

THE FAMILY PARLIAMENT.

[THE RULES OF DEBATE will be found on page 312. The Editor's duty will be to act as "Mr. Speaker;" consequently, while preserving due order in the discussion, he will not be held to endorse any opinions that may be expressed on either side, each debater being responsible for his own views.]

SHOULD EARLY CLOSING BE MADE COMPULSORY?

(Debate concluded.)

TRADER:—As one of the so-described selfish, money-making traders, who does not close until nine o'clock, and eleven on Saturdays, but who himself thinks that he works harder by far to support and educate his family, and pay his way, than any assistant ever works, allow me to give a few reasons against compulsory closing. To be just it must close every shop, omitting none, at say eight, and on Saturdays at ten. If all shops are not included the Act will never work, for it would be unjust to compel the thousands of small struggling traders who keep a lad or junior assistant to close, and to leave his neighbour who did not to keep his shop open; for I maintain that shops are only kept open late because of the thousands who cannot well do their shopping at an early hour. In many districts there will be twice as many people in the streets from seven until nine than there is at any other hour of the day, and no Act of Parliament will make the child go to sleep earlier or give the hard-worked woman leisure in the day time. I hear a growl about ten o'clock on Saturdays; but since the artisans, &c., have had their Saturday half-holiday, it has more and more become a fact that they with their wives make that time an opportunity for shopping.

The small trader is almost always overlooked by those arguing for earlier closing, and they do not care about going into the question of why, if the large aristocratic draper can close, the small trader doing business with a lower class finds it more difficult. It is a fact that many small traders and young beginners take more money of an evening than all the rest of the day, because evening is the leisure time for the million, so much so that an Act not allowing shops to open until nine a.m., and close at nine p.m., would, after all, be more convenient to the public and the trader, and so shorten the hours of attendance or work: I cannot say, as our exaggerating platform friends say, "toil," for there is, after all, little hard work for assistants generally; as a rule, a good deal of time is spent very leisurely.

That I, as a trader, and all assistants would like more leisure I freely admit; but my thirty years' experience tells me there is little actual over-work, and that, instead of thousands sent to premature graves, the health of traders' assistants is as good as that of classes of the community who have more leisure. Doctors may meet with cases of consumption and bronchial affections, &c., but do they never meet with such cases amongst those who have even nothing to do?

That compulsory closing will be very objectionable there can be no doubt, and those who are assistants now will, when they start in business for themselves, be brought to see those difficulties, and will find it help to drive the trade to the large houses. To attempt thus to legislate reminds me of old times, and the failure of curfew and the sumptuary laws.

* JOHN CARSON:—There can only be one opinion regarding the evils of the present long-hour system of doing business in shops. Both the Opener and his Opponent recognise them; they differ only in the methods to be adopted to bring about a change; the one thinking that it should be left to public opinion, agitation and combination amongst the employés, the other that legislation should step in and at once compel the change. "If people generally," the Opponent says, "could only be induced to make their purchases early, the shops would not be kept open, and legislation would be unnecessary." But customs, however bad, are difficult to break from. All see the evils, but at the same time *individuals* think that, as others are sure to go late, their doing so also cannot make much difference, and so the evils are perpetuated. Experience has fully proved that people will not do their shopping early while the shops are open for them to do it later. Therefore, this is a fit subject for legislation. The converse holds that if the shops are closed early, as the purchases of clothing and the necessities of life must be made, they *must* be made early. The hardship of being obliged to buy in reasonable hours would only touch the few, whilst the benefit would be experienced alike by masters and assistants. The time now occupied by them in supervision would be their own, and there would be a saving in light and other etceteras to the masters; the assistants would be more contented, and have opportunities for improvement which are now practically denied them, no matter what their thirst after knowledge. When a man or woman is employed in a certain trade, he must conform to its customs and rules or else leave it. To this extent the individual is *not* a "free agent," so it is idle to talk of "freedom of contract" being interfered with. When society and custom imposes, gradually but surely, hardships upon any portion of the community who cannot rid themselves of these fetters, the law should put things right when by doing so it is not infringing the rights of others to any material extent.

It is not a cry of over-work, but rather one of over-time. For many hours of the day there is comparatively little to do when the assistants would be glad to be kept busy. Towards evening the bulk of the customers come in, because they know they *can* procrastinate. If the large shops employing assistants were closed, the smaller shopmen who stand in their own shops would not seriously interfere with the trade of the former, as the customers frequenting the one are seldom seen in the other. Once let people feel (and this can only be done by Act of Parliament) that their shopping must be done in good time, and public approval can be safely allowed in a matter of this kind to follow.

* To this speech was awarded the divided Honorarium.

END OF THE DEBATE ON EARLY CLOSING.

IS IT WISE TO PROMOTE EMIGRATION?

OPENER'S SPEECH.

MR. SPEAKER,

I am fully aware, Sir, that in seeking to demonstrate the "un-wisdom" of promoting emigration, I am doing a very bold thing, since I set myself in

opposition, not only to the majority of my countrymen, but also to the principal political economists of past and present times. Nevertheless, so strongly do I feel that the tide of emigration—encouraged and assisted at every turn—is flowing too often to the

detriment either of the emigrant or of the country which he leaves, that I dare to bring my views before the representatives of the Family Parliament; and, having argued my case, I shall even venture to ask them to agree with me.

In the first place, it will only be fair, both to myself and to those who may oppose me, to clear the ground of all special cases, and to rest my arguments on a broad general basis. Thus it would neither be reasonable nor just to instance emigration from either Germany or Ireland, and to draw conclusions from what has happened or is happening in those individual countries. On the one hand, emigration is promoted in Germany, certainly by the action of the State, but as certainly contrary to its will and wish: it is the result of the law of universal military service, which drives a large percentage of the able-bodied youth of the empire to seek employment in other lands, rather than be compelled to spend some of the best years of life in military training; it—together with its cause—is one of the main reasons for the slow growth in the commercial prosperity of the German Empire. Probably all will be ready to admit that emigration promoted in such a way is a direct loss to the country, and is therefore greatly to be deplored. On the other hand, Sir, I am bound to admit that when a country is impoverished to the extent that Ireland is; when it is impossible that the land can support all the population; when there are no trades or manufactures worth mentioning, and but scant prospects of introducing them—in the case of such a country assisted emigration is perhaps the sole resource, although even then it can only be considered as a very unsatisfactory remedy. Special circumstances then must always be taken into account, and I would therefore narrow the question at issue to this: whether in a country which is contented and prosperous, which is subject to no grievous burdens, and which is continually demanding skilled and unskilled work of every kind, it is wise to promote emigration merely because at recurring periods there is a little congestion in the labour markets, a little excess of supply over demand in certain cities or districts.

Now, Sir, it can hardly be denied that the flesh, and bone, and muscle, and brain which go to make up a man or woman represent a certain amount of capital—are, in fact, a part of the wealth of the country in which the man or woman is born. Or, as an eminent political economist has put it, “the skill and the energy and the perseverance of the artisans of a country are reckoned part of its wealth, no less than their tools and machinery.” Indeed, from figures which have lately been published in connection with emigration to some of the Australian colonies, it seems that the advent of an able-bodied man in those colonies is reckoned a matter of no small account, his coming being computed as an addition of from £150 to £200 to the capital of the State. It is plain then that even *unaided* emigration can only assist a country when the emigrant cannot perform a sufficient amount of labour to support him at home, and when he lives partly on the labour of others. But when, in addition

to the loss of capital represented by the man himself, the sum paid by the country or by individuals to assist his emigration is taken into account, it must indeed be clearly shown that his home-labour is far from remunerative, before the holding out of inducements to him to emigrate can be in any way defended.

And this, Sir, brings me to what I must call my main argument. By the operation of various outlying circumstances, the majority of emigrants—I mean, of course, the majority of those who emigrate and *remain abroad*—would have added to the wealth of their country if they had remained at home: in other words, their productive labour would have more than sufficed for their own support and the support of their families. And the reason for this is not far to seek. Emigrants are of two classes: the one comprising the strong, self-reliant men, full of energy and capacity for toil, who think they will find in a new land a wider scope for their ambition and enterprise—these are the men who would get on anywhere; the other consisting of weak, feeble individuals, who, whether by misfortune or their own fault, can find no field for their meagre capacities—these are the men who would fail under almost any and every circumstance. The former class emigrate and enrich the land of their adoption; the latter too often roam from clime to clime, only to return at last to take advantage of the charities and poor-law systems of their mother-country.

As a type of the first class there is the skilled artisan, the master of many trades, gifted with dogged pluck and vast powers of endurance, who is worth almost his weight in gold to any country in which he may pitch his tent; and as a type of the second there is the poor clerk who is too lazy or too stupid to succeed at home, who is too proud to undertake manual labour (manual to him sounds like *menial*), and who emigrates as a last resource, only to find the same old difficulties besetting him everywhere. Is not this a fair picture of the two kinds of emigrants from a prosperous though thickly-populated country? and if so, I would submit, Sir, is it fair or wise that either a country or private individuals should be taxed to assist either class to emigrate? I am strongly of opinion, Sir, that it is not.

OPPONENT'S SPEECH.

MR. SPEAKER,

Confident, Sir, in the strength of the arguments that are to be adduced in favour of the promotion of emigration from thickly-populated countries, I am quite content to meet the Opener of this debate on his own ground, and to allow him to circumscribe it in any way he may please. Great Britain is evidently that country which he takes as a type throughout all his remarks, and I am quite willing that it should be so.

My honourable friend has been at some trouble to assert that the inhabitants of a country are part of its capital, and he quotes John Stuart Mill to this effect. Now, by his own showing, a country which is over-populated suffers from an excess of

capital of this particular kind, and for an excess of capital of any kind there is no better remedy than an *emigration* of capital. John Stuart Mill speaks with such force on this very point, in connection with the main question at issue, that I feel I cannot do better than take his argument *verbatim*:—"One of the counter-forces which check the downward tendency of profits in a country whose capital increases faster than that of its neighbours, and whose profits are therefore nearer the minimum, is the perpetual overflow of capital into colonies or foreign countries to seek higher profits than can be obtained at home. I believe this to have been for many years one of the principal causes by which the decline of profits in England has been arrested. It has a two-fold operation. In the first place, it does what a fire, or an inundation, or a commercial crisis would have done: it carries off a part of the increase of capital, from which the reduction of profits proceeds. Secondly, the capital so carried off is not lost, but is chiefly employed either in founding colonies, which become large exporters of cheap agricultural produce or in extending and perhaps improving the agriculture of older communities. It is to the emigration of English capital that we have chiefly to look for keeping up a supply of cheap food and cheap materials of clothing, proportional to the increase of our population, thus enabling an increasing capital to find employment in the country, without reduction of profit, in producing manufactured articles with which to pay for this supply of raw produce. Thus the exportation of capital is an agent of great efficacy in extending the field of employment for that which remains; and it may be said truly that, up to a certain point, the more capital we send away the more we shall possess and be able to retain at home." What has my honourable friend to say to this?

Every year it is proved more clearly that when the population of a country out-strips the growth of the means of subsistence, there are but two main expedients by which unprofitable toil and approaching want may be warded off: the importation of foreign food supplies, and emigration. The facts must be looked boldly in the face. The existence of a large mass of unemployed labour is not phenomenal, but is a constant factor in every thickly-populated land; and even emigration is but as the opening of a small valve, providing slight relief from the pressure. But emigration has a reacting influence for good. The word is almost synonymous with colonisation, and it is from a country's colonies that it may reasonably expect to derive the greater proportion of its food imports. Hence, the two remedial agents of emigration, and importation of food, run to some extent together.

In Great Britain, at the present time, it cannot be denied that the labour market is over-stocked, and that every trade is over-crowded; and it is highly probable that if it were not for emigration our work-houses would be full to overflowing, and vast schemes of national work might have to be undertaken to provide employment for the famine-stricken populace.

Well is it, then, that all reasonable support should be given to intending emigrants, even if many of them be our most intelligent and energetic artisans. They will go to other lands, and find highly-remunerative work without taking the bread out of their fellow-workmen's mouths; and when they have amassed a competency, or it may be a large fortune, the probability is that their thoughts will turn away from the land of their adoption to the land of their birth, and that they will come back to the old home, bringing all their wealth with them. And even if they do not return, they are not, by any means, lost to the mother-country because they live in the Greater Britain beyond the seas.

And, Sir, I think an argument on my side may well be adduced even from the second of the classes into which my honourable friend the Opener elected to divide emigrants. True it is that many do go abroad who are but feebly gifted for the race of life, or who are rolling stones, likely to gather little moss wherever they may find themselves. But in the case of such comparatively worthless members of the community, surely an over-crowded country is benefited even by their temporary absence.

I hold then, Sir, that emigration is an undoubted good; and that in such a country as ours it should be encouraged both by the State and by private individuals. But I would go further than this, and would argue in favour of the systematisation and State control of emigration. It should be the duty of the State to see that every emigrant is fully informed of his chances of employment at the destination for which he is setting out, and he should be directed and guided in every way consistent with perfect freedom of action; and while colonies and foreign countries should be encouraged to hold out inducements in the shape of bounties or assisted passages to intending immigrants, their offers and promises should be rigidly scrutinised and severely tested by the home Government. When emigration is put on some such footing as this, it will become even a greater blessing than it is at present, and, Sir, still more deserving of the hearty support of those who wish well to their country and their fellow-men.

[RULES OF DEBATE.—*The course of debate is as follows:—Two principal speakers holding opposite views on the question discussed are selected by the Editor. Readers of the MAGAZINE are then invited to express their own views on the subject, to the Editor, who will at his discretion select some of the most suitable and concise of these communications, or portions of them, for publication in a subsequent Part of the MAGAZINE. The Opener of the Debate is to have the right of reply.*]

TO OUR READERS.—The Editor will be happy to receive the opinions of any Readers on the above Question, on either side, with a view to the publication of the most suitable and concise communications in the June Part. Letters should be addressed "The Editor of CASSELL'S MAGAZINE, La Belle Sauvage Yard, London, E.C.," and in the top left-hand corner of the envelope should be written, "Family Parliament." The speech should be headed with the title of the Debate, and an indication of the side taken by the Reader. All communications on the present Question must reach the Editor not later than April 10.

An Honorarium of £1 1s. will be accorded (subject to the discretion of the Editor) to the best speech, which may be on either side of the Question; no speech to exceed 50 lines (500 words).

THE FAMILY PARLIAMENT.

[THE RULES OF DEBATE will be found on page 375 of our May Part. The Editor's duty will be to act as "Mr. Speaker;" consequently, while preserving due order in the discussion, he will not be held to endorse any opinions that may be expressed on either side, each debater being responsible for his own views.]

IS IT WISE TO PROMOTE EMIGRATION?

(Debate resumed.)

JAMES CROMAR :—That emigration is a necessity, the safety-valve as it were of an overcrowded country, is a truth admitted by Opener as well as Opponent. That powerful arguments are advanced by the latter in favour of State-aided emigration I am willing to admit, but that they are conclusive I emphatically deny, even when backed up by so high an authority as John S. Mill.

Do the facts of history endorse Mill's theory? They do not. On the contrary, they brush away his logic as a summer breeze does the morning dew. The colonisation of Virginia furnishes an apt illustration; detachment after detachment of State-aided emigrants perished, and it was only when our Government left emigration to look after itself that the colony took root. Is not the story of the Darien expedition under Paterson an historical protest against the system? Men and money were sacrificed for a kingdom in a wilderness, when the country could ill spare either the one or the other. In our own age we have examples without end. For half a century the tide of emigration has been steadily flowing from Germany, Switzerland, and Ireland, either directly or indirectly forced on by the Government. The consequence is that thousands of the emigrants have died before their time, or become demoralised; and their fatherland, in place of reaping profit by their exodus, is becoming poorer and weaker year by year. The history of the Scottish Highlands will further illustrate the truth of my statement; besides, the charity dole dispensed by Government has a debasing influence on the mind of the recipient. He feels his independence tarnished, his manhood debauched, and the bond that linked him to the land of his birth severed for ever.

The reverse of this picture is a cheering and bracing one. If people are left alone to obey the natural law of breaking new ground for themselves, when the old fields have become too narrow for their exertions, they strike their tents with hope in their aspect, and courage in their hearts. They go forth to seek their fortunes, as citizens of a fatherland they are proud to own, resolved that, come what may, they will bear themselves as Englishmen, Irishmen, Germans, or whatever their nationality may be. These are the emigrants, and these only, whose success in the land of their adoption will advance the glory or prosperity of the mother-country. For be it noted that this class of emigrant does not trust wholly to the chapter of accidents for getting a settlement. It not unfrequently happens that one or more pioneers have gone forth as an advance-guard to survey the "land of promise," and so prepare the way for the friends and families that are to follow.

A. BURGESS :—The fatal mistake running through the Opener's Speech is that he leaves entirely out of the question the state of the labour market from which the emigration takes place. For instance, he states that in the Australian colonies the advent of an able-bodied man is looked upon as an addition of from £150 to £200 to the capital of the State, but it is unfair to argue from this fact that we are that amount poorer by the loss of every able-bodied man. In England, where we have more labour than we can employ, such labour becomes a drug in the market; and it is, therefore, surely wise to give assistance, and help that surplus labour to transplant itself to a place where its advent will be looked upon "as an addition of from £150 to £200 to the capital of the State."

ROBERT MCCASKIE :—The question is, not whether it is wise for an individual to emigrate, but whether it is wise for the nation to encourage emigration.

On the one hand it is asserted that the brain, bone, and muscle of the working class who leave this country in the tide of emigration represent so much capital being lost to the nation; while, on the other hand, it is even more boldly asserted, on the authority of John Stuart Mill, that the brain, bone, and muscle being so much capital, the cause of low profits, and the consequent unemployment of labour, is the result of an over-supply of this class of capital.

Here, at the outset, we find both openers laying down wrong economic maxims. Labour is not capital, nor is capital labour. Labour is the producer of capital; capital is the result of labour. When Mill made those remarks quoted by the hon. gentleman who advocates the cause of emigration, he was speaking not of the emigration of labour, but of capital, the product of labour. So far Mill was right. When capital emigrates, it does so of its own free will (and generally returns to the land of its birth); so, freely, goes labour when it is unassisted, goes to where it can be most profitably employed. But the question is not whether it is good for any particular class to emigrate, but whether "it is wise to promote emigration;" and therefore the arguments of the Opponent fall to the ground.

GEORGE L. SELBY :—The hon. Opener has devoted no inconsiderable portion of his speech to "clearing the ground," and so vigorously has he applied himself to the task, that he has but barely escaped clearing the question away completely.

He seeks to lay the question on a "broad, general basis," and to divest it of all special features, and then blandly asks us to admit—what no sane person would dream of denying—that in a contented and prosperous country the promotion of emigration is unwise.

Now, Sir, I beg leave to contend that the attempt to lay such a question on a "broad and general basis" is an attempt to beg the question. Emigration is a special remedy in a special case. (This Opener admits.) It can never be regarded as a general remedy to be used indiscriminately.

The Honorarium of One Guinea is divided between Charles Moore, ro, Princess Street, Leicester, and N. Newnam, 24, St. Paul's Road, Clifton, Bristol.

Other speeches, supporting Opener's argument that it is *not* wise to encourage emigration, received from—Mark Crawshaw, Abraham Hart. Total 5.

Other speeches, supporting Opponent's argument that it is *wise* to encourage emigration, received from—W. R. S., J. Eaton Fearn, G. D. Newton, Rex, Alexander Spark, John Bolton, Mary M. Davidson, Richard Rees, Happy Thought, J. A. Lamb, Nemo, Frederick Dolman, R. H. Rowton, F. R., Robert Warren, George C. Wells, Manufacturer, Charlotte A. Pritchard, J. A. W., Leo Baker, J. Chell, J. R. Leaven, Henrietta Somerville, Herbert E. Norris, Lenore, H. C. McK., Henry W. Lock, F. W. Brewer, T. H. R. Evans, W. J. Evans, S. K., Angus Ross, W. King, G. H. Rimmington, R. J. Walker, A. M. Brunsden, "Sir Patrick Felis," M. E. St. John, Joseph Roantree, L. Koos, Celia, E. Goff, J. D. F. Gilchrist, J. D., C. Tyre, A Friend of Emigration, Meph, H. Maidment, R. Bransby, W. Speakman, W. N. L., Irishman. Total 59.

THE FAMILY PARLIAMENT.

[THE RULES OF DEBATE will be found on page 375 of our May Part. The Editor's duty will be to act as "Mr. Speaker;" consequently, while preserving due order in the discussion, he will not be held to endorse any opinions that may be expressed on either side, each debater being responsible for his own views.]

* placed before a name denotes a speaker who has won distinction in the present or in a former debate.

IS IT WISE TO PROMOTE EMIGRATION?

(Debate concluded.)

W. J. RITCHIE:—Being an Irishman, I am a native of a country from which a great deal of emigration takes place, and am therefore in a position to know some of the effects of emigration upon a country. I am aware that the condition of Ireland makes emigration from it a necessity, and that it is not logical to draw general conclusions from particular and exceptional instances. Yet, Sir, some of the good effects of emigration on Ireland are so marked that I cannot but think it would benefit any country, however prosperous. The Opener says that flesh, and bone, and muscle, and brain represent a certain amount of capital. I hope he does not value these elements in the ratio of the order in which he names them. I hold that brain is the most important element, since it is the engine which works the other machinery, and regulates its motions, and without which it would be only so much lumber. Now emigration widens the mental range by changing the original standpoint, it facilitates the mind's action by giving it more exercise, and it refines it by filtering through the world. The mind being thus invigorated imparts new life to the body, and teaches the hands to work, and habits of industry are soon acquired; and industry begets economy and thrift. Now the mind of every worthy man is so strongly impressed with the associations of youth, that all through life it is drawn back with yearning to his native land. By this means, the benefits the emigrant acquires abroad are reflected on his native land, which, in his communications with it, he enriches with thought, and the knowledge he has gained by travel, as well as by the products of his toil, though he may never return to it. I have seen this to be the case, and I know several districts in which the manners, and intellects, and social condition of the people are improved by their communication with friends who emigrated to other countries.

JOHN CARSON:—A discussion on this question can only apply to a country like ours, where the tendency is for the increase in population to outstrip the means of finding them employment. This surplus, if not drafted off to new countries, or fed and cared for by Government, is liable to be reduced by starvation and disease. As we cannot allow them to starve, and it would be economically unwise for the Government to create unnecessary employments for them at the ratepayers' expense, the only alternative is to induce them to emigrate, and by preference to our own colonies. This is done at present, as not only do we placard bills at public places, detailing the advantages of emigration to Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, but we warn emigrants against being led away by specious devices into schemes for supplying labour to the Brazils and River Plate. We also undertake that the ships leaving our shores are properly fitted up for the reception of emigrants, while any temporary advance for passage and outfit is refunded by the Colonial Governments.

I agree that "bone, brain, and muscle," like "tools and machinery," are part of the country's capital; but as tools employed lose in profit and interest, so when our labourers cannot be employed profitably, we lose in food and clothing by retaining them here.

Neither Opponent nor Opener says whether our encouragement should go the length of actual money-assistance; but, as the colonies receive emigrants gladly, only in very

exceptional circumstances should we be justified in expending anything on their removal. The worst phase, however, is that the aged and lazy, whom we desire most to get rid of, are not wanted by other countries, and so our poor laws are generally saddled with those remaining behind. Many emigrants from their savings assist their poor relations by remittances, and some afterwards send for their friends to join them.

Any steps taken to promote emigration come back to us indirectly, in the importation of cheap food, &c., and the colonies become in time good customers for our manufactures, so that both the emigrants and those left behind are benefited.

C. B. T.:—In discussing the question whether emigration should be promoted, it is undoubtedly wise to avoid all special cases; but, inasmuch as both Opener and Opponent seem by their speeches to take Great Britain as the typical country to which their remarks should apply, I am quite satisfied with the arrangement.

There can be no gainsaying the fact that emigration has been most advantageous to this country in the past. It has been the means of peopling those vast colonial possessions which form at the present time so valuable a market for many of our home manufactures, and also supply us with numerous products of comfort and convenience. The nations which constitute our Greater Britain are a source of strength to us in peace and war, and they have become so by means of emigration promoted and assisted by the mother-country.

If it be true that the past often repeats itself, it is most true with regard to emigration. While there are regions unexplored, while there are countries thinly inhabited by uncivilised and barbarous tribes, so long will it be wise to encourage a healthy exodus of emigrants from our native land. The theories of political economists may be very learned, but they tell equally strong both positively and negatively. Experience is the safest and most satisfactory guide, and I unhesitatingly assert that its lessons are entirely in favour of Opponent's views. At the present day, the labour market is overstocked; the learned professions are overcrowded; mercantile employment of every kind is anxiously sought after by hundreds and thousands, for wages that will scarcely keep away the wolf from their door. What more effectual remedy for this condition of things can there be than to encourage all who are unable to earn enough to keep themselves in a comfortable position to emigrate to the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, or some such place where there is a wide scope to obtain a handsome remuneration for one's toil? I would like to notice in detail some of Mr. Opener's remarks, but space will not permit. I am confident that at the conclusion of this debate he will be found not only opposed to the majority of his countrymen, but also to that of the intelligent representatives of the Family Parliament.

* N. NEWNAM:—To those who have watched the sailing of an emigrant-ship from one of our large ports, the departure of such a number of people from their native land cannot but appear a sad sight. Sentiment has strengthened our misgivings that, after all, emigration may be a great economical blunder; and, like the Opener of this debate, we have valued the emigrants at so many

* To these speeches the divided Honorarium of One Guinea has been awarded by the Editor.

pounds sterling per head, and have calculated the loss to this country, and the gain to the countries in which they are about to settle. But there is no such ready method of solving the question of emigration, and perhaps the following figures, which just touch one point of the subject, may help us to the conclusion that emigration, although a sharp, is still a very necessary remedy for our rapidly increasing population.

We sometimes overlook the fact, which appears absurdly obvious when it is mentioned, that agriculture must always remain the root and life of all commerce and civilisation, and that a nation, where this primary interest bears but a small proportion to the secondary interests which spring out of it, is resting its prosperity on a very uncertain base. Let us see whether this may not be the case with our own country. In 1846 we only imported 17 lbs. of grain per head of the population, while in 1881 we imported 195 lbs. per head. If we include meat, our bill in 1863 amounted to £39,453,000, or about £1 6s. per head; in 1880 it had risen to the enormous sum of £111,841,000, or £3 4s. per head—an increase of 185 per cent. We will now compare with these figures the values of our exports for the same two years. In 1863 the sum-total, after deducting the value of foreign and colonial produce, amounted to £146,600,000; in 1880 it had reached £223,000,000—an increase of 52 per cent. Assuming the same rates of increase for the next twenty-five years—and the assumption is much more favourable than the statistics warrant—we shall then be paying a larger sum for meat and bread-stuffs alone than the total value of our external trade. Now, without touching any of the vexed questions of political economy, it is very plain, in a country like ours, that this kind of thing cannot go on indefinitely. There must come a time, and that within a very measurable distance, when our enormous food bills will exceed the value of our industrial profits.

But even assuming for a moment that emigration *is* a national disadvantage, is it a disadvantage to the emigrant? He is relieved from the stress and pressure of our crowded life; he obtains, as a rule, larger returns for his capital and labour; and his children are much better placed to make their way in the world than they would have been at home. In this broader view of the subject, I think, Sir, we shall hardly fail to say that it is wise to promote emigration.

* CHARLES MOORE:—The hon. gentleman, the Opener of this debate, argues upon the principle that each man forms part of the capital of the country to which he belongs; but does he not forget that capital must be employed before it can be of any benefit to any one? For instance, money hoarded up by a

miser is practically useless whilst so hoarded; it requires circulating. Therefore, I agree with the hon. Opponent that surplus capital should be moved to some place where it may be employed.

For an illustration of the benefits of emigration, look at nature. When the denizens of the hive find themselves straitened for room, what do they do? "Swarm" is, I believe, the expressive word which denotes their action; or, in more modern language, a large number of them emigrate. Bees go further: they kill the drones! Do not be alarmed, Mr. Speaker, I am not about to argue that our human drones should be molested, but I am forcibly reminded of the Apostle's words, "If any will not work, neither should he eat."

But, Sir, I must object to the "idle clerk" being taken as a type of one class of emigrants. Have they emigrated in sufficient numbers to be taken as a type? But even if they have, such persons soon discover that they must either work or meet with speedy ruin.

I submit, Sir, that Great Britain is overcrowded; there are thousands who would be glad to work, but there is an excess of unemployed labour in nearly every branch. See the large number of lady candidates for a small number of vacancies in the Post Office. See our daily papers, how many advertisements there are of "Situations Wanted;" and what almost incredible numbers of persons will answer an advertisement where a good situation is offered! On the other hand, you have only to read the papers to see that in Queensland, New Zealand, Manitoba, and various other places, there is a large demand for skilled artisans and female servants. Then, I say, God speed the emigrant! He obeys the natural law which regulates supply and demand, and he obeys the Divine command to "replenish the earth, and subdue it."

A word to parents in conclusion, if it be not out of place. Bring up your children to believe that manual labour is not beneath the dignity of man. Let them learn a trade, instead of sending them to an office because it is thought to be more respectable. Bring up your daughters to understand the management of a household. Then they shall be able to take the places of those who leave us. Teach them to "look labour boldly in the face." So shall emigration prove a blessing to those who go, and those who remain, who will be subject to less competition, and will receive better wages when the balance between supply and demand is more equally adjusted.

END OF THE DEBATE ON EMIGRATION.

The Debate on "Should National Insurance be made Compulsory?" will be resumed in our September issue.

THE PHANTOM SHIP.

A LEGEND.

THE anchor's weighed, the harbour past,
 Away! away! the ship flies fast.
 The skipper's wife is at his side,
 In fear she scans the darkening tide.
 "Fear not," quoth he, "thou'rt safe with me,
 Though the fiend himself should sail the sea!"
 And merrily ho! the breezes blow,
 Over the sea the ship doth go.

The sea grew black, the wind blew high;
 "A ship! A ship!" the sailors cry;
 Down sank the blood-red sun in flame,
 But nearer still the vessel came.
 She had no sails, no oars, no crew!
 But nearer, nearer still she flew.
 One lone dark man on deck they see.
 They can hear him laughing mockingly.

The skipper stood with frozen stare,
 His men were white with wild despair;
 The tempest shrieked, the sea was flame,
 And nearer still the strange ship came.
 Down knelt the skipper's wife and prayed,
 "God of the sailors, send us aid."
 Each stony sailor bent his knee:
 "Save us, O Lord! we cry to Thee!"

Hurrah! Hurrah! the spell is done!
 The phantom ship is gone, is gone!
 The winds are fair, and fair the tide;
 The skipper's wife is at his side.
 He holds her hand, he cannot speak,
 A tear rolls down his rugged cheek;
 And merrily ho! the breezes blow,
 Over the sea the ship doth go.

FREDERICK E. WEATHERLY.