

sale importation of their special commodity. Where there is no great land-holding interest, like the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in Canada, promoting immigration, it is easy to understand the adverse attitude of any colony toward the wholesale importation of unfortunates from England's congested centres.

In England the attitude is not universally favorable. Mr. Keir Hardie, M. P., who stands high among representative workingmen, deprecates the idea of solving the unemployed difficulty in Britain by emigration. In arguing his case he points to Ireland, where the population has been reduced from eight to four millions without removing the danger of want. It must be apparent, in a broad view of the situation in the mother country, that the evils seen in East London are not due to overpopulation. The country, as a whole, is not congested. It is capable of maintaining a much larger population than at present. It has extensive forests and game preserves that could be made productive. Ireland's case is still more suggestive. The island is sparsely populated. But if there was only one man in Ireland, and all he produced over and above a bare living were taken from him annually in rent, he would be poor during the good years and would starve when the crop failed. The introduction of the potato was regarded as a means of relief, but it merely enabled the people to pay more rent; and if another vegetable with double the sustaining power of the potato were introduced and the rents proportionately advanced, as they naturally would be, the people would be no farther removed from actual want. Keir Hardie sees clearly that emigration is not a solution of Britain's industrial and social problems. It is wise and courageous to reject impracticable makeshifts, even if no effective solution of the problem is in sight.

EMIGRATION AND CONGESTION.

General Booth's project for moving 5,000 people from East London to Australia has been interrupted by the unfavorable attitude of the Australian Government. Premier Deakin has cabled the General that he cannot proceed with a scheme which is likely to involve conflict. This shows that opinions are divided in the island colony as to the wisdom of augmenting the population by a large influx of London's poor. In this the Australian people show the discernment that marks their attitude toward all public questions of a sociological nature. They are never willing to sacrifice life for the means of living, and they never seek alleged success by means that make conditions more onerous. The crowding in of population from London would make the Australians individually poorer in land and would thus increase its price, but the benefit of that would be problematical. The people to be deported would no doubt do much better in Australia than in London. But the fact of their failure and dependence would go to show that they were of the weaker elements. They would probably constitute a lower grade of citizenship than would be supplied and established by the men who maintain themselves independently and go out at their own expense and on their own initiative. To the extent that these men lowered the general tone of citizenship in Australia they would be an undesirable acquisition. Another source of opposition is the labor elements, which are cohesive in the island colony and inclined to vote solidly in their own interests. The protection idea is gaining ground, and the men with labor to sell do not relish the prospect of a whole-