month, which was distributed in and about Seattle. But the white mob of Seattle murdered or drove out the Chinese, whose lower rate of wages actually ensured their employment at full rates; and now the mines are closed. The proprietary companies, deprived of the cheap Chinese labour, could not afford to pay the higher wages demanded by the whites for sorting and loading, and so had to stop work altogether. In many other infant industries on the Coast an equally useful office is filled by the Chinese, from whose cheap labour the whites directly profit; and yet they drive them away! By driving them away, however, punishment in some form must be incurred: if work does not stop altogether, either the whites must work for lower wages or the cost of production will be run up so high that the products of the Eastern States will flow in, which will in the end produce the same result of lower wages unless the Knights of Labour, to guard against this danger, which will soon loom up large, next take in hand the distribution of commodities.

MR. LABOUCHERE'S speech against the Hereditary Principle, having been reproduced in sympathetic quarters here, proves, as might have been anticipated, to be the utterance not of a Statesman or a Senator but of a Parliamentary Merry-Andrew. It is a string of prepared jests, all of which put together are not worth a single sentence of Beaumarchais. The House of Commons by taking delight in such exhibitions shows how little it merits the name of a deliberative assembly. That the hereditary principle of government is in a state of pronounced decadence nobody looking over the political world can deny. The conditions, political, social, industrial, and intellectual, under which alone it could flourish, have departed or are departing. Its exceptional retention in the British Parliament is explained by the fact that, in this case, its ascendancy was early reduced to proportions not incompatible with progress. To lean upon it any longer as our conservative safeguard is to lean upon a bruised reed. That some other principle must be found to give stability to government and

prevent it from becoming the sport of passion is the inference drawn by statesmen, but which a speaker whose only object was to tickle the ears of the House or of the Radical section of it could not be expected to draw. Nor could he be expected to consider, supposing the hereditary principle to be at once set aside, what is the alternative actually before us. He tacitly assumes, of course, that it is election by merit. Unfortunately the fact is that the assembly to which his speech is addressed, and all other existing assemblies of the same kind, instead of being the products of election by merit are in average probity and intelligence rather below than above the general level of the classes from which they are taken. It may be very unreasonable and undesirable that a man should be set to govern us merely because he is his father's son; but, if it is not so obviously unreasonable, it is perhaps even more undesirable that a man should be set to govern us because he has gained votes by knavish and mendacious appeals to the passions of the ignorant. The tomb of a dead ancestor is a bad portal through which to enter the legislative hall; a worse is the Gate of Lies. If there were no choice except between hereditism and demagogism, others besides hereditary Peers might hesitate to commit society to the change. Happily there are better things in store.

LORD ROSEBERY'S vigorous and sensible conduct of foreign affairs, until of late, has been not a little perplexing and disappointing to some foreign statesmen who, accustomed to the ordinary manner of a Gladstonian Government, had counted on profiting by the advent to power of the present one. When Lord Salisbury fell, Russia was engaged in the amiable work of concocting an alliance between Servia, Montenegro, and Greece, with the addition of Bulgaria if it could be detached from Turkey, to effect which, if Prince Alexander would not consent, he was to be made distasteful to his people by representations that he stood in the way of the development of Bulgarian independence. This alliance would perhaps not have been concluded had Lord Salisbury remained in office but a few days longer: an important counter arrangement, it is said, which would have effectually prevented it, was then actually in progress; but this came to an end with the Salisbury Government; while Russia, seeing her opportunity in the return of Mr. Gladstone to power, quickly completed her scheme. But the new British Government had learnt from their predecessors of what was afoot, which so impressed them that, to the surprise of foreign statesmen, and the chagrin especially of Russia, Lord Rosebery immediately instructed British representatives to inform the several Governments to which they were accredited that he would continue to carry out the policy begun by his predecessor. The Czar, however, thought he knew Mr. Gladstone, and the alliance was, it is pretty certain, concluded, as far as concerned Russia and Greece, and perhaps Montenegro. Nothing therefore could have been more surprising and disappointing than such a deviation from what was expected of Mr. Gladstone as the veto put by England on the threatened Greek rising. This rising was intended to be the signal for a combined attack on Turkey, in which also Montenegro, Servia, and Bulgaria should take part, for in the convulsion a rupture of the alliance between Turkey and Bulgaria was to have been forced by some means on the latter Power. But, owing to the firmness of England, the onslaught was, not indeed prevented, but postponed.

EVEN if an outbreak be prevented, nothing is more certain than that Russia will not rest content while the Turkish-Bulgarian Treaty remains in force, or contains anything inimical to Russian interests. Bulgaria owes her independence originally to Russia; and this Power could, perhaps, hardly be expected to consent that her creation should undertake to furnish the Sultan with military aid. Accordingly she has succeeded in procuring the elimination of this clause of the treaty, thus taking the very core out of the work of Sir Wm. White; and England has apparently acquiesced. Russia has also procured the substitution of the words “Prince of Bulgaria” for “Prince Alexander of Bulgaria,” as it originally stood in the treaty; and she further insists that under the treaty Prince Alexander is Ruler of Eastern Roumelia for five years only; the meaning of which modification and reading is that if the rupture between Turkey and Bulgaria cannot be brought about without the consent of Prince Alexander, intrigue will go on to displace him. The treaty, it is held, is a personal alliance between the Prince and the Sultan; and the Prince's Governorship of Eastern Roumelia has to be renewed at the end of five years. If, therefore, Russia, having succeeded in getting the Governorship conferred on the “Prince of Bulgaria” instead of Prince Alexander, hereafter succeeds in deposing Alexander, and seating a creature of her own—Prince Waldemar of Denmark, the Czar's brother-in-law, is the one named—on the Bulgarian throne, then the renewal of the Governorship to the new Bulgarian Prince may be insisted upon, or the alliance be put an end to alto-