

visitors, on account of the extreme beauty of the views which it affords. A circular, or rather spiral line, is to be made up this mountain, to be worked by ropes attached to a stationary engine. Perhaps it is wise not to be too sentimental about these matters. There are many tourists of the Mark Twain school, to say nothing of the aged and infirm, who would never to get to the top of a mountain at all unless they were carted up bodily. For the daring and the strong there will be plenty of mountains left affording boundless facilities for breaking their necks. From the Gorner Grät there are nearly one hundred peaks visible of over twelve thousand feet in height, and we venture to predict that it will be several years before their summits are all accessible by railway.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

All communications intended for the Editor must be addressed: EDITOR OF THE WEEK
5 Jordan Street, Toronto.
Contributors who desire their MS. returned, if not accepted, must enclose stamp to that purpose.

LEGISLATION AND THE CHINESE COMMISSION.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—I see that in a recent issue you state that the Government has legislated contrary to the Report of the Chinese Commission. I doubted from your reference to the report soon after its appearance whether you had read it or not. The report consists of a report signed by M. Chapleau; one signed by Mr. Justice Gray, and a large body of evidence. The report signed by Mr. Justice Gray might be fairly described as a pro-Chinese report; the writer is evidently opposed to the exclusion of the Chinese from British Columbia, or to even any effective restriction on their immigration; the writer of the other report is opposed to their admission, and in favour of gradually shutting them out. He does not, indeed—like anti-Chinese orators—indulge in vile and vulgar abuse of the Chinese, and he acquits them of nearly all the charges brought against them, but he shows conclusively, elaborately, exhaustively, that the immigration of Chinese into Anglo-Saxon communities is undesirable. The very Act which has been passed is suggested by the first report. See its conclusions, secs. 20-22, pp. cxxxiii. and cxxxiv., and also pp. ci. to cix.

Regina, N.-W.T., August 4th, 1885.

NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN.

[Without the aid of the ex-Secretary to the Commission, few readers would have been able to gather from the Report that M. Chapleau "is opposed to their (the Chinese) admission, and in favour of gradually shutting them out." Ordinary readers, we venture to say, put a very different construction on the language of the Report. No one, perhaps, except Mr. Davin, could find in M. Chapleau's language a justification of exclusion. M. Chapleau distinctly states that "no one, save a few persons of very ill-considered opinions, desires to exclude Chinese merchants, or any class of Chinese save two," the vicious and the criminal; "That Chinese labour is a most efficient aid in the development of the country and a great means to wealth"; "That their (the Chinese) morality is not lower than that of the same classes of other nationalities"; that the evils which "Chinatowns" generate "might be dealt with by police supervision"; that these immigrants "do not burden public charities nor unduly swell the calendar of crime." If the object of M. Chapleau was to justify the exclusion of Chinese immigrants, his Report must be pronounced a failure. It is true, he tells us, that "the very best friends of the Chinamen think their immigration should be regulated." But regulation is one thing and exclusion is another. The question of exclusion is touched on in the Report only to show that complaint against it by the Chinese would be "illogical." The strength of the Report lies in its facts; while the conclusion which requires our assent to the assumption that if one Chinaman takes the proceeds of his savings—a mere fraction of his gross earnings—out of the country, we are justified in excluding all other Chinamen, is economically unsound. It rests on another assumption—that the withdrawal of the proceeds of the savings nullifies the public benefit of the exertion of the labour which produced them and leaves an adverse balance against the country—which is certainly untrue. The profit of the employer of labour remains to enhance the riches of the country. The facts given in the Report are conclusive against the policy of exclusion. Even on moral grounds, on which anti-Chinese orators are wont to dwell, they do not justify it. Economically, there can be no justification of a policy which shuts out an important element of wealth. As well might it be said that, because foreign capital used to set labour in motion in Canada is sometimes withdrawn with the profits of its employment, the ingress of foreign capital ought to be prohibited. M. Chapleau distinctly states that he desires to exclude only the vicious and the criminal; and yet the Act of last session mulcts the servant and the labourer, against whom there is no objection on the score of morality, in the fine of \$100 each. This restriction must operate as an exclusion of every Chinaman who is not able to pay a tax of \$100 for the privilege of being able to enter a Canadian port as an immigrant. In effect, this means the exclusion of the kinds of labour most in request, and which no other nation is willing to supply in sufficient quantities and at a reasonable price. We repeat, on the strength of the facts, that the Chinese Immigration Act of last session is contrary to the spirit of M. Chapleau's Report; and the extra-official exertions of the amanuensis of the Commission will scarcely convince the public to the contrary.

—ED.]

ESQUIMAULT AS AN IMPERIAL PLACE D'ARMES.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—I have read your article on the injurious results which would follow applause from Canada and Australia to the war mania prevailing in England. I cannot agree with you that there is a "war mania" at home. There is great alarm at the progress of the Russian army, more especially among those who, like myself, have not only served against that army, but have several times visited Russia, and therefore know that the Russian Imperial army may be likened to the hill side of one of your great rivers in the North-West, when, as often happens, it moves en masse towards the river. The Emperor, Imperial family, and educated public are as trees on the hill side, all bound to go with the move, some standing, some falling. No doubt a Southern seaport is much wanted, but the reason above is the immediate cause of the disturbance. General Komaroff and his officers have been pacified for the present by the handsome rewards from the Emperor, who really desires peace, and is troubled with his Frankenstein. There is, however, grave

cause for alarm, and for the preparations for defence now being made at home. I read the Canadian newspapers carefully, but cannot remember any careless applauding of a war mania, though some think the utmost limits of concession in favour of peace have been reached and the next move is regarded with anxiety. Some papers hint that Canada should fly from the scene of danger, and throw herself into the arms of the United States. I believe Canada's destiny is to become a nation and an example to the United States in all those qualities which distinguish a superior race, and I am far from being alone in this belief.

You consider it childish to send torpedo boats to British Columbia, and you are right in that limit. The late Government, however, were considering something more definite, and the papers concerning it have been handed to their successors in office. It is no less than the formation of a formidable *Place d'Armes* at Esquimault for the British fleet and an army corps opposite to Vladivostock, "The Queen of the Pacific." Canada's great strategic railway has by its completion given birth to this great naval and military position, only eighteen days from Plymouth, while its rival and "queen" is 3,000 miles distant from the nearest railway station. Russian officers will be the first to appreciate the true value of this new feature in the theatre of war. If there be a landing on holy Russian soil they must march to turn out the intruders. Hence a grave disadvantage. They are now giving "check to the queen" in India. We shall soon be able to say "check to the king" on their Pacific coast near China, with which nation they are not on good terms. Our admirable *Place d'Armes* occupies a central position for England, Canada and Australia. It is easy of access, has abundant and excellent coal close to it, with numerous harbours to shelter the Imperial fleet. With regard to provisions there is all Canada and British Columbia to be drawn on. Should a landing be effected and earthworks and guns mounted on Russian soil, the lumbermen with timber from British Columbia could house the troops. Russian officers would have to consider how they could turn out 20,000 British troops supported by their fleet. Would their army march over the wastes of Siberia, or come by sea? Those would be the questions. The answer would probably be that they were not ready yet, and that meantime pressure on India should be relaxed; in other words, there would be no war.—Your obedient servant,

Gleichen, Alberta, July 31st, 1885.

EDWARD PALLISER.

FISHERIES QUESTION.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—In your issue of August 6th there appears an editorial suggesting a parliamentary policy for the Dominion. Amongst other things you say that "The Fisheries question raises the more general question of the customs line"; that "this is a great, practical and vital issue," and that "it is the only great, practical and vital issue, which now is, or is likely soon, to come before the country," and you argue or hint that this policy will be acceptable to the great body of the people of the Dominion. One is led to inquire, What is the policy to be advocated that will gain so many adherents? Are we to infer that it is the abolition of all customs houses and tariffs, "along the line," and that an Utopia is to be found in a mutual embrace between ourselves and our cousins over the line? Such an embrace, between young men and maidens, there can be no objection to (with benefit of clergy). Annexation if you will in marital bliss, but any other form of embrace, methinks, would take all the vitality out of us—a huge pressure, fifty millions to four millions, simply means absorption.

Again, you say that "Canada has been taken out of the Commercial Union of the Empire." I am at a loss to conceive what meaning should be attached to the statement. I am not aware that Canada has discriminated in her tariffs in favour of any country, as against Great Britain. I am free to admit that there has been a slight divergence from the old beaten paths, but Canada's vast public works and other unforeseen contingencies have rendered necessary a slight revision of her customs and excise tariffs, and her rulers are rather to be commended than condemned for preparing the "ways and means" to meet the increased expenditure.

The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 was a very unsatisfactory one to Canada (proper), whose fisheries were bartered for a very questionable equivalent, and it was rendered still more objectionable from evasions and other causes. The Treaty of 1872 was more satisfactory to Canadians generally, inasmuch as they were made consenting parties to its provisions. In discussing the clauses of the Treaty, the Imperial House was almost an unit in expressing its desire that Canadian interests should be adjudicated on by the Dominion Parliament. Consequently due care was taken, and saving clauses embodied in the Treaty, that commissioners should be appointed to determine the relative value of the fisheries of Canada and of the United States. By instruction of the Government the Fishery Acts were drafted by those whose practical knowledge of the subject was a guarantee that every care would be taken to effect the protection of the fisheries and the organization and consolidation of the fishery service generally. I dare affirm that the Fishery Act was almost perfect in its inception, simple and practical in its operation, and comparatively inexpensive.

The evidence—pro and con.—taken before the Halifax Commission appeared to justify the Award. The United States, however, evidently deemed the amount excessive, so, for that and other causes, they have considered it necessary to amend the Treaty, hence we open up a new chapter in our trade relations with our friends "across the border," for on the 1st July, 1885, the Treaty of Washington died a natural death. We have been given to understand, however, that the President will, on the meeting of Congress, submit the consideration of Reciprocity to the people's representatives. Whatever subsequent action may be taken, it is earnestly to be hoped that a fair and equitable arrangement may be made, so that, though not formally annexed, we may become so in all good offices and in mutual regard and esteem—the one for the other—induced by honesty of purpose.

Ottawa, August 15th, 1885.

SPECTATOR.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND REVENUES.

To the Editor of The Week:

SIR,—I have read your article upon this subject and also the extracts from letter of Rev. John May, Manitou. Although I cannot agree with you as a whole in what you say, I do think you are much nearer the mark than the champion of Oxfordism. Mr. May is evidently "at sea" in his knowledge of history when he writes of the great "Catholic Renaissance" as taking "her (the Church) by the neck" and shaking her "into life." The great awakening, as everybody knows, took place in the last century and in the early part of this, when the evangelical spirits founded the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (1701), Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (1698), Incorporated Church Building Society (1818), Church Missionary Society (1799), National Society for Education of Poor (1811), Colonial and Continental Church Society (1828), London Society for Promoting Christ amongst the Jews (1809), etc. May I ask Mr. May if we owe the