

and just to look to that Government for precedents to guide this "land of the free and asylum of the oppressed of all nations" in similar acts? It seems to us that the high position you now occupy places it within your power to inform this Government whether we have so conducted ourselves that we are entitled to remain here or depart after twenty-five years' trial and residence here without going to the antipodes to find British persecution and precedents against our people.

In view of the long and pleasant social and business relations we have had together, you will believe us when we say that our eyes are open, and that we fully comprehend the gulf that separates us since you espouse a politics. The transformation in your case has simply amazed your old friends—the Chinese merchants.

QOONG-HONG-ON,
WING-WO-SANG,
Presidents Merchant-Exchange.

AN OPEN LETTER.

The Chinese Merchants to the Hon. Horace Davis.

Some time ago the CHRONICLE, in an interview with Colonel Bee, attorney for the Six Chinese Companies, published the substance of a letter sent by the Presidents of the Chinese Merchants' Exchange to Horace Davis, reproaching him for his attitude on the Chinese question. The letter is an interesting one, and reads as follows:

CHINESE MERCHANTS' EXCHANGE, }
SAN FRANCISCO, January 7, 1878. }

Hon. Horace Davis - SIR: We read your dispatch sent to the press of California on December 30th, wherein you desire to inform a portion of those you represent in Congress that you had officially requested the Secretary of State to obtain for you from the British Government full information relative to enactments by the Queensland Parliament and other Australian colonies discouraging Chinese emigration. We learn, also, by the same dispatch, that you have long been impressed with the value of the precedents set by the British colonies, and therefore you express a desire "to be fully armed" with these British precedents, "with a view to arguing the Chinese question before Congress," and to be "prepared to answer possible questions in debate." You will pardon us if we presume so far as to aid you in your search for information upon a question of so vital importance to us now, and, we may be allowed to add, of great pecuniary importance to you quite recently. In fact, our social and business relations for a long series of years with you will always be most kindly remembered and cherished by us. Nations and Governments that can point with pride to the commercial integrity of their citizens occupy a high standard of civilization the world over. Hence it is a

PLEASURE TO OUR PEOPLE
To recall the unlimited confidence and credit you were at all times and upon all occasions and are now anxious and willing to extend to us. In fact, when we refer to the large aggregate value, amounting to several hundred thousands of dollars, that our population have paid you, and also the fact that you always considered our word as good as the bond of your own race, it cannot be otherwise than pleasant to recall such memories to your notice, not the least of which is that you never can say the Chinese ever defrauded the Golden Gate Mills out of one dollar. Again, in volunteering to give you the facts in reference to legislation in Australia on Chinese emigration, we desire to truly post you, that you may correctly answer "possible questions," and if you desire to address the President of the United States on the subject, we should regard exceedingly to have you make such wild and exaggerated statements as that recently made by your colleague (Mr. Page) in a letter addressed to His Excellency on the Chinese in California. Theretofore, in furtherance of aiding you in reference to Australian precedents, we beg to state that the first bill passed was by the Victoria Parliament in the year 1855, placing a £10 capitation tax on all Chinese arriving in that colony (Victoria). In 1861 the New South Wales Parliament passed a bill with a like object. Both these bills were afterward repealed—the Victorian Act in 1865, the New South Wales in 1867—much to the gratification of the Imperial Government, as expressed by the Duke of Buckingham, then the head of the Colonial Office, who wrote the Colonial Governments "that he learns with much satisfaction that the restrictions hitherto imposed on Chinese emigrants had been removed; that, in his opinion, such a measure ought never to have been passed." See London Times of September 10, 1867.

THE ONLY OTHER PRECEDENT
Is that of the colony of Queensland, which has a population of less than 200,000. By reference to the London Times of October 2, 1877, you will find a bill, designated as "The Gold Fields Amendment Act of 1877," passed by the Queensland Parliament and sanctioned by the Imperial Government to the extent that all Asiatics shall pay for a miner's right to work in the gold fields the sum of £1, and for a business license £10 each year. This bill was passed with the reservation of the right of repeal within two years by the Imperial Government. It might not be out of place to inform you further that the same colony attempted to place a duty upon rice, but the home Government refused to sanction it, and Lord Carnarvon took occasion to express his opposition in strong terms to such an act. You can fully appreciate his Lordship's position in reference to taxing an article of food like rice, so largely consumed by our people, when you are so fully aware of the constantly increasing shipments of flour made by us to China, and how disastrous it would be to that growing traffic if the Imperial Government of China should reciprocally place a duty of two and one-half cents a pound upon flour exported from this country to China. We mention this as a precedent, and regret it because it is British. We are pained at the honor of your dispatch, wherein you are in search of adverse acts of persecution against our people by a nation that for nearly half a century enforced its shameful and outrageous demands upon our country at the cannon's mouth, burned our cities and towns, slaughtered tens of thousands of our people, demanding millions of tribute, and finally forced our people to buy the "poison drug." The horrors of this traffic will yet be portrayed to a civilized world in letters of fire.

THIS MODEL CHRISTIAN NATION
Of the world insist on degrading, morally, physically and intellectually, a nation of people to enhance its revenues. Will the treatment of that Government toward our people be any justification for this great and free people to do likewise? Is it fair