

DOES DENIS KEARNEY FOUND THE EMPIRE?

I would have to quote so freely from the following article that I prefer to reproduce it entire, and will further refer your readers to the articles on the Chinese question by Mr. Lucas, now appearing in the *Gazette*.

THE CHINESE QUESTION.

A correspondent of the *New York Evening Post*, writing from San Francisco, communicates some facts—or what he alleges to be such—in relation to the Chinese, which are worth considering by those who honestly desire to reach an intelligent conclusion in respect to the controversy between Chinaman and Californian. One of the facts stated is that the Chinese at home are abandoning their old-fashioned junks, and indulging in the luxury, comfort and profit of foreign built steamships. They like these so well that they have concluded to build some for themselves, and have just completed two iron-clads, of five thousand tons each, at Shanghai. If the question of their right of residence in this country is settled authoritatively in their favour, they propose to put on a line of steamships between Shanghai and San Francisco. These facts, if accurately stated, bear somewhat heavily upon the widespread impression that the Chinese are wholly and irredeemably unprogressive. Another fact stated has an important bearing upon the proposition which is accepted as an axiom in California, that the Chinamen eat "next to nothing." While flour can be shipped from San Francisco and laid down in Hong Kong for \$5.10 a barrel, the same weight of rice costs in Hong Kong \$5.75, and when it reaches San Francisco the freight and charges have brought it up to six and one-fourth cents a pound. Yet the Chinamen live on the rice, which is by far the more expensive commodity of the two, and ship 300,000 barrels of flour annually in exchange for it.

Other interesting facts are that the exports of the Chinese in California, consisting of butter, bacon, cheese, lard, soap, starch, candles, tallow, whiskey and flour, amount to more than \$3,000,000 annually. Constituting a little less than one-twelfth of the population of San Francisco, they pay one-third of the duties collected at the Custom House. They import from \$10,000,000 to \$11,000,000 worth of silks, tea and spices annually. They pay \$1,000,000 a year for rents, and \$528,000 for water, gas and insurance.

In respect to the competition in labour, the information furnished by the *Evening Post's* correspondent is very valuable if accurate. Instead of performing domestic service more cheaply than other help the Chinaman actually commands a higher price, the figures being, for white help \$21, and for Chinamen \$22.50 per month. In the hotels there is no competition, and white waiters get from \$35 to \$40 per month, which is very far from starvation wages. On farm lands the Chinaman does cut under his white competitor, the latter receiving \$35 a month and found, while John works for \$30 and found. In Michigan even the latter figures would not be regarded as ruinously low.

It is not quite easy to understand, if these statements are true, and most of them are undisputed, why there should be such violent opposition on the part of intelligent people in California to the continuance of the Chinaman in his work. For it is a fact that there is such opposition on the part of the class named. The denunciation of the Chinaman is by no means confined to the Sand Lotters and the Kearneys, as so many have hastily assumed. The contrary is very conclusively shown by the large vote which the new Constitution of the State received—a vote far too large to be attributed to the Kearneyites alone, or even to the Kearneyites and workmen combined. It is shown, moreover, by the tone of the leading newspapers and of the articles admitted into the new magazine—the *Californian*—which certainly does not represent, and cannot hope for patronage from, the unintelligent.

To a certain extent the opposition can be accounted for, possibly, by the feeling that the Chinaman does not intend to become a citizen, but contemplates the removal of what he accumulates, instead of permitting it to remain in California as a part of the wealth of the State. But even this explanation does not cover all the ground or quite account for the personal hostility to a foreigner, who, if unattractive, is singularly inoffensive. Perhaps some thoughtful philosophic Californian, who shares in the hostility will enlighten the country on the point. Until he does so, it is almost inevitable that the hostility shown the Chinese should be largely attributed to prejudice.—*Detroit Free Press*.

The hoodlum of California, British Columbia and Australia finds that the Chinaman distances him in a labour competition; not so much because he works for somewhat smaller wages, but because he is civil (though not servile), industrious, saving, sober and reliable—and he hates him accordingly. The intelligent employer of labour knows John's value as a workman, but declares that he is a danger to the moral and physical health of the community. That he is addicted to gambling and opium smoking is undeniable; but it is equally undeniable that no society composed entirely of males, as are the Chinese societies in the countries named, is so free from vice. It is an ugly question, but it has to be faced, and we may say at once that until we see the Chinaman with his wife and family there is no comparing his way of living with our standards.

To understand our almond-eyed friend properly we must look at him in the lands where he has a fair chance. I have seen him in Singapore, Malacca, Penang, Moulmein, Rangoon and Calcutta. In these places he inter-marries with the natives—Malays, Burmese and Hindostanis, and is in every respect a valuable citizen. In Singapore they are not only the favourite clerks in merchants' offices and banks, but are merchants and bankers; the Hon. Mr. Whampoa is a member of the Governor's Council. In Malacca and Penang there are liberal, educated and enlightened Chinese who will compare favourably with any European. I never met any one who knew them in these cities who did not like them and consider them infinitely superior to all other natives of the East.

Surely justice is not dead—and the nations who have forced their intercourse upon China at the point of the bayonet are not going to forbid the Chinaman the right to labour in their lands!

They have, however, a right to say—come as do other settlers with your wives and families and we will welcome you, but an invasion of males we will resist.

Thank Heaven, we, in the Dominion, have a clean record—as far as the African and the Indian are concerned—let us not blot our history with injustice to the Chinaman; they are bound to be a great power on this continent; let us secure their affection, by treating them as they are treated in our Eastern Colonies, and stamping out the British Columbia hoodlum's opposition to them.

There is ground to believe that the dispersion of the California Chinese by Kearney and the sand-lotters will be one of the great events in American history.

They will spread from the mountains to the sea, be appreciated as they deserve and sought after. The news of their good treatment will be spread over the flowery land, and tens of thousands will be attracted by the glad tidings that all "Melican" men are not like Californians.

When the thousands multiply into millions, will a change in the system of government be needed? Can Asiatics ever be converted into Republicans? or Democrats?

Is this what the "thoughtful philosophic Californian" foresaw? and does Denis Kearney or Grant found the Empire?

BRAIN-POWER AND THE IRISH.

"F. H. T." at London, Ont., has an odd way of expressing his sympathy with Hibernian feeling. He tells us that in the paper on "Brain-power," "the one sentence in particular which very much amused" him contained "an insult to Irishmen." His theory in italics is decidedly fishy: there's "a power o' the Irish" element where fish is scarce, and the clever fellows from the Maritime Provinces are few. Whatever the favourite food in London the lesser may be, "fallacious nonsense" seems to be one of its products, and as there is no telling what evolution and diet may do for us, we may live to hear of poetical poetry. A couple of letters more would make "F. H. T." FIGHT. The "plucky little" Pungent hit "H. B. S." hard on the Brain-power. "H. B. S." did not intend to be sarcastic, but had in his head a sort of worn-out witticism about potatoes and potteen, which our Irish friends could well afford to let pass.

Their Island gave birth to the greatest apostle of temperance the world has ever produced. His teachings and preachings have left their mark. One effect may suffice—namely, the almost total disappearance of the Faction Fights which in his day were common in Ireland. Some people—the *Toronto Telegram* amongst others—are fond of saying that Irishmen are indolent and intemperate. From personal knowledge it can be averred that they are neither the one nor the other. Authorities not favourable to them speak of "the alacrity of their race." They drink no more than their neighbours, and opinion is strong that they drink less; in fact, Pat is not an habitu  of the "Public." Over a social glass he loves to meet his friends at fairs, markets, or such gatherings. Straight to his Celtic brain goes the whiskey, which, making him hilarious and noisy, proclaims his condition and furnishes "a case." Friend Bull when brimful of beer, and his brither frac "Scoatlan" when fou, have a way of making for home and saying "nothing to nobody," "nae boddy kens ae thing about it." 'Tis only fair, however, to say that as the sons of Erin in England and Scotland are many, they must do some of the drinking in these countries.

Some one signing the poetic, historic and aristocratic name Beauchamp has written a verse or verses eulogistic of Mr. Parnell. Mr. Weller thought "them 'ere poets" a poor lot, and it might be well if Mr. Beauchamp would leave off mooning for a season and try what a few months' study of grammar might do for him. Occasionally "he duns" may be said with emphasis, but never "He done." There is what is called the poetic licence, but it hardly takes in grammar. Talking of grammatical blunders, "H. B. S." got off some bad ones; but as the terrible "Niven" has sounded his note of warning, we are all very likely to get a share of the rod "in retentis."

Mr. O'Donohoe, Q.C., came here from Toronto to tell us about a St. Patrick's Society in Hamilton which a few days ago threw out the word "Protestant." Protestant is not a nice word for that kind of Society; it is slightly foreign, and in justice to the outraged feelings of a down-trodden people should be expunged from everything. Hamilton takes the lead, and wisdom may even be learnt from toadies. Could not the Rev. Mr. Carmichael give a lecture on Protestant Parnell (leaving out Protestant), or on Kearney the Catholic, or on some of "the powerful intellects"? Mr. O'Donohoe told us of "another thing which caused Ireland pain was the fact that a Jew reigned over England, who with folded arms watched Irish life being blighted," but Mr. O'Donohoe, Q.C., did not tell us that the "Jew" was one of the first who subscribed to the starving. We know the rule with a long robe is to do all you can to damage your opponent. The subscription was not much; it was this, it was that, and "how dare he assist us," but fair play on the platform, say I: "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." Neither did the Queen's Counsel say whether Ireland was pained when Rothschild the Jew and his brethren sent a large sum to help its people in '46, when famine was sore in the land. The silk gown did not say anything about the meeting