The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia has just moved the amendment.

Mr. HALE. I move to substitute $1,800 for $1,500.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the ninth district the Senator from Maine moved to amend the amendment by making it $1,800.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. VOORHEES. It is now five o'clock. It is obvious that this bill will not be finished this evening; and to test the sense of the Senate upon that subject, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. TELLER. I ask the Senator to withdraw the motion to adjourn into executive session for a few moments.

Mr. VOORHEES. If the Senator from Colorado wishes that, I will do so.

Mr. TELLER. There is a confirmation that ought to be made.

Mr. VOORHEES. I will modify my motion, then, to a motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and [at five o'clock and twenty-three minutes p.m.] the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, March 22, 1882.

The House met at twelve o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. F. D. Power.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. RANDALL. On the last hour of business, Mr. Speaker, I find that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Bacon] has just submitted a motion to transfer the number of the Statistical Abstract of the United States to the House, with the recommendation that an order to print be made. The chairman is not now in his seat, but he is instructed to report that recommendation to the House.

The chairperson also moved an amendment. -

The question is now before the Committee on Printing, and we have instructed our chairmen to report it back to the House with the recommendation that an order to print be made. The chairman is not now in his seat, but he is instructed to report that recommendation to the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have no objection to the order to print.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS.

Mr. NEAL, by unanimous consent, submitted the following; which was read, considered, and adopted:

Resolved. That Monday, the 27th day of March, after the call of States and Territories for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, be set apart for the consideration of such business as may be presented by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. PAGE. I move to dispense with the morning hour to-day for the call of committees for reports, with a view of proceeding with the consideration of the immigration bill.

The motion was agreed to, two-thirds voting in favor thereof.

SUFFERERS FROM THE OVERFLOW.

Mr. WHEELER, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 5365) to authorize the Secretary of War to direct the officers in charge of the Missisippi and Arkansas movement to furnish necessary seed and to plant grain for planting purposes to persons represented to be in a destitute condition; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

RELIEF OF DESTITUTE PERSONS.

Mr. WHEELER, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 5371) for the relief of persons in destitute circumstances, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SUFFERERS FROM MISSISSIPPI OVERFLOW.

Mr. KING, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, considered, and adopted:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be requested to inform the House of Representatives at the earliest possible date what further relief, in the shape of assistence, from the difficulties incident to the overflow, is in contemplation; and also to ascertain the number and the extent of the sufferers from the present overflow of the Mississippi river and its tributaries.

Mr. KING moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

HERBS OF JOHN BOYLE.

Mr. THOMAS, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 5372) for the relief of the heirs-at-law of John Boyle, deceased; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. THOMAS also, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 5373) granting an increase of pension to certain classes of pensioners therein mentioned; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Select Committee on the Payment of Pensions, Bounty, and Bait Pay, and ordered to be printed.

DR. F. O. ST. CLAIR.

Mr. CHAPMAN, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 5374) to refund to Dr. F. O. St. Clair $57,05, duties on a monument to the memory of Francis J. Townshend, late of the United States Navy; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

ROAD TO NATIONAL CEMETERY, FREDERICKSBURGH, VIRGINIA.

Mr. GARRISON, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 5375) to construct a road from the corporate limits of the city of Fredericksburg, in the county of Spotsylvania, to the National Cemetery, near said city; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

JOHN C. DEVELL.

Mr. TALBOT, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R.}
No. 5376) for the relief of John
and
Affairs, and
of their presentation and their application to the bill. I believe he
strictly under the
entertained . Therefore I would like to have an understanding with
their application.

The S P E A K E R . The regular order is
between these gentlemen.

The SPEAKER. Pending amendments will be considered of course
after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. Robinson, of Massachusetts. Without regard to their number.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will see that any arrangement made
between the gentlemen, with the consent of the House, is carried out.
Mr. SPRINGER. Under the rules, only one amendment with an
amendment to that amendment and one substitute with an
amendment to the substitute can be pending at the same time. But under
this arrangement, as I understand, amendments may be offered without
reference to the number that may be pending at the same time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand that any definite
arrangement has been made; there has merely been a suggestion
of what would be done hereafter.

Mr. PAGE. I have no such agreement.

Mr. Robinson, of Massachusetts. Let me inquire whether the
gentleman from California agrees to the arrangement I have sug-
gested.

The SPEAKER. No definite arrangement has yet been made, but
only suggestions have been received in reference to it.

Mr. Robinson, of Massachusetts. Will not the Chair indulge us
for a few minutes to see whether we cannot arrive at some arrange-
ment agreeable to all sides of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no objection to indulging gentle-
men, if it can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. PAGE. I do not wish to make any definite arrangement at
this time on the matter suggested by the gentleman from Massa-
echu-

The SPEAKER. It can be done hereafter, as there is plenty of
time.

Mr. Robinson, of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman from
California is quite willing to enter into any reasonable arrangement,
and there can be no objection to making such arrangement at this
time. The Chair knows it is easier to make such arrangement when
we are ready for it than to wait until the previous question has
been ordered, when it is in the power of any one member to make objec-
tion by interrupting the consideration of the rules. If we can come
to an arrangement, which I understand the gentleman from Cali-
ifornia is willing to make, for he has said so, I think it had better be done.

Mr. PAGE. Before making any definite arrangement I propose to
talk with my colleagues and with the friends of the measure. The
gentleman from Massachusetts understands very well that I am will-
ing that some amendments, which are germane and proper, shall be
voted on, but I do not propose that this bill shall be flooded with
amendments, as has been the case with those other measures on which
we have had the same interest as you have had in this bill. As soon as
having this bill passed at as early a time as is reasonable, and just as
it is.

Mr. Robinson, of Massachusetts. I do not suppose that my
friend from California makes the slightest allusion to me in what
he has just said.

Mr. P age. No; not in the least.

Mr. L ORD . Does the gentleman intend to call the previous ques-
tion to-day?

Mr. Page. I shall be governed by what the majority of the
House desire. If, when the time comes when I gave notice yester-
day I should call the previous question to-day, at three or half past
three o'clock, I will then consult the wishes of the House. I do
not desire to cut off anybody in debate on this bill, and if it is the
wish of a majority of the House that further debate shall be had I
have no objection to allowing it to go on. I have no intention to
cut off debate after the arrangement of the rules is made.

Mr. Randolph. The gentleman test the sense of the House
on that point at three or half past three o'clock to-day.

Mr. Page. What point?

Mr. Randolph. Test the sense of the House whether the majority
wish the previous question at three or half past three o'clock to-day.

Mr. T ownshend. Say four minutes.

Mr. T ownshend, of Illinois. Wait until then and we will know
more about it.

Mr. Page. Very well.

A message in writing was received from the President, by Mr.
Pruden, one of his secretaries.

It was further announced that he had approved and signed a bill
and its resolutions of the following titles:

An act (H. R. No. 2730) authorizing the sale of certain logs cut by
the Indians of the Menomonee reservation in Wisconsin;

Joint resolution (H. R. No. 130) granting the use of articles, tents,
&c., at the soldiers' reuni on to be held at Grand Island, Nebraska, in
the month of August, 1852; and

Joint resolution (H. R. No. 130) granting the use of articles, tents,
&c., at encampment of Grand Army of the Republic of the Depart-
ment of Pennsylvania, on the battle-field of Gettysburg, in July, 1852.

C H I N E S E I M M I G R A T I O N .

Mr. Townshend, of Illinois. I demand the regular order of business.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the further consideration of
the bill (H. R. No. 71) to execute a treaty signed by the United
States, and the United States, with respect to Chinese immigration,
on which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Washburn] is
entitled to the floor.

Mr. Washburn. Mr. Speaker, in the few remarks that I propose
to make on the subject under discussion, I shall not speak with
reference so much to the particular bill before us as upon the gen-
eral subject embraced in that bill as well as the one introduced into
the House in the early days of this session; understanding that the
two are of substantially the same import and effect, both having for
their object the restriction of Chinese immigration, and I suppose the
ultimate suppression of Chinese emigration to this country, and it is to
this general proposition that I wish to speak briefly at this time.

The restriction of Chinese immigration, though by no means new, is
one that until within the past few years has not received from the
people of the more easterly or central portion of the country the seri-
ous consideration which it has deserved.
The evils or alleged evils likely to occur from the want of placing some restrictions on this class of immigration have been so far away and so widespread as to make it evident that there are altogether far too many who believe that immigration is a class of evils to which we import restrictions upon, and which it is not consistent with the genius of our Government and opposed to the spirit and practice of our institutions. We are told that we must adapt ourselves to this system of labor, that it is inconsistent with the genius of our Government and opposed to the spirit and practice of our institutions. We are told that we must adapt ourselves to this system of labor, which is inconsistent with the genius of our Government and opposed to the spirit and practice of our institutions.
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degrading labor, with which the pauper labor of Europe can bear no comparison. We are invited to permit the degradation not only of the labor of the field, but that of the men and women, of the iron industries of Pennsylvania, which we have been called upon to protect against the pauper labor of Europe, but the labor of the entire country. It has been said that to permit such labors is to stamp the entire class of cheap labor that has ever cursed this country. I propose to do nothing that will encourage the introduction of a labor that I believe is detestable, and which I believe, as a just reward.

We there have an unusually large representation of what is known as the Chinese labor, who, receiving the just reward of his honest and intelligent toil, is enabled to support and educate in a decent way those dependents upon whom he has laid it down to his last day for the doing strike a blow at the very foundations of our free Government. We can afford the tendency of which is to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. The great danger that many do not realize is that of the poorer classes of labor being brought into competition with the lowest and most disgusting of any other country.

As a rule, I refer much from our fellow-countrymen of the Pacific States of the effects of this cheap degrading labor upon the industries of that section of our country. Now, I do not suppose the people living west of the Rocky Mountains are substantially different from those of other sections of the country. In fact, that population has been drawn largely from all sections of the country. The best blood of the English and Scotch, and Irish, and German, and French, and from the South, and from all other parts. I take it, they are probably no better or no worse than the average population of the country west of the Mississippi. Let me take into consideration the same effect. While slave labor in the States of Pennsylvania, which we have been called upon to protect against the same, Mr. Speaker, the people whom I represent on this floor are engaged in competition there can be no other result. He will say, as other gentlemen have said, that when these systems of labor are removed, and I will say that I have never yet seen the man or woman in this country, with their own hands, who, receiving the just reward of his honest and intelligent toil, is enabled to support and educate in a decent way those dependents upon whom he has laid it down to his last day for the doing strike a blow at the very foundations of our free Government. We can afford the tendency of which is to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. The great danger that many do not realize is that of the poorer classes of labor being brought into competition with the lowest and most disgusting of any other country.
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A bill (S. No. 1432) abolishing the military reservation of Fort Abercornble, in the State of Minnesota, and authorizing the Secretary of War to convey the land included therein to the nearest public lands, is hereby referred to the committee on public lands, to which the same is referred.
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Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this is a question of vital interest to the people of the Pacific coast and, as I think, to the people generally throughout this country. My purpose is to offer a few ideas upon that phase of the question presented to the minds of many well-intending people in the Eastern states who are opposed to the restrictions of the bill before us. The question, under the provisions of the treaty with China, provides for certain essential restrictions upon the importation of that class or portion of Chinese subjects whose presence in our land has been productive of such productive evil consequences in the past and is now fraught with such danger to the prosperity of ourselves and our institutions in the future.

In favoring the measure before this House I start upon the broad and unexceptionable assumption, and I lay it down as a sound proposition, that in this great nation of ours, founded as it essentially is upon the idea of self-government and dependent for success upon the virtue and intelligence of each and every citizen, that there is no recognized principle that the ignorant, the savage, the barbarous, the brutal, the servile, the riffraff, are entitled of right to enter our body-politic and become a part and parcel of our governing power.

I am aware of no correct or well-defined principle that makes Americanism more than anything else the fear of invasion by every foreign power. In the Republic of America we assist in governing the rest, and it is a matter of the very greatest importance to us each and every citizen, the vitality of the State, the security of our property, our liberty, and our lives, shall be possessed of those essential qualifications which alone can insure the safety and success of a new and seceded nation. You will admit with me, Mr. Speaker, that it is a question of the day yet unsolved in the minds of many publicists and statesmen as to the capacity of people, generally speaking, of an American nation, grand as it has been her success hitherto, is yet an experiment of but a single hundred years' trial; and you well know that had it not been for the industry, the energy, the brain of the Chinese individuals flooding our shores, that our American nation would not have long since been numbered among the nations that were not but now.

It is by those essential individual and national requisites must continue to exist, or self-government, or rather the government of each by all and each by all, will yet prove a lamentable failure—sufficient intelligence to know how to do for the right and for the best and virtue to do it. Our nation is like a great pyramid, our people composing the base, and if they are not of the right material the whole will crumble and fall.

It therefore becomes pertinent for us to inquire as to the character and kind of people who are henceforth to take part and lot with us. I say, what is this true pyramid composed of, as capable of support as the base of government, and far more so in despotic countries where arbitrary power over the masses is centered in one.

In this land of liberty and freedom, the people may say, the idea of an archipelago, or the religious prejudices of the people, make it impossible for us to exercise our own rights of government. I hold that it is no more the right in any case of any man or woman to choose to have or her own national or place of residence than it is such community as he or she may choose to declare for itself whether or not it thinks them worthy or safely entitled to admission.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, this is a vital question, and the exigency demands that the statesmen of America—those who love our institutions and our homes, our liberty and our Government as we love life—pause before they vote that no restrictions shall be placed upon the countless hordes with which old pagan and despotic China can flood our western land.

Reflect upon the fact that under the policy which has largely swayed our public affairs the terms inhabitants, citizens, and voters, so far as one sex is concerned, are almost synonymous, and in that respect the question which we shall view in all questions relating to the admission of members of other races and other nationalities into this and succeeding the treaty with China, the Philippines, and other provinces in the Orient, who have been excluded after the conditions of the treaty, interfere with the exercise of our own rights of government.

I hold that in the light of our traditional policy as a Government we should not admit any considerable number from other lands unless with the ultimate view of allowing them after a reasonable probation period to become a constituent part of the governing power of this country.

These thoughts bring me directly to the subject—matter and call for the inquiry whether this Chinese element which the bill under consideration is intended to exclude, is not such as to make its admission safe one for the development of our institutions. Is it intelligent, and does it possess the requisite virtue? If not, will it in a reasonable time attain to a sufficient degree of intelligence? Does it possess the energy or the pluck of other elements of which it ever be a patriotic element in our nation? Will it appreciate and love our institutions, and become in all essential respects a part and parcel of us? In other words, can we digest it and have it become a part of our system and body-politic; and will it, like healthy food, build up the national bone and sinew, or will it poison and canker all its surroundings? Too great care in the acception of this foreign population cannot be taken.

We are not to be told that many of the Eastern people have formed favorable or false or erroneous opinions of the class hereafter to be excluded, derived from articles in books and papers concerning other classes of Chinese in this country, and differing from the lower caste, the servile coolies who are imported here. Some of the better class are on our coast, and in the West, and hence come before us, and allow them to come and to go as they please. The bill does not molest them, neither does it nor can it, under that treaty, interfere with the admission of the Chinese of the better, the well-to-do Chinese. All the rest are under the sanction of our treaties and laws. All that it provides for, and all it can provide for, is that a restriction shall be placed upon the further importation of coolie laborers. I say importation, for it is a sad mistake to call it immigration. It has none of the essential characteristics of other immigration to our shores. In the past, pure, genuine immigration is never eastward, always westward. No instance of such immigration from the Orient to the Western world, and yet we have been told that the great tide of immigration has been, and is now, westward around the world. This has been the great immutable law of the universe. Asia was the birthplace of Europe, Europe was its home, and still westward to America, and on the American continent we well know that along the line from Eastern to extreme Western States or from China to extreme California there are men. All, all, all, westward, never eastward. And the people who have made America what it is to-day have all come from the East. The capital, the homesteads, the towns, the cities, are the result of the East. We never got it from Asia, and we never will. Asia is fossilized. It has long since attained its growth in civilization. The cheap laborers are brought from there, to do the work that can be done, the work which can be done by our American citizens laborers. Through their habits of life, brought about by years and ages of forced necessity, depravation, and want, and with no family cares, they are enabled to work and thrive at rates ruinous to the American and his family. Let me give you some idea of the vastness of the land, and the quality of the great Chinese resident from which is drained the great current that floods our Pacific homes.

I incorporate into my remarks the following facts, gleaned from a recent official report from the American consul-general in China services, and others.

The condition of these Chinese immigration into our country, and the rapidity of their progress, is such that it must produce an effect upon the general results of the early occupation of the Mississippi valley and the national interests of our country. We are forced to recognize the fact that the Chinese immigration is already far in excess of what we anticipated, and that we have not yet begun to realize the magnitude of the problem which we have to face.

It is therefore the duty of Congress to take immediate measures to check the rapidity of this immigration, and to prevent the introduction of such a vast number of Oriental laborers into our country as will result in the destruction of our agricultural and manufacturing interests.

The following table shows the number of Chinese immigrants admitted into the United States from 1851 to 1882:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Chinese Immigrants Admitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>167,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>227,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>287,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>347,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>407,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>467,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>527,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>587,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>647,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>707,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>767,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>827,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>887,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>947,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1,007,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>1,067,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>1,127,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1,187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1,247,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1,307,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1,367,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1,427,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1,487,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1,547,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1,607,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1,667,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1,727,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1,787,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1,847,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>1,907,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1,967,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average number of Chinese immigrants admitted into the United States during the period from 1851 to 1882 was 1,736,000 per annum.
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The grand average of an income under the head of skilled labor is as follows:

**For a master, per week:**
- $8.15 per annum.
- $27.50 per year.

**For rent, &c.:**
- $4.50.

**For clothing, &c.:**
- $0.

**Total:**
- $13.65.
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our land upon the compensated toil of too many free, intelligent, devoted Americans who live by the sweat of their brow to ever make it a policy of our Government to "cheaper" the labor of the great mass of self-governing American citizens.

Oh, no; cheap, servile, ignorant labor may do for a despotism what the white, free, and ignorant labor of a republic can do for itself, but as a feature of government, protection must either become a balance against the favored classes or a one-man power, but not in this land of freemen founded as it is upon the idea that every citizen in his design and must have the power to maintain his sovereignty and independence.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. FAGE. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Maryland is extended. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall try to finish my remarks in ten minutes.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection the time of the gentleman is extended accordingly.

Mr. GEORGE. As I was about to say when interrupted, our Government, our institutions, and our future welfare are too dependent upon the prosperity of the countless homes of American laborers who love our republican principles, who pride themselves on our civilisation, and who revere our religion, ever to embrace a policy which will destroy this grand foundation.

It is protection to the laboring-men of our country to legislate on the staple products of foreign lands. I believe in dignifying and protecting labor. I believe in legislation in behalf of our American citizens and laborers for reasons stated before, and because in our form of government, where one man has the balance against the other, to legislate ultimately almost any power, it is necessary to legislate in behalf of the weaker class or the uneducated mind, or the intelligent but poor class of laborers who are down but who are striving to get upon their feet as it were.

It is necessary also for the reason that our success as a nation depends upon our intelligence, independence, and virtue of our people, and to preserve that proper equilibrium between the various elements and interests in our land. It has been the policy of Congress for years in her tariff regulation to endeavor as far as possible to protect our American laborers from the productions of cheap foreign labor. That practically is what is asked in this bill.

In that tariff regulation we have placed restrictions upon the entry of the products of cheap foreign laborer; this bill places restrictions upon the presence of far cheaper and of ignorant, servile, unassimilating, and pagan laborers. We are only asking for the West what we have long had in the East, the policy of dignifying and protecting American laborers. No, Mr. Speaker, "cheap labor" is not an American policy, and our permanent prosperity depends upon a fair and more just distribution of the wealth of labor among its producers.

You of the East do not feel the force of the evil of unrestricted Chinese immigration as we of the West, but the time may come when you will. On our undeveloped coast where, though driven from one industry they could more readily find another, our laborers generally, except in the principal cities, are herefore untaxed and have such as it has been, despite the Mongolian, but let there be an im- mulation of Chinese upon any of your eastern cities as we have had in our West, and then there is a connection between the larger classes and the herefore unprofitable to the laborer in the East as there has been, but there is a connection between the larger cities and the herefore unassimilated and herefore unassimilating, and they will soon be the same as the laborers in the East.

It is simply a question of cold mathematics. If there are in no danger. But we are. Chinese companies can pour onto our coast and into this country thousands to where one has been sent before, and their absence scarcely be noticed in the East. China is indeed, if they land upon your shores and in your ports as well as ours. Only the fear of an uprising or the engendering of a too formidable opposition to be overcome has hitherto restrained the greed of the importation companies, and so we on the Pacific alone feel the evil as it exists to-day and has for years.

The resentment of our people operates as a constant restraint on their action. Those Chinese companies are, however, clearly watch- ing events, flooding our decks with specious pleas to deceive our eastern people, and anxiously awaiting results.

Will you of the East turn a deaf ear to our interests? Will you not assist us? For over a quarter of a century my personal obser- vations of this question have extended, and now remembering the past and casting the future earnestly in my firm conviction that there is an irrelative conflict that must continue until one system prevails. Paganism, with cheap, ignorant, servile, and ignorant laborers, is not the policy of the Government. As I understand the American Congress say it shall be! America has had enough of race troubles. With the red race and the black race we have dealt with in the West, and now with the yellow race we have been invited to come and lend a helping hand, but none other.

We have invited them to join us—they do not come of their own free will. We are the community of the land is going to follow the law. It is the land of freemen founded as it is upon the idea that every citizen is the land of freemen founded as it is upon the idea that every citizen in his design and must have the power to maintain his sovereignty and independence.

The right under the law of nature sanctions it and the law of self-defense demands it.

The right of defending ourselves is just as dear to an aggregation of individuals as to a single individual. If society may impose one of its members for the public welfare, much more may it extend, if necessary, for the same reasons, those of a foreign shore. We as in- dividual Americans have the right to protect our own homes and our own households from dangerous intruders; so have we to protect our great American home. Let us hear no more of misapplied government principles or national boasts, for there is no room or proper consideration of this question, vital to our western interests. I may remark, by the way, that neither sentiment nor mistaken views of commercial advantage should weigh with us in the consideration of the blood of the American people.

We of the distant Pacific are indeed good-faith immigrants to that fair portion of our national heritage, but there we are meeting the increasing demands of capitalism upon labor. As I understand the lamented Garfield said was "too much like an immigration to be welcomed without restriction and too much like an invasion to be resisted," and I believe the same is the case. No good man was not misled by name false applications of principles as I fear others have been.

I propose to vote for this bill and am going to trespass upon the floor for a little while to give my reasons to support it. I would not trespass upon the House but for the character and turn this discussion has taken.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I wish to know something about the order of the debate.

Mr. McLANE. I wish the gentleman from Illinois would take time to inquire. I believe as Mr. Garfield said, "that if we are to go on with this question of order, I desire to know, Mr. Speaker, to the order of debate whether the gentleman from Maryland has been recognized in his own right.

Mr. KASSON. I wish to say that I understood I was to be recognized for this hour and the gentleman from Maryland for the succeeding hour. As one of my papers, however, was not at hand, I proposed to the gentleman from Maryland that he should go on now and I would follow him, thus simply alternating the hours.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I desire an answer from the Speaker to my question whether the gentleman from Maryland takes the floor in his own right or in the time of another?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In his own right.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. Is the gentleman from Maryland the chairman of the committee reporting this bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not know whether the gentleman from Maryland is a member of the committee reporting the measure or not, but under any circumstances, is entitled to recognition at this time.

Mr. DIBLE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I believe as a member of the committee that I am entitled, fairly, to take part in this.

Mr. McLANE. The committee has no more right than anybody else in that respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will answer the question at the proper time.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I would like to know if the Chair would call the gentleman to order so that I may proceed.

Mr. DIBLE. I understood from the Chair that I was entitled to an hour.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I wish to make a further inquiry
if the Chair will hear me. I desire to know whether the list is to be regarded in the order in which the names are upon it, or whether the Chair intends to recognize gentlemen regardless of the list?

Mr. MCLANE. I beg the gentleman from Illinois not to interfere with me. I was about to state that is not a parliamentary inquiry; and furthermore that the Chair has no list.

Mr. MILLER. I feel that I ought to embrace the opportunity, if I may, to vindicate the vote I mean to give in the affirmative.

Mr. Speaker, that upon the general principle that every government existing among men is bound to vindicate its own dignity, its own character, and to regulate itself for the best interests of its own people, there should be no dispute. I take it further that no American citizen would question that the very foundation of good government and the basis of all governments ought to rest upon principles of self-government, and knowledge of the people themselves. Not only the people of the national government, but the forefathers in their formation of a system of government based all law and all rule upon these principles, but when as a Congress of the United States a man is elected upon a principle not foreign to the people not embraced within the States, we laid that down as a fundamental principle of all government.

I feel that all that, whenever it may be abstract declarations, such as the Declaration of Independence, declaring all men to be free and equal, no American citizen believes that to be free and equal means other than under the law. It was an essential part of this House to-day who questions that the principle embodied in the Declaration of Independence, that we are all free and equal, means that we are all free and equal under the law; and that the principle embodied in the Declaration of Independence, and the men of Africa and the men of India and the men of all the world, if they were to come to us and give their consent— if, I say, I am so to understand them, I must be permitted to say that in my judgment they mistake the fundamental sense of the language. Not only are they in conflict with the practice and the law of their own country, but they are in violent conflict with the sense of the language they profess to understand.

Why, sir, we have had from the foundation of our Government laws which designated who should come. We never had any naturalization law that embraced any but white men. That was the law from the very beginning. That was the sense of the American government, that the claim of the Chinese to come to our country was not a claim to political rights, but a claim to a right to hold intercourse with us. Non-intercourse was not a legal emancipation. It was a second treaty, that was made by Bradford Reed, were made by Mr. Fillmore, and for months he remained at the gates of Canton asking admission to present his letter of credence, and was told by the dispatches, up and down the coast, that he had no right to refer to them—that the imperial government had not time to receive the letter; that there was nothing material to be attended to, and when there was, they would take occasion to invite the minister to come to some convenient place and there deliver his letter. For one reason or another the minister persisted, and at last it was agreed he should be received in a warehouse outside of the city, and he refused to proceed from his letter. And he went from port to port to find some man who would receive his letter. There was no intention to insult them seriously, but an absolute aversion to hold intercourse with us. Non-intercourse and non-resistance, too; as astute as astute can be, but trifling withal, childish withal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that this treatment extended to the American minister was also extended to the British minister and again! Look at their dispatches. Why, sir, I have in my hands very documents written by the imperial Chinese commissioners to the Emperor of China, with the vermillion penciling on their communications, saying, "Well done, faithful servants; keep out the foreigners; we do not want nor need them; and you yield no more to them than you are obliged to yield, and at the hazard of your lives yield when you are obliged to yield."" Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get to another question. This has ever been held with that people by England or America except under the thunders of British cannon; none. I am amazed when I hear honorable gentlemen talking in this House about free and equal intercourse with the British officials. And yet he would be spit upon, the guard of the city that he did not incur danger, even the guard of the city that he did not incur danger, and that he would not have existed in Peking. And with all that police it existed with the China officials. And yet he would be spit upon, literally spit upon by the Chinese officials and the Chinese people.

Our first treaty, I mean the treaty that Cushing made, and our second treaty, that was made by Bradford Reed, were made under the protection of British cannon. Some gentleman has referred here to Tatnall's remark about blood being thicker than water. That was what he said, for the gentlemen just because I have tried to uphold a legal embarrasses me. That slip of paper contains what two or three hundred thousand men in the United States any but white men, until the time of war came to deal with the great domestic problem, until in the course of time we came to deal with five millions of people emancipated by war, not by the voluntary act of the people of this country.

We had State conventions North and South to ratify amendments to the Constitution which proclaimed freedom to the black man. But every man knows that the black man was free as air before those amendments were ratified by the States or affirmed by the Congress of the United States. No question has ever been raised in this country about any law by war or by declaration. That sword which crushed out the rebellion wrote in the fundamental law of the country the freedom of the black man. And being free now, the people of the United States are not only the government of that day that I am asking this House to deal with the sentiment of the country from the outside of their cities; permission to anchor our ships at the mouths of their rivers and send up in junk and flat-boats the produce and merchandise we had to sell, and receive in return the teas and silks and stuffs they had to send back, we receiving millions from them for the thousands we send to them, we paying for all we look from China by bills on England; no reciprocity in trade; no reciprocity in immigration; our people not admitted within the walls of a Chinese city outside of the British minister's official residence; and the fact that we would not have existed in Peking. And with all that police it existed with the China officials. And yet he would be spit upon, literally spit upon by the Chinese officials and the Chinese people. A man with a child would not have existed in Peking. And with all that police it existed with the China officials and the Chinese people.

These thunders of the British cannon protected your minister when he went to Peking; and, what is more humiliating still, they took care of him when he got to Peking. Without the preliminary arrangements made by the British minister and the Chinese government, it is certain that the thunders of the British cannon would not have existed in Peking. And with all that police it existed with considerable danger and with repeated insults. That was the state of things that Mr. Buzard called a "cakewalk." Mr. MILLER. Tell us about the Tatnall affair that you referred to.
Mr. McLANE. I have allowed that to escape me. Mr. Reed was instructed by the administration of Mr. Buchanan to accompany the British minister. Prior to that, summer after summer, for threeconsecutive summers, the American minister and the British minister had gone through the ceremony by which, last year they got to the gates of Peking. Finally, there at the gates of Peking, they were delayed until the snow and the little of winter overtook them. They were not invited, in the sense of being given the privilege for my honorable friend from Mississippi to use, to go back to Cantow, to go back to the point from which they started, and that even to talk on the future wishes, and all that were reasonable “his heavenly grace the Emperor of China would send word to his slave to do what was meet and proper”—that is the official language; that is the form of Christian civilization—“would allow your slave at Canton to hear them.” And the expression was, “and what is needful and proper we will do for them,” supposing that the minister “maintains a reverent and respectful demeanor.”

Now, the answer to that from the British diplomatist was a report to his government that he had been outraged, had been insulted, and that communication was absolutely impossible between the British officials and the Chinese officials. And the American minister made just the same report.

The two governments, however, took very different views of the question. I am not here to criticize the action of either of the two governments. I am only leading up to my anecdote about Tatnall. The two governments took very different views. Great Britain obtained her liberty from China, and she sent an invitation to the British admiral of the British navy by towing up to Canton and to Paris, inviting the French and American Governments to send out fleets also. The French Government accepted the invitation, and the United States did not.

The American Government—and the dispatch was written by Governor Marcy—said that it might suit the British Government and the French Government to enforce their treaty by force. I give it here as one of the reasons why it did not suit the United States of America to do so, and therefore he declined to send a fleet. He ordered, however, his minister to keep in observation and to give moral support to the British and French Governments, but no more.

The British and the French fleets went to the Peiho, and the American did not. That fleet, bringing up a copy of the Bible, accompanied the other two fleets, but did not come within the anchorage. The British and the French fleets opened fire on the Chinese forts. The Chinese fled for their lives.

In the midst of the battle the British admiral, like Perry on Lake Erie, found his ship sinking, his reinforcements aground, and himself in great extremities. Tatnall was in command of the American fleet, giving his moral support and observation as he had been instructed, could stand it no longer. He said that blood was thicker than water, and he ordered his steamer into the Chinese bay and rescued the admiral of the British navy by towing up to him the ship, he could not otherwise reach.

That was the anecdote connected with Tatnall. Thus instructed to resist the impulse at the last moment of going into the battle. But what did our minister do? He stated that he was instructed to go to the Peiho. He said: “If you do not go to the Peiho, the British minister has a clause which gives us the rights of the most favored nations. As I have said, England obtained the right by the thunder of her cannon, and we got it because the war was over we negotiated a treaty of peace and commerce which gives us the rights of the most favored nations. And by that treaty we have the right to go into the interior of China, but only by that treaty.”

Mr. Speaker, what is that right to go into the interior of China? It is a right only to trade and to preach and to pray. I recollect that when I met the French Emperor, (I have in the course of my life conversed with the Emperor,) I recollect the language was put in English, and if the privilege to trade was put in for the Englishmen, we get both.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish I had time to tell you the fruit of that privilege. I have shown you the Emperor, I have shown you the abbe® Hume, who went up into the mountains of Thibet, at the headwaters of a river 3,000 miles in length. He took this Bible there and he read it; he studied it as closely and perfectly as any Christian missionary or preacher of the Gospel, and he studied it till he had gained the language, if that is the mode of education in China. An educated Chinaman is a man who knows by rote 20,000, 30,000, 40,000, 50,000 words. He is a great scholar when he knows by rote 50,000 words. Among the great intellectual achievements of the Chinese is this cultivation of the memory. I knew the missionary who was sent to China and taught them to read and write Chinese. He was one of the cleverest men ever sent into the missionary field. When I first met him he had spent twelve years of his life in China.

This Chinaman having read and studied that Bible till he knew it by heart, walked into the market-place without his Bible; assembled the people about him and said to them, “You fools, who believe in Confucius and these impostors known as Buddhist priests who tell you that God created the world out of blocks and stone,” then he related to them the creation of the world as related in the book of Genesis. He preached to them by the hour from the book of Genesis and the other books of Moses; and then from the New Testament he unfolded to them the whole scheme of Christian salvation. He said: “God sent his son; Jesus Christ is my elder brother, and he came to save me.” He had read the books of Moses to some purpose. [Laughter.]

Thus preaching, he was naturally interfered with by the police. The consequence between the miserable and the signers of such oaths is a worse than in the Chinese. The sealed and the official governing class is almost inconceivable to a man educated in this country. This immense gulf between the government class and the masses is the greatest characteristic of Chinese civilization. When my honorable friend from Mississippi talked of 400,000,000 Chinamen, he ought to have told you that the mass of these are in a state of abject poverty and subserviency to less than 100,000 Chinese and Mongolian officials. The middle class of that country is absolutely effaced. Let any man in China who has a dollar of property raise his voice against the government to-day, and to-morrow he is a pauper. The middle class has in fact no political existence in China. But the masses, the millions, are as roomless and vicious as any oppressed people in any country.

You all know how passionately fond of books the Chinese scholar is. This book he took home, and his home was at the foot of the outskirts of Titch, the outskirts of foreign length. He took this Bible there and he read it; he studied it as closely and perfectly as any Christian missionary or preacher of the Gospel, and he studied it till he had gained the language. The Chinese is a man who knows by rote 20,000, 30,000, 40,000, 50,000 words. He is a great scholar when he knows by rote 50,000 words. Among the great intellectual achievements of the Chinese is this cultivation of the memory. I knew the missionary who was sent to China and taught them to read and write Chinese. He was one of the cleverest men ever sent into the missionary field. When I first met him he had spent twelve years of his life in China.
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own work. We have no fear now for China, now that I know the Bible is in the interior of the country of the name of Owu work. We have no fear now for the Bible. There were the missionaries and the tracts, and the tracts were almost minutest matters of municipal and domestic control. Results could flow from these missionary efforts, but they came back and there were the missionaries. You have, on your knees, taken down, Mr. Reed. English, the very reports of their ministers themselves rendering eastern king in one of his decrees from heaven, wheat and sacks of corn, and who under the dispensation of God could come from China who are paid and under contract and forced to come, and you can go to-day into the Chinese Empire and see Chinese laborers crowded up in jail, looking for all the world like an English laborer. It is no yard of difference. That is just the condition of affairs there now with the laborer. He is locked up there till the time comes to carry him out and put him on an American steamer that brings him to California. His way is paid, and the contract is sometimes made with the man himself, sometimes with his father, and sometimes with a corrupt police magistrate. The police magistrates are allowed to send criminals. Notorious as the corruption of the Chinese officials is, it is not difficult to send innocent men as well as criminals off under contracts of this kind, if we were at that period now. The negro was brought to this country, and why was he brought? He was brought to labor; he was brought to labor because his labor was cheap, and in California to-day we find the people subjected to exactly the same condition of affairs that this country suffered from when the mother country permitted African negroes to be introduced, able men to be shipped to the South and sold as slaves.

Sympathizing with him fully and hopefully I invited him to send the bill, because it is the Chinese laborer to-day. He is his own king in one of his decrees from heaven, wheat and sacks of corn, and who under the dispensation of God could come from China who are paid and under contract and forced to come, and you can go to-day into the Chinese Empire and see Chinese laborers crowded up in jail, looking for all the world like an English laborer. It is no yard of difference. That is just the condition of affairs there now with the laborer. He is locked up there till the time comes to carry him out and put him on an American steamer that brings him to California. His way is paid, and the contract is sometimes made with the man himself, sometimes with his father, and sometimes with a corrupt police magistrate. The police magistrates are allowed to send criminals. Notorious as the corruption of the Chinese officials is, it is not difficult to send innocent men as well as criminals off under contracts of this kind, if we were at that period now. The negro was brought to this country, and why was he brought? He was brought to labor; he was brought to labor because his labor was cheap, and in California to-day we find the people subjected to exactly the same condition of affairs that this country suffered from when the mother country permitted African negroes to be introduced, able men to be shipped to the South and sold as slaves.

Now, as to the right. I have dealt with the general question, and with the particular features presented, and now a word as to the right of this immigration. I know that my colleague here, who has taken the same position in this bill, thinks we have no right to suspend this immigration for twenty years. Why, when Mr. TreasooT, Mr. Angel, and Mr. Swift negotiated this treaty, they did not want to prohibit it. In a dispatch to the Department, which I will not stop to read, for it has been read during the course of this discussion perhaps twenty times, here or in the other end of the Capitol, they say flatly that the Chinese did not want to prohibit it. They agreed however to limit it, to regulate it, though they did not want to prohibit it. They had a great deal of pride in the treaty, and Mr. Speaker, that they put these laborers in jail simply because it is the readiest mode of sending them to America.

Now, Mr. Speaker, nobody disputes what "suspend" means. You may suspend the habeas corpus act if you want to. There is a right to do it, and when it is done you are not bound to any time. You suspend it indefinitely, or for five or twenty years as you please. Now, the discretion is here with the United States to suspend this immigration, and as to the time of suspension it is left to the discretion of the Government.

Mr. Robinson, of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman from Maryland permit me to call his attention to the fact that the word "reasonable" is incorporated in that connection—a "reasonable" suspension?

Mr. McLane. If on the question of interstate commerce and fixing a uniform rate of carrying freight, or for passenger traffic, I could hardly say what "reasonable" meant, and I cannot tell how long I shall say the history of the Chinese laborer to-day. These were Chinese laborers and that is applicable to them in all parts of the Chinese Empire. Whether they go to Peru, Chili, or to California it is the same thing, it is the same Chinese laborer.

But now I want to go back to the bill, because it is the Chinese laborer that this bill strikes at, and I should do great injustice to myself if I allowed other questions to carry me away from that which is the question of vital importance before us. This bill, Mr. Speaker, allows all the Chinese to come to America. This is reciprocal with the Americans that are allowed to go to China.

Men can come here to trade or travel or to teach, and our citizens can go to China. There is a pretense and an attempt to say that this is not interfering with the field of labor. In that connection we are regulated by the Burlingame treaty. That treaty gave the Chinese the right to come here to labor on the continent of the United States. It is a matter of national policy to decide that question. We have dealt with the slavery question in the past, and no man can deal with it in a more catholic spirit than I do, for I defend the negro in a perfect equality among the rights and liberties of the remonstrance, and in spite of their protests the negro was brought, I say if we were at that period, with our experience of the past, there would be a different question presented. But we are not at that time. We are not in that state of affairs to be referred to a judicial tribunal might adjudicate; but when you come to talk about my conscience, about my individual judgment, and tell me you leave to my discretion, as to how long I shall say the history of the Chinese laborer to-day. These were Chinese laborers and that is applicable to them in all parts of the Chinese Empire. Whether they go to Peru, Chili, or to California it is the same thing, it is the same Chinese laborer.

My colleague Mr. Speaker from the South who moved the amendment which I am about to speak against. I beg to say that I am not wishing to interrupt the gentleman in his remarks.

Mr. McLANE. Now, when you say that you can suspend or regulate it, but it must be reasonable, I reply it is a matter between individuals, and that is a matter which cannot be adjudicated. There is a question arising between individuals, and the treaty so considers it, for provision is distinctly made that if the Chinese Government is not satisfied with the question of contract or the question of suspension, it can bring the matter to the attention of the United States Government and make it the subject for negotiation.

Now, this is the point of argument, but I beg to say that I am not wishing to interrupt the gentleman in his remarks. I beg to say that I am not wishing to interrupt the gentleman in his remarks. I do not wish to interrupt my friend if he prefers I should not.

Mr. McLANE. Except on account of my being limited in time I should be delighted to have the gentleman's question.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I certainly have no desire to interrupt the gentleman in his remarks.
Mr. HURBELL. I hope the time of the gentleman from Maryland will be extended if he finds it necessary.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I only desire to know what is the object of putting the restriction of reasonableness as to suspension, in connection with. If you say you have the right to decide that for yourself absolutely and are not bound by that limitation of reasonableness, why put it in the treaty? If it only means what you say it means, it is of no use. That was the thing the gentleman in New York objected to in which he said it was putting the word "suspend" in the treaty, but we object to doing the same, and I have no doubt will, do justice not alone to China but to our own citizens, to suspend the Chinese immigration, of Massachusetts.

Mr. McLANE. That is right.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. Now, if there is not anything in reason applicable to this why did we not say prohibition and stick to it?

Mr. McLANE. I will say to my friend from Massachusetts I am right on that line, and I think I have already answered his question; although, being so hurried, thinking my time was near an end, I did not pursue the matter to justice. My answer to the gentleman is this, and with me it is conclusive; and that is why I can vote for twenty years. When these negotiations were inaugurated we were already simmering under the Chinese immigration question. The Chinese have been the occasion of riot and disorder. The entire Pacific coast was in a state of anarchy on this question. Laws were being enacted by the States for the protection of the citizens of the United States. The State was arrogating to itself a sort of police power to deal with these people as it pleased, prompted by its own necessities. The United States in the face of this disorder sent this commission. No time was to be lost. The instructions to the commissioners were urgent. And they did involve the one point that at any hazard the right to suspend immigration, the right to stop it, should be concurrent.

Now, my friend from Massachusetts will observe that when the Chinaman in this negotiation concedes the right to suspend, I stipulate for no such condition. He knew very well when the gentleman in New York asked this question to the discretion of the United States he could not arrest our action; he had given away the case; he had left the United States to judge what was reasonable. But he stipulated; and it is to that I call your attention—he stipulated that if we did exercise this power unreasonably then there could be a remedy; and as between nations it is the only remedy you can have. The stipulation is that if we exercise this power in a way that China thinks unreasonable, then the Emperor of China shall have the right to negotiate with the United States that his representatives shall come in the usual diplomatic way and assert that what we have done is unreasonable and is a subject of negotiation, and we in our turn could advise with the exigencies of the United States. If we think it reasonable to suspend immigration for a longer or shorter time, and to justify the reasonableness of our action. This is the real gist of the question.

Now, I am not making any argument; that is why I want the attention of the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts. That is the meaning of the treaty; that is the contract; that is the bond. There is no mistake about that. Now, I am not making any argument; that is why I want the gentleman to understand precisely what the treaty means; that is the contract; that is the bond. There is no mistake about that. My answer to the gentleman is this, and I will complete my reply to the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. McLANE. I only wish to complete my reply to the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. McLANE. It was understood when I interrupted the gentleman that he should have more time.

Mr. McLANE. Five minutes is all that I desire, and that is my request.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. It was understood when I interrupted the gentleman that he should have more time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland desires five minutes more time.

Mr. McLANE. I want the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBINSON] to understand precisely what the treaty means precisely what he had to concede. He stipulated that we had the right to suspend, he knew precisely what he had conceded; he knew that he had conceded to us the discretion to suspend for any period we pleased. And he knew very well that some concession had to be made, for he knew as we did that this country on the Pacific coast was in revolt and anarchy, and that this local consideration would influence us in determining the time of suspension, and that our discretion alone would determine the period of time. And if he had not given us the right to suspend, this Congress of the United States would have abrogated the treaty.

Mr. McLANE. I am asking the right to abrogate it, and it would have been our duty to abrogate it.

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that he had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

An act (H. R. No. 4439) to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States establishing the times, places, and provisions for holding elections of the district commissioners of the northern district of New York.
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it is demanded of us to pass in its entirety? The first section sus­
pends all immigration into this country of Chinese laborers for twenty years.

The second section punishes the master of any vessel of whatever nationality who shall bring within the jurisdiction of the United States and permit to be landed any Chinese laborer. This section applies to the Gulf of Mexico, to the Atlantic Ocean, to the Pacific Ocean, and to the waters of the United States; and it is a violation of the treaty of 1882.

The third section provides that the provisions of the first and second sections shall not apply to the Chinese laborers now in the United States who may have come within the territory of the United States before the fourth section comes into force.

The fourth section applies to the registration of Chinese laborers now in this country and who may desire to go abroad and afterward return to this country. It imposes upon such certain duties at the office of the collector of the port from which they leave, and before their return it requires a $200 fee by an officer of the United States in a foreign country.

The fifth section provides for the other classes of Chinamen who by the treaty are permitted to come freely to the United States and to return to their own country. As to them (and I beg gentlemen of the House to observe it) the provision is a system of registration, an express permission from the Chinese Government in each individual case, a passport, and the regulations hereafter are so arranged that they shall enjoy the privileges which the treaty says they shall have. And they are to be described and identified by offensive regulations.

The sixth section provides that a Chinese laborer coming to this country may not be allowed to go to any place out of the lines of construction of the language. It covers all entitled under the terms of this act, the privileges of entering and residing in the United States. And it covers all citizens of Chinese blood and requires very onerous and very disagreeable duties, especially toward citizens of a friendly nation.

The seventh section appears to be based on section 6, and is liable to the construction of its terms.

The eighth section is dependent upon others to which I have referred. The ninth section imposes duties on the master of a vessel, requiring him to make a manifest of the passengers who are to be discharged, and that he is to suffer punishment for his failure to conform to the law.

The other provisions it is not perhaps necessary to rehearse, except to say that every person who shall land or be driven by a Chinese laborer to come within the territory of the United States is punishable by fine and imprisonment, and that any individual Chinese laborer coming into the United States is also punishable by fine and imprisonment, and to the same sentence of punishment as the Chinese may do in the case of the Chinese.

Now, the object I take to the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh sections of this bill is that they impose rigid and burdensome conditions upon teachers, merchants, and others who are not Chinese laborers. They shall not be eligible to hold office or sit in the Senate or the House, or be permitted to come and go of their own free will, as freely as those of the most favored nation. It requires, for example, in the certificate of the master of a vessel brought into the United States, that he shall be accorded all the rights, privileges, immunities, and exemptions which are accorded to the citizens and subjects of such most favored nation.

Now, the objection I take to the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh sections of this bill is that they impose rigid and burdensome conditions upon teachers, merchants, and others who are not Chinese laborers. They shall not be eligible to hold office or sit in the Senate or the House, or be permitted to come and go of their own free will, as freely as those of the most favored nation. It requires, for example, in the certificate of the master of a vessel brought into the United States, that he shall be accorded all the rights, privileges, immunities, and exemptions which are accorded to the citizens and subjects of such most favored nation.

Now, the objection I take to the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh sections of this bill is that they impose rigid and burdensome conditions upon teachers, merchants, and others who are not Chinese laborers. They shall not be eligible to hold office or sit in the Senate or the House, or be permitted to come and go of their own free will, as freely as those of the most favored nation. It requires, for example, in the certificate of the master of a vessel brought into the United States, that he shall be accorded all the rights, privileges, immunities, and exemptions which are accorded to the citizens and subjects of such most favored nation.

Now, the objection I take to the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh sections of this bill is that they impose rigid and burdensome conditions upon teachers, merchants, and others who are not Chinese laborers. They shall not be eligible to hold office or sit in the Senate or the House, or be permitted to come and go of their own free will, as freely as those of the most favored nation. It requires, for example, in the certificate of the master of a vessel brought into the United States, that he shall be accorded all the rights, privileges, immunities, and exemptions which are accorded to the citizens and subjects of such most favored nation.
to make it the duty of the executive department of the United States to provide such laws and in under which they shall be made applicable to the purposes of the treaty, which again brings it into harmony with the fourth article of the treaty, which provides that in case of difficulty adjustments may be made by the exchange between the two governments of representatives of good character and good faith.

I do not intend now, sir, to go into detail touching these other amendments. I have only to say there are still some clauses of the bill which I would reject, especially the residence clause; the conscience and judgment of many of us who remember the events of the decade from 1850 to 1860. I doubt very much whether the conscience of this country will allow them to go into the treaty. The Chinese have not the confidence of the community. They may have taken across the Canadian or other frontier into the United States some poor young Chinaman to relieve his wife from the hard life of her home. I do not think the "admitting in everything a single Chinese laborer to come into New York, New England, or Louisiana, is not disproportionately and excessively punished by the enactment of this bill. It is evident, that the best interests and the peace of the Pacific coast will be best served by a restraint of this immigration of the lower classes of Chinese. For such a bill I will willingly vote.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. KASSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I wish to ask the gentleman if these 105,000 people are counted as inhabitants in making up the population of California for the purposes of the Fourteenth Amendment?

Mr. KASSON. Unquestionably; and California has received an additional Representative on their account.

Mr. HUTCHINS. Then, if we pass this law I would like to ask the gentleman who does this additional member represent, the property owners in California, or the Chinese?

Mr. KASSON. I think I shall have to leave the answer to that question to the gentleman who does this additional member represent.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I make the closing speech upon it. It is evident, Mr. Speaker, that this population is there. It is equally evident that three-fourths of this House are willing to stop its increase by legislation under the treaty. But my demand is that nothing that we shall do and no law which we shall pass shall violate our sense of honor or even remotely appear to make a violation, for I am not afraid to appeal to the advocates of the bill in that sense and for the object I have stated to give their consent to modifications of this bill which would not only satisfy the meet the sentiments and win the co-operation of both sides of the House.

Now, sir, a word upon the spirit of the Chinese Government and its friendly relations toward us. It will justify my demand for a reasonable modification of this bill, while it tends to answer my friend from Maryland, that the Chinese have always been, peace and friendship between the United States of America and the Chinese Empire, and between their respective governments. They stand in a position of honor from the Chinese Empire, and the Chinese have always been, peace and friendship between the United States and China. It is equally evident that three-fourths of this House are willing to stop its increase by legislation under the treaty.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I wish to ask the gentleman to read the first article of the treaty with China, together with the date, which I have marked.

The Clerk read as follows:

Treaty of peace, amity, and commerce between the United States of America and China, concluded at the Ta-Tsing, on the 8th of August, 1858.

ARTICLE I. There shall be, as there have always been, peace and friendship between the United States of America and the Chinese Empire, and between their respective governments. They stand in a position of honor from the Chinese Empire, and the Chinese have always been, peace and friendship between the United States and China. It is equally evident that three-fourths of this House are willing to stop its increase by legislation under the treaty.

Mr. KASSON. I will submit and print with my remarks some further provisions of that treaty which I will not stop now to read, my point being to show the character of the Chinese Government in its relations with us. A few years ago we made a treaty with great difficulty with the Government of Great Britain, in which we introduced a clause for arbitration between that government and ours, and between all civil governments, in lieu of war. China long before that had itself adopted that principle to avoid war and to secure a system of settlement of all disputes by peaceful arbitration. In another article of the treaty, the kindest, I may say the least Christian sentiments, are expressed in reference to their relations to the United States. I refer to article II.

All citizens of the United States of America in China peaceably attending to the various concerns of commerce, being placed under the friendly and good will of the subjects of China, shall receive and enjoy for themselves and everything appertaining to them the protection of the local authorities of government, and shall be defended from all insult or injury of any sort. If their dwellings or property be trespassed upon or attacked by any person, the local officers, on being informed of the case, shall bring about an amicable arrangement of the question, thus showing their friendly relations to us.

Mr. HUTCHINS. I will submit and print with my remarks some further provisions of that treaty which I will not stop now to read, my point being to show the character of the Chinese Government in its relations with us. A few years ago we made a treaty with great difficulty with the Government of Great Britain, in which we introduced a clause for arbitration between that government and ours, and between all civil governments, in lieu of war. China long before that had itself adopted that principle to avoid war and to secure a system of settlement of all disputes by peaceful arbitration. In another article of the treaty, the kindest, I may say the least Christian sentiments, are expressed in reference to their relations to the United States. I refer to article II.

All citizens of the United States of America in China peaceably attending to the various concerns of commerce, being placed under the friendly and good will of the subjects of China, shall receive and enjoy for themselves and everything appertaining to them the protection of the local authorities of government, and shall be defended from all insult or injury of any sort. If their dwellings or property be trespassed upon or attacked by any person, the local officers, on being informed of the case, shall bring about an amicable arrangement of the question, thus showing their friendly relations to us.

I passed to another quarter of the city and saw great crowds of men and houses of these people coming together, disassociated from all the rest of the population. They are far and away the most numerous and separate Americans civilization. I thought that was wrong and dangerous. But the gentleman from Mississippi told us yesterday that it is in harmony with the spirit of the treaty between the United States and China. He requires them practically to be treated together, and he quoted the law.

However that may be, sir, I return to my theme, which is that we were not distinguished citizens of the United States of America, or upon an individual strain foreigner coming from China; nor operate harshly upon American or foreign vessels that may have some of these people to help them to navigate their vessels to or from our ports. We want nothing harsh or unjust, nothing that will be resented by the Chinese Government, or the nature of the treaty itself. We want no more than can justly be granted under the treaty, which is based upon the judgment of the people of the United States that the best interests and the peace of the Pacific coast will be best served by a restraint of this immigration of the lower classes of Chinese. For such a bill I will gladly vote.
Mr. Speaker, at the close of the treaty of 1856, the government of China, in the treaty which it was agreed should be given to the United States as laborers, by enrolling their names and admitting them to the States, had already opened the way to stretch their concession to the last point tolerated by the treaty—indeed, the last point it was necessary to enforce the protection of which was to interdict them absolutely from coming to the States. I therefore speak of the 1856 treaty as that of the government of China to the United States as laborers, and I mean by that, simply their consent to let us have them as laborers. Having given this assent, the treaty goes on to say—"The United States, on the other hand, have agreed to use their influence with the government of China to procure for us, as laborers, the right of residence in their empire, to be still greater in the future, when she shall have accepted more and more of the principles of progress that have already been adopted by the enlightened government of the United States."

The Chinese official issued it, referring to the imperial government of Peking. The answer came in about sixty days, and reads essentially like this, as was given to me by a member of that Embassy: "The imperial government, knowing the friendship of Mr. Forbes for China, departs from its usual custom of receiving such memorials in silence, and now, for the first time, is authorized to make a public reply. The Chinese government wishes the United States to know that it is highly pleased with the violation by the United States of the treaty of 1856, by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which is a violation of that treaty, and which the Chinese government has decided to enforce by making an effort to prohibit all immigration from China..."

The United States and the Chinese government were equal partners in this contract, and the Chinese government is not bound by the decision of the United States Supreme Court, and by the admission that the Chinese government has not violated the treaty of 1856.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to emphasize the fact that the United States have not made war on the Chinese. The United States have made war on the Chinese government, but the Chinese, as a nation, are not responsible for the acts of their government when they are acting contrary to the treaties they have made with the United States. The treaty they have made is a treaty with the United States, and not a treaty with the Chinese.
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I contend that the bill is contradictory to its title, and contradictory to the treaty.

The treaty declares that "the limitation or suspension shall be reasonable," and that no prohibition was contemplated by either party to the conference; and the Chinese ministers understood it perfectly. To prohibit for five years might be regarded as reasonable; but to prohibit for ten years, by a very indulgent interpretation, might also be, or without outrage upon the use of language be construed or assumed to be a suspension.

The treaty authorizes a suspension. That is a word of certain import in the relation in which it stands; and the Chinese ministers understood it perfectly. To prohibit for five years might be regarded as reasonable; but to prohibit for ten years, by a very indulgent interpretation, might also be, or without outrage upon the use of language be construed or assumed to be a suspension.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the star of empire on its westward way shall at the Golden Gate, under a cloud alleged to be portentous in foreshadowing evils, shall endanger the nation, but because, if an experiment is made to the suspension of immigration to either of those shorter terms so as to be "reasonable," as expressed in the treaty, I shall vote for the bill. I shall do so with reluctance even then, because I regard it as a departure from great and cardinal principles upon which are based, and from which are deduced all the theories of human rights that underlie and sustain the grand structure of government that has rested its foundations on the sacredModelIndex of mankind.

If this bill must be passed, not because the evils to be remedied were beyond the jurisdiction of the nation, but because, in the opinion of some, the present humors of men are such as to require it for the preservation of the nation, then it should be passed with the least possible imputation of its expedience upon it. I have had the misfortune or good fortune to spend considerable time translating the Bible, on which we base our civil and religious institutions, and more we have been sending missionaries to China, and from out our promised land and from the home of the red man. I do not treat his Scriptures as a mere record of a belief, but I treat them as a revelation of the will of God, and as a rule for our conduct. I am as much opposed to the bill as the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. Rice], who spoke in opposition to the bill and gave that kind of faith an old Latin name, "pocus fides," which I fear will be hereafter plastered in Chinese if this bill passes. I am against it for every reason.

I observe in the debate that one gentleman advocating the bill expressed the opinion that it does not violate the treaty if passed, but that the purpose is to meet the declared necessities of the Pacific States as represented by the gentleman from Illinois. I shall vote for the bill. I shall do so with reluctance even then, because I regard it as a departure from the great and cardinal principles upon which are based, and from which are deduced all the theories of human rights that underlie and sustain the grand structure of government that has rested its foundations on the sacredModelIndex of mankind.

Mr. R Assassin. 1 now yield the remainder of my time to the gentlemen from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There are ten minutes remaining.

Mr. Robinson, of Massachusetts. I would not wish to take the discussion of this proposition from the gentleman from Illinois, but I think it is better to speak now, but would rather speak to-morrow.

Mr. Dible. I am ready to take the floor now.

Mr. Robinson, of Massachusetts. Then I will reserve the ten minutes to which I am entitled until to-morrow.

Mr. Randall. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Dible] is to be entitled to the floor at the end of ten minutes. I do not desire to speak now, but would rather speak to-morrow.

Mr. Dible. I am ready to take the floor now.

Mr. Robinson, of Massachusetts. Then I will reserve the ten minutes to which I am entitled until to-morrow.

Mr. Dible. With the statement that I am in favor of this bill and will vote for it as it is, I will yield the gentleman from Virginia the ten minutes of my time, if he will propose to yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Hawk], and the remainder of my time to my colleague [Mr. Rich-ardson].

Mr. Tucker addressed the House. [See Appendix.]

Mr. Hawk. Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to deal with the question under consideration in the same channel that has been pursued by the gentleman who has just preceded me, [Mr. Tucker]. Yet I will refer briefly to some of his allusions, and draw some parallels. The information which he has communicated to the House with reference to the historical points touched upon by him. My time, however, is limited; I am not permitted under the arrangement to address the House longer than fifteen minutes, and I cannot, therefore, without a brief notice of some of the gentleman's citations. He referred eloquently to the Scriptures, and said that the bondsmen we are about to receive are a true and substantial parallel for the information which he presents, and the Scripture he quoted in proof. His statement that America was specially designed for the Caucasian race might have been properly followed by the qualification that the continent has for ages before been the home of the red man. I do not treat his Scripture quotation in any light sense, but I call the gentleman to task to make special pleas in this direction and attempting to sustain them by scriptural quotations.

The gentleman also, referring eloquently to races, mentioned the colored race, and stated that if the political status of the colored race at the South has been established no man would dare say that it is rather an untried experiment. So he runs the parallel between these races, the colored Mongoloid, and his parallel is correct in more respects than one.

The negro has been for long years kept in bondage and denied the rights of citizenship, and it is not an untried experiment that these Mongolians, having drifted along for a period of many years, have come here with the avowed intention of becoming part and parcel of our national citizenship.
Mr. Speaker, as I before stated, my time is limited, and I will therefore only refer to the above-mentioned points.

The first point I would like to stress is the fact that the introduction of Chinese cheap labor into the country endangers the interests of all laborers both of this and other countries. I believe it is in violation of the spirit, if not indeed of the letter, of our treaty obligations.

And to the extent of nipping this great evil of the ownership of these Chinese in even remote degree by any individual, company, association, or organization whatever, whether such owners reside in this country or any other portion of the globe, the bill meets my most hearty approval.
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consent to offer certain amendments, which have already been printed, and to have them considered as pending amendments. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIS. Let them be printed in the Record.

Mr. SPRINGER. No; they are already in print.

Is it understood that to-morrow at two o'clock the previous question will be called?

Mr. PAGE. I shall then call the previous question on the bill and amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the proposition of the gentleman from Iowa that his proposed amendments already printed shall not be considered unanimous consent if considered as pending? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HISCOCK. I desire to suggest to the gentleman from California that when the general debate is closed on this bill it shall be considered as in Committee of the Whole, under the operation of the five-minute rule, and open to amendment section by section.

Mr. RANDALL. Oh, no.

Mr. PAGE. I prefer not to consent to that. It is a bill of some seventeen sections, and to agree to that would prolong it into next week to have five-minute debate on amendments to every section.

Mr. ROBESON. If any friend would pardon me, there may be some people who would like to amend this bill in some particular way for the purpose of perfecting it. Now, the debate on this bill has been general debate, given out according to order.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. What is the proposition before the House?

The SPEAKER. There is no proposition pending for consideration of the House.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I thought a motion was made to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. It was not insisted on.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the House to take a recess until ten o'clock, to-morrow morning.

Mr. RANDALL. That does not require unanimous consent.

Mr. PAGE. And that it shall be agreed the previous question shall be ordered at two o'clock. I move that the House take a recess until ten o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. RANDALL. With the understanding that the first two hours shall be devoted to debate only on this bill and to offering amendments.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I object to that proposition.

Mr. PAGE. I move that the House take a recess till ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. SPRINGER. I will give notice that I will object to the consideration of any other business except this bill. That will accomplish the object of the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER. This bill will be the regular order. The ayes seem to have it, and the motion is agreed to.

SERVICE OF SUMMONS IN CALIFORNIA.

The SPEAKER, by unanimous consent, laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In compliance with section 4119 of the Revised Statutes, act of June 22, 1880, I transmit to Congress a copy of two additional regulations established in accordance with the act by a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, approved June 22, 1883, for the purpose of authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to appoint a person to be the collector of customs and to perform the duties of the office of agent for the United States for the Survey of the California coast from the point of San Diego to the mouth of the Columbia river. These regulations, which are accompanied by a copy of the minister's dispatch on the subject, are commended to the consideration of Congress, with a view to their approval.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 22, 1882.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

WHITE MOUNTAIN INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. DAVES, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 5378) to define and mark out the boundaries of the White Mountain Indian reservation in Arizona Territory, and making appropriations for the necessary survey; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Territories, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. VAN VORHIS. I called for a division on the motion that there be a recess till to-morrow at ten o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood it was called for by the gentleman from New Hampshire, but understood it was afterward withdrawn. Is it understood that it is withdrawn?

Mr. BRIGGS. I did not withdraw it; I stated distinctly on inquiry that I would not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair misunderstood the gentleman.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

On motion of Mr. BLACKBURN, by unanimous consent, the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. No. 4292) making appropriations for the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1883, and for other purposes, were taken from the Speaker's table, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion that the House take a recess till to-morrow morning at ten o'clock.

The House divided; the ayes were—aye:s 72, noes 17.

Of the motion of Mr. FORNEY, by unanimous consent, the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. No. 2308) making appropriations for the fortifications and armament of the United States Navy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1883, and for other purposes, were taken from the Speaker's table, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

MORNING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House at ten o'clock a.m. (on Thursday, March 29) resumed.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the further consideration of the bill (S. No. 71) to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to China.

Mr. RICHARDSON, of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, while I heartily indorse most of the arguments which have been so ably and so eloquently urged in favor of this bill, I cannot give my entire assent to some of the reasons advanced to show how we should pass the bill as in its present shape. I shall then call the previous question on the bill and make the matter in the House, already wearied with this long discussion, to point out the arguments I do not give my assent to or to repeat those I fully indorse.

I must take time, however, even at this late hour in the discussion, to give, in a very hurried way, some reasons why I shall vote for the bill. I would like to be understood in at least one particular. For several reasons I believe it would be best to limit the period to ten years within which to exclude Chinese laborers from coming into our country.

We have been told by those favoring the bill in its present shape to make it twenty years, and if we see reasons for shortening the time we can easily repeal the law. That is not so easily done as seems to be supposed by the friends of that feature in the bill. Besides, such a course would not remove the chief objection I have to that clause. The bill with the twenty years' limitation in it looks to my mind, and I submit it will appear so to the nations of the world and to all unbiased minds, as a virtual abrogation of our solemn treaty with China, and would avoid the aspect of its appearance as well as in fact, as we can do so without injury to ourselves and without a destruction of the objects which are professed to be sought in the bill. That is this I have no doubt. The bill will be just as effective and will accomplish for us so much more for the time for which it will run if it is limited to ten instead of twenty years, and will look much fairer and more in keeping with the four and five section of the treaty as it stands, and the measure is working as satisfactorily as its friends hope it will, we can more easily extend the time than we could repeal the law if now made to be of force for twenty years. I say I would prefer this change or modification, and I hope an effort will be made to that end. If it is made, I shall give it my support.

I am, however, in much favor of giving our friends on the Pacific coast the relief they need, and think them so clearly entitled to protection from the evils which threaten them, that I do not hesitate to say I shall vote for the bill in its present shape, whether it be modified as indicated or not, rather than not see it pass; and, as I have said, I desire to give some reasons why I shall do this. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is our first duty as legislators to look to the interests of our constituents—to look to the interest of those we now represent, our own people, those now on American soil, who are one of us and who have cast in their lot with us, before we look after the interest of the great brotherhood of mankind. It sounds very fine and very patriotic for honorable gentlemen to speak of this country as being the "right and the wandering sheep," but it is like a "call to every decline," and to proclaim "that our doors are open to all who love our free and republican form of government." And it does very well with this that should be the case within certain limitations and restrictions.

But, Mr. Speaker, I hold that it is a higher and better patriotism to labor first after the immediate protection of all classes of our own people, those who claim and have the right to call upon us "as fellow-countrymen." We now claim that it is our duty, and we exercise that duty to exclude all classes of our own people, those who claim and have the right to call upon us. We now claim that it is our duty, and we exercise that duty to exclude all classes of our own people, those who claim and have the right to call upon us "as fellow-countrymen."
any and all persons who we know or believe would injure and lower the moral standing and condition or degrade any class of the people who e interest we are sent here to look after and protect of those who hold any and all persons who we know or believe would injure and lower 1882.

doubt that their unrestrained and unlimited introduction into our territories and they are able, let us make provision against the evil which threatens our factories and workshops of the North and East, but when they will come to the protection and support of American labor all over our broad land—in the North, in the East and in the West as well as in the South—that labor is the labor of the people of the South where except at the South is made up of our own race—bone of our flesh, flesh of our flesh, and blood of our blood. In the South it is made up of a people who need our protection and our fostering care. Many of us represent more colored people than we do white people. For one, I represent not less than eighty thousand colored people. These with us in the South are our laborers—not ex-slaves. I declare that this bill is an attempt to enslave and to protect the protection and support of American labor of our blood. Chinaman, Chinaman.

In closing these remarks let me say I am a little surprised to see so many of our Republican friends opposing this bill, and so many of them have expressed a desire to see the Chinese laborers admitted into our country, and as a consequence of such coming the opportunity, the right, and the power to compete with and run down the wages of our own people. I confess I looked for a different course to follow, and as I have been able to judge, have always proceeded at least to be the friends of the laboring man and the especial friends of the colored man.

I know that the factories and workshops of the North and the East, and perhaps of the South, want cheap labor, and that they can if this restriction is not placed upon the Chinese coming to our country, obtain all the labor they require at perhaps one-half their present cost. But, Mr. Speaker, we must look beyond the mere saving of wages, and never consent to allow the Chinese coolie the right to come into the factories, the workshops, the farm and rice fields of the South to drive out our own people, white and colored, and supplant them for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I have felt it my duty to raise my voice in favor of this bill and its rejection.
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and unskilled laborers and Chinese employed in mining, and not to the vicious, diseased, or vagrant classes as such. Now, unless this exclusion is authorized by unquestioned treaty stipulations, it is clear that our Constitution is opposed to it. In fact, no legislation, no act of Congress, can violate the Constitution of the country, for it is a cardinal American doctrine "that the right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of all people," indispensable to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Hence our Constitution has been designed and measured to give to all the blessings of its name. But of this I will speak hereafter.

Resolved, that our Constitution makes no discrimination against the Chinese, and that such is the object and spirit of the bill.

I subscribe to this doctrine fully; it is a part of my political creed. I am speaking now without reference to the existing treaty. With Senator Morton, I believe a man, whether Celt or Saxon, Teuton, African, or Mongolian, has a right to withdraw from his native country and make his home in another, and thus cut himself off from all connection with his native country, is a part of natural liberty, and we have a right to take this as a principle in legislation, as we have to the sacred truths of the Declaration.

On this question Senator Morton says:

To withdraw from his native country and make his home in another, and thus cut himself off from all connection with his native country, is a part of natural liberty, and we have a right to take this as a principle in legislation, as we have to the sacred truths of the Declaration.

In opposition to this Senator Morton says: I have, in my judgment, an inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance, and also the mutual advantage of the free migration and immigration of their citizens and subjects, respectively, from the one country to the other. Nothing of the kind; as laborers to the sacred truths of the Declaration. On this question
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to us without restraint and under treaty stipulations which bound us to protect them and treat them with the same kindness and consideration as we would afford to citizens of our favored nations. For thirty years our people had been going to China for travel, for trade, and to reside. They received the fullest protection, and their property was safe. The United States were not surpassed in benevolence, and the Chinese were never more contented. Our commercial relations with that people were undisturbed, and our citizens resided among them secure in their rights, enjoying all the advantages which commerce and trade can confer.

Our relations with China were entirely changed after 1844. Before that time, the Chinese were satisfied with the situation, and did not desire to limit or suspend the immigration to her domain of citizens of the United States, on the ground that, as long as there was a possibility of profit, they would receive us and carry us to the end of the world. But after the treaty was made, and the restrictions imposed on the Chinese, they were left alone, and by which it is statements and assurances, before it that this is fair' To such legislation I cannot and will not give dance. Ray On.

But let us go further and see how the high contracting parties construed this clause during the negotiation of the treaty. The Chinese commissioners were unwilling to allow the word "prohibit" in connection with the phrase "is prohibited," and the Chinese were unwilling to the latter words only on the condition named. The Chinese commissioners explained what they intended their concession to mean.

They stated in number they meant, for example, that the United States having, as they supposed, a record of the number of immigrants in each year as well as the time necessary for the completion of their journey, they could clearly calculate the total number that must reach the Union in any year, and could predict the time it would take to admit them all. And they went on to say that the Chinese Government would accept the treaty as long as the total number of Chinese admitted to the United States each year did not exceed a certain number, stating that this number should be allowed to go not more than ten or twenty thousand.

The United States Government did not ask the Chinese Government to regulate the number of Chinese immigrants. It asked that the Chinese Government agree to regulate the number of Chinese immigrants, or to prohibit them from coming to the United States, which treaty was so constructed that the Chinese had the absolute right in any number to come to the United States. This had caused trouble and embarrassment. What the United States Government asked was that the Chinese Government consent to such a modification of the Burlingame treaty as would enable it, without raising unpleasant questions of treaty construction, to exercise that discretion.

During the negotiation of this treaty this further conversation took place:

The Chinese commissioners asked if the United States commissioners could give them any idea of the laws which would be passed to carry such power into execution.

Mr. Treston replied that this could hardly be done. It would be as difficult to say what would be the special character of any act of Congress as it would be to say what would be the words of an elect of the Emperor of China to execute a treaty power. That two great nations discussing such questions of treaty construction, to exercise that discretion was clearly undue. The Chinese Government, therefore, would be willing to accept the new treaty on the condition that it might be given to them in writing.

That the United States Government might never deem it necessary to exercise this power. It would depend upon circumstances. If Chinese immigration consequent in cities where it threatened public order, or if confusion itself to localities where it was an injury to the interests of the American people, the Government of the United States would undoubtedly feel the necessity for preventing the immigration of Chinese. If, on the contrary, there was no large immigration, or if there was only a small immigration, and the immigration was steady, or evenly distributed, it was not believed that the legislation of the United States under this power would be adapted to such circumstances. For example, there might be a demand for Chinese labor in the State of California, and the Chinese Government might desire to prevent the immigration of Chinese of the United States, and yet not decrease their resources, we never believed that the United States would be bound to this.

In general the legislation would be in view of and designed to control the immigration of Chinese, not to prohibit it, but to enable the United States to take such measures as might be necessary.

The Chinese commissioners said this explanation was satisfactory; that they had not intended to ask for a draft of any special act, but for some general idea how the Chinese would be treated. They were content with the answer which they wanted, and they asked that it might be given to them in writing.

It will be observed that the longest period of suspension mentioned in the negotiation was five years, and it was not intimated by our commissioners that a total suspension would be asked for during that time. Mr. Treston went further, and said the United States might never exercise the power of suspension at all, if it did exercise it would be done by legislation adapted to the situation at the moment such legislation became necessary. Here, in the face of these statements and assurances, before any material change in the situation occurred, we were certain that no extraordinary haste in fashioning a statute which, I assume to say, is intended to prohibit Chinese immigration for all time. True, it is for twenty years only, as we read it, which is not much more than the time necessary for the completion of the journey of the United States forever. Will it be said that this is fair? To such legislation I cannot and will not give my assent.

This was agreed by this treaty that if any suspension of immigration should take place it should be enforced only by necessary legislation. Is the humiliating system of certificates and registrations impositions on the Chinese, as the Chinese are entitled to all the civil rights and protection of the laws of the United States? As was said by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. Kasson,] is it necessary in order to protect our Pacific coast to run down every poor Chinaman who happens to cross our frontier, or steps from a ship to see a seacoast town or city? Shall it be a crime, I ask, for a Chinaman on his way home from Cuba or Brazil to step from the ship to see a view of the coast of the United States? Shall it be a crime to carry a bill of lading closing every port, wailing about every town, and keeping the Chinese laborer from touching our soil at any point necessary for the furtherance of his own labor? Such laws have brought reproach to our people in the past, but I have until now indulged the hope that they would disgrace themselves by the same foolish and mean act of legislation that they have just made. In these provisions of the bill I find additional reasons for refusing it my support.

I will be indulged in saying, I hope, sir, that I differ from many gentlemen of the House as to the necessity for this immediate and summary exclusion of the Chinese. I can neither subscribe to the facts nor the logic by which they fortify this bill. I am to be frightened away from this Chamber. It is claimed that the Pacific States are being "deluged with the surplus tide of Asiatic civilization," or if the deluge is not exactly here it is on the way. My colleague [Mr. Calkins] puts it thus: "I apprehend there is good ground for such an influx from China to this country as to crowd out those who now live in and inhabit parts of this Republic, to the latter words only on the condition named. The Chinese commissioners explained what they intended their concession to mean. They said they would be willing to accept the new treaty on the condition that it might be given to them in writing.

It will be observed that the longest period of suspension mentioned in the negotiation was five years, and it was not intimated by our commissioners that a total suspension would be asked for during that time. Mr. Treston went further, and said the United States might never exercise the power of suspension at all, if it did exercise it would be done by legislation adapted to the situation at the moment such legislation became necessary. Here, in the face of these statements and assurances, before any material change in the situation occurred, we were certain that no extraordinary haste in fashioning a statute which, I assume to say, is intended to prohibit Chinese immigration for all time. True, it is for twenty years only, as we read it, which is not much more than the time necessary for the completion of the journey of the United States forever. Will it be said that this is fair? To such legislation I cannot and will not give my assent.

This was agreed by this treaty that if any suspension of immigration should take place it should be enforced only by necessary legislation. Is the humiliating system of certificates and registrations impositions on the Chinese, as the Chinese are entitled to all the civil rights and protection of the laws of the United States? As was said by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. Kasson,] is it necessary in order to protect our Pacific coast to run down every poor Chinaman who happens to cross our
immigration. Other States did the same thing. It was done to save what they thought to be a shift from the farming to the manufacturing and mercantile classes, but the doctrine is very different. The State of Indiana, for instance, gave the following: "The people of this State by the Constitution," and the then Governor of the State, a Senator, and a candidate for the Vice-Presidency—on the 8th of August, 1866, spoke as follows:

"I tell you there will be hot blood when they are found here in such large numbers. I tell you the slave laborer's white mechanic conscience will not be absorbed by his own to his wife and children at the close of his day's work; to tell them that a negro is made to work anyplace to another place, and that player is taking advantage of this competition to reduce the wages upon which he relies to feed and clothe them, the words will not be spoken with composure.

The constitutional provision which Mr. Hendricks brought so wise and abrogated, and for many years no law has inter­vened between our people and the negro from Kentucky and Ten­nessee, and still the selfish employer has not taken advantage of the colored man's competition to reduce the wages of the white man. For many years past Indiana has been rid of this caste legislation. All people have been permitted to come to us and abide with us, and which has never been cheapened or degraded.

Another eloquent gentleman, now a Senator of the United States, in a public speech at the capital of his State, follows:

"Already the vagrant negroes and black lazaroad of Kentucky and other southern States have been driven into the market of the State, the white men who till the soil, the mechanics in the shops, to determine whose labor will be the cheaper and always with a determination of both the races, and acceleration of all the forces of slavery and oppression of the negro race. Notwithstanding the future escape which is revolting down when we persist in the attempt to absorb into the labor market of the white race. The wages of labor may come slowly here in Indiana, but they will as surely come as the footprints of time continue to advance into the unknown years.

"Already the vagrant negroes and black Lazaroad of Kentucky and other southern States have been driven into the market of the State, the white men who till the soil, the mechanics in the shops, to determine whose labor will be the cheaper and always with a determination of both the races, and acceleration of all the forces of slavery and oppression of the negro race. Notwithstanding the future escape which is revolting down when we persist in the attempt to absorb into the labor market of the white race. The wages of labor may come slowly here in Indiana, but they will as surely come as the footprints of time continue to advance into the unknown years.

"Every day we are driven further into the market of the State, the white men who till the soil, the mechanics in the shops, to determine whose labor will be the cheaper and always with a determination of both the races, and acceleration of all the forces of slavery and oppression of the negro race. Notwithstanding the future escape which is revolting down when we persist in the attempt to absorb into the labor market of the white race. The wages of labor may come slowly here in Indiana, but they will as surely come as the footprints of time continue to advance into the unknown years.

"I quote these predictions in regard to the effect of the unrestricted immigration of the colored people into the free States on white labor because they are supported by the same logic now used by those who defend this bill. Twenty years ago it was "the ignorant, filthy, vicious, lazy, degraded negro" that menaced our laboring people; it is the filthy, diseased, immoral, and pauper Chincman who threatens them now. To run the parallel, I quote from a speech made by a member of Congress for the State of Georgia, in the presence of the colored per cent of a population of 7,250,000. As a general thing they are vicious, indolent, and lazy. They number about thirty-six thousand, but their ratio of numbers is less than 1.9 per cent, white of the great increase of the last ten years has been made none.

"I quote these predictions in regard to the effect of the unrestricted immigration of the colored people into the free States on white labor because they are supported by the same logic now used by those who defend this bill. Twenty years ago it was "the ignorant, filthy, vicious, lazy, degraded negro" that menaced our laboring people; it is the filthy, diseased, immoral, and pauper Chincman who threatens them now. To run the parallel, I quote from a speech made by a member of Congress for the State of Georgia, in the presence of the colored per cent of a population of 7,250,000. As a general thing they are vicious, indolent, and lazy. They number about thirty-six thousand, but their ratio of numbers is less than 1.9 per cent, white of the great increase of the last ten years has been made none.

"We have enough peril of the invasion of the Mongolian race in our country after an experience of thirty years. Why not exclude all? Is there no danger of competition from this vast influx of laboring people from the Old World? Let Mr. Coleman, of California, ask, and I will answer. Every observing man knows the demand for labor has kept pace with the ever-increasing supply. I can imagine some conservative political and his to the right of his employers to have taken advantage of the application of steam to machinery prohibited because it thus utilized is brought into competition with the man who relies upon his labor only to secure shelter, food, and railing for his dependent family.

"Watts and Bolton made their first successful steam engine a hun­dred years ago, and it alone shows the application of steam to machinery has quadrupled the working forces of the world. What a fearful competitor the steam-engine is to white labor. Take the lesson the locomotive has taught us. Before its day the product of the work­man was forge, the furnaces were small and the precious steam was cut to the distant market, giving employment to millions of men and beasts. The railroad now occupies this field.

"Every day we are increasing the competition with labor by increasing the labor-power of machinery, and all intelligent people encourage this labor-saving machinery. Will the laboring man ever be able to encourage them by giving the inventors of new and useful devices a monopoly in their use. Notwithstanding the vast increase in the mechanical forces, personal labor is still in as much demand as ever. The invention of the reaper drove the old grain-cradle from our harvest fields, but labor was not injured. All these improvements in machinery, this immense increase in the labor power of the world, have but stimulated the industries of the people, opened up new and more lucrative fields of employment. They have enhanced the value of labor. Willing hands are now enough to do.

"Mr. Speaker, I am not here to defend the Chinese, for I know little of them as a people; but I am here to defend the rights of human nature as I understand them. I freely admit that if the Chinese laborers are filthy and degraded, if contact with them can injure the health, character, habits, and superior civilization, they ought to be kept away. But are those charges true? We have enough perils of our own without borrowing others from abroad does not come with the American population. We have the same thing in the employ of labor. Willing hands are now enough to do.

"There are three things that can be said in favor of the Chinese that have attracted many people and given them a status, where, perhaps, a fuller acquaintance with them, and a fuller perception of their peculiarities, would be admitted. They have been as favorable to us, namely, that physically, mentally, and politi­cally, they are as equal, if not superior. The American public in the comparison is against them. Physically, as laborers in the field, on this farm, they are equal. They are strong, fair, and light, and their brown and black fig have a show quickness, strength, self-divisibility, endurance, accuracy, and fidelity in a way that is hard to describe.

"Mentally, they are quick; alert, apt, strong, and tenantless in memory, and rarely fail in the lessons that have been taught them. In the higher walks we know that as scholars, statesmen, and
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HOMESTEAD BILL. (Mr. Dingley.)

Mr. Dingley. The Homestead Bill has been under the consideration of the Senate for a number of years, and I trust that this body will see its way clear to pass it.

Mr. Ender. The Homestead Bill has been before the Senate for many years, and I trust that this body will see its way clear to pass it.

Mr. Dingley. The Homestead Bill has been before the Senate for many years, and I trust that this body will see its way clear to pass it.

Mr. Ender. The Homestead Bill has been before the Senate for many years, and I trust that this body will see its way clear to pass it.

Mr. Dingley. The Homestead Bill has been before the Senate for many years, and I trust that this body will see its way clear to pass it.

Mr. Ender. The Homestead Bill has been before the Senate for many years, and I trust that this body will see its way clear to pass it.
waste places, and planted the garden and the vineyard in the wilderness. They are faithful, ready, intelligent, and industrious; they pay promptly and are highminded and correct. As a race they are mentally quick, acute, and correct in their perceptions—strong and cheerful in their economy. In them properly walk the wise scholars, statesmen, and diplomats—polite, adroit, and shrewd.

These people seldom swear or become intoxicated. It has been asserted that this is due to their religion, and they are never drunk in the Christian religion, but this testimony shows that in San Francisco alone quite 1,000 attend church, Sabbath-school, and Christian association; effective instruction in the English language, and the Christian religion. Many have renounced idolatry and professed the Christian faith. But they are unclean! Why, sir, it is shown that they are unclean and are repulsed by the best and most exacting people. In health they are equal, if not superior, to the white race. They are faithful and industrious, thrifty and economical, but laborers whose wages at no time amount to anything. The same disease affects the price of white labor, for there is an abundance of work for all. Such is the people that caste prejudice proposes to forever exclude from coming among us.

But they are idolators and worship idols and are dangerous to our civilization! How dangerous? Do they proselyte us or attempt to do so? No. Will they attempt to subdue us by the sword? Certainly not. Are we afraid that our faith will be overthrown by the peaceful pagan? I pity those men of God who, professing the Christian religion, so hate or fear the heathen Chinese that they are unwilling to even try to teach them the truth in the gospel of the brotherhood of man. But, sir, I do not care to pursue this branch of the question further.

With reference to the effect of this ill-advised and unwise legislation on our citizens residing in China and our commerce with that empire? Who can predict? Shall our people come and go hereafter without permission? Will we not retaliate by depriving our citizens from her shores for twenty years on this basis? Has she proved mistaken? I am assured that the problem of citizenship so far as our commercial interests are concerned is not seriously affect the price of white labor, for there is an abundance of work for all. Such is the people that caste prejudice proposes to forever exclude from coming among us.

The experiment of Mr. BUCKNER, of the Republican party, to support this bill, or to violate an existing treaty. On this question my feeling has made a record of which I am proud and upon which I stand. When, in the frenzy of an excited public opinion, Congress was induced to strike a blow against the Chinese of California, the Republican party was true to its faith and saved the nation from dishonor by an Executive veto.

This is the stand of an honest policy—that of a faithful execution of treaty obligations with the nations of the world. It will not betray the rights of any people, nor prove untrue to its obligations. Will the rights of the Chinese be质量和 and our commerce with that empire in the midst of the Chinese garrison and a treaty signed with the Chinese people, the Republican party was true to its faith and saved the nation from dishonor by an Executive veto.

The governments of the world are watching us, and our legislation will be subject to their approval or censure. They will review our statesmanship and judge us by it. We wish to extend our commerce and our influence, and in that endeavor we have a high sense of justice and honor. If we expect our people to be justly and fairly treated, we must extend a generous fairness to the Chinese as a race. The spirit of other powers during past recollection and future interest, demand the utmost good faith in the observance of every treaty obligation. I leave this question here.

Mr. WISE, of Virginia, addressed the House. [See Appendix.]

Mr. DAWES. The evil to be remedied by the passage of this bill has not existed of late years, but was common from the beginning of the Chinese immigration. It was threatened danger of a conflict between the Caucasian and Mongolian races upon the shores of the Pacific. He had formulated the legislation for the protection of the innocent and for the accommodation of the passions or prejudices of any section. It is to-day, as it has ever been, the friend of the laboring classes.

To legislate to protect a million and a half of our people from idleness; to prevent any form of the public peace or order by the introduction of any form of slavery; to accommodate the passions or prejudices of any section. It is to-day, as it has ever been, the friend of the laboring classes. The evil to be remedied by the passage of this bill is a right, that men of every name and of采用., are never converted to Christia.

There has appeared the spirit that causes me the gravest apprehension. When we made the colored people free, when we elevated them to the high rank of American citizenship and gave them the ballot, I thought we had settled their question of the adjustment of the races. The proposition of the bill that no one of the colored race who are free shall have the right to vote is attributable to the fairness of her trade with the Mongolian it may be attributable to the fairness of her trade with the Mongolian. If England has the advantage of us in the extent and value of her trade with the Mongolian it may be attributable to the fairness of her trade with the Mongolian. If England has the advantage of us in the extent and value of her trade with the Mongolian it may be attributable to the fairness of her trade with the Mongolian. The Chinese have given us a solemn promise, they held little faith in our word, and they expected our people to expect our people to do what they were to abide with us. Indeed, sir, I was weak enough to be convinced of the truth of this statement.

A distinguished Senator a few days ago, speaking of our colored fellow citizens, said:

Do not tell me to tell you that it is a blessing to this country that these people are here! It is no fault of ours that they are here; it is no fault of theirs; it is the fault of a past generation; but their presence here is a great misfortune to us. It is a misfortune in the estimation of the adjustment of the races. But as two races socially and politically is no nearer to a solution than it was the day before yesterday. The philosophy of the history of every age and our experience of the last seven years in the garrison of the Pacific is convicting the people with the facts of a race war.

The principles supposed to lie at the foundation of our political system, which presumes the universal equality of rights under the law of all people, is challenging the rights of our Chinese people—those whose bodies still live in our shores are heathen in religion, leprous in body, infected with small-pox, that they are mere objects for a time with a fixed purpose to turn their bodies or their bones to China, and that they
are vicious and beastly in their personal habits, and without virtue in their social relations, and that their cheap labor takes the place of the American laborer his opportunity for employment and degrades his calling and his wages. It is argued also that this fountain of wickedness is but opened and unless its flow is stopped a foul and over-spread flow over the land and endanger if not submerge American civilization.

Suppose we grant every count in this terrible indictment against the races of Asia, then, the skilled and unskilled labor from Asia, the world that it fundamental proposition is a failure and that it cannot govern and restrain the vicious who are in its midst; cannot quarantine and disease; cannot correct by legislation; cannot keep out by a system of passports and registration in this land of freedom; and, worst of all, to vote to fan the fierce flame of prejudices against a race of human beings, created by the same God, endowed with the same capabilities of feeling of suffering or of joy, and, as I believe, endowed with capabilities of education, civilization, progress, and Christianization.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain this House at any great length in the discussion of questions having, in my judgment, nothing to do with the pending bill which has for its object the absolute prohibition of Chinese immigration. How far this proceeding is in defiance of the free principles of our Government and in violation of sacred treaty obligations has already in this debate been most satisfactorily argued. For, sir, while I shall hope be faithful to the interests of the people of Massachusetts whom I have the honor to represent, I cannot forget I am also to take care in the dissection of the principle that the general welfare of this whole country shall not suffer.

I need not remind the intelligent gentlemen who honor me with their attention that if the nation is prosperous and Trimingham, in the markets of the world, the Chinese shall have their share of the general success; while on the contrary if the nation is dishonored and driven from the markets of the world by bad faith and cant, and abnegation of virtue, we shall not only lose all our former advantage, but to listen to the siren voice of some promised political and temporary advantage is not only bad policy in statesmen who seek enduring security, it is crime, not only in statesmen but to the generalations who are to follow us by the stain it fixes upon our national character, added to the positive injury it does to our trade and commerce.

In the first place, what has been accomplished by opening communication with China and Japan? It has drawn across this continent the great trade of the world between the East and the West, and in this way compelled the building of the great line of railroad which binds the two oceans together. Not to speak of the enormous profits of the carrying trade, it has given us an advantage in placing the products of our manufacturing industries in the markets of China, India, and Japan, which almost defy calculation. So rapid and constant has been our successful competition in these markets as against England, our great competitor, that for years a wall has gone up from the English press over the downfall of a rich trade which had hitherto been enjoyed by England and which we have now, in most cordial and friendly relations have grown up between China and the United States. So important and promising had this fruit of our diplomacy been regarded, that when my honored predecessor in this chair, Mr. Burlingame, came to this country in the year 1867, great expectation was entertained that it would prove to the United States it was hailed with a joy only equalled by the dismay it created in foreign courts.

The average amount of goods which accrued to us from these friendly relations were real, and we have already stated in this dissection in the millions of dollars added to our foreign commerce. It was, too, a commerce which represented markets opened up to the productions of the manufacturing industries of the United States. Shall these markets be forever closed against us by a mad and suicidal policy, which, so far as I can see, has nothing to recommend it but some small and mean temporary political advantage? The Chinese Government has manifestly attempted to protect our friendship that has been evidenced toward us by a law that must not be oblivious to the fact that human nature is the same everywhere, and that sooner or later injustice and utter disregard of the common instincts of self-preservation on our part will deprive us of a friendship so profitable and satisfactory.

I dare say, sir, that the 100,000 Chinese now resident in the United States have shared in the profits of the successful competition of China, and that to our adventurism in China that our adventurous citizens in China have drawn from that empire to our shores, to be added to the aggregate of our nation's wealth. Besides, China has a large and certain market for our products, and with the considerable resources of our country, while we have ships, iron implements, and manufactured goods of infinite variety to sell, and China has not a single product that we must not import it.

How strange an anomaly is presented by this Congress! Millions of dollars are asked to be voted from the national Treasury in the way of subsidies to open up commerce with other countries, and yet while we ask our country to come to be an empire that supplies the largest market in the world for the consumption of our industrial products! The losses which are to cause us to use this legislation are un-
doubled. They are not justified by national honor or some supreme necessity. On the contrary they are in direct violation of our pledged faith and in opposition to every interest of our people. What, then, can be the motive for so strange and disastrous an event? It is Mr. Seward's and Mr. Blair's, and the great political parties' duty to tell the people of this country, as loudly and boldly as we can, that, if there is any
California, Nevada, and Oregon are supposed to hold the balance of political power in the next Presidential contest, and partly because Mr. Johnson is the only other element of those three States which has the possession of the ballot.
Mr. TAYLOR applied the touch-stone to the whole of the clause as he had done the other day that there would be no measure brought here like this if the 100,000 Chinese who now create such panic had in their hands the same ballot with those who now hold it. It is, he held, the United States at whom it specially aims; it is dishonorable to us; it is injurious to our commercial and manufacturing interests; it is, in the homely language of Benjamin Franklin, paying the price of our whistle. And I feel that I am acting in harmony with the intelligent, just, and law-abiding people of Massachusetts in casting my vote against such unwise legislation. It is an Democratic, un-Republican, un-American.
Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Speaker, I made up my mind at the beginning of this debate that I would take no part in it; that I would content myself with voting against what seemed to me to be a dangerous proposition; but on mature reflection I became satisfied that the people of my State will demand that I shall speak as well as vote on this bill.
After the great length of time occupied in the discussion of it by other gentlemen, I shall only trespass upon the patience of the House long enough to give the reasons for my vote in the most clear and intelligible manner possible.
Ostenibly and in theory this purports to be a bill "to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to the coming of Chinese," but in fact it is to violate a treaty and prohibit for twenty years all Chinese laborers, whether skilled or unskilled, from coming to the United States. And this prohibition is intended to be so guarded and hedged about with fines, penalties, and imprisonments as to absolutely prevent its evasion or infringement. To the other nations of the earth, not affected by this legislation, it must appear strange and absurd that a country which by a people made up of immigrants from every race under Heaven should, at the very beginning of the second century of its existence, attempt to build around itself a barrier against foreigners deeper and broader than that which kept China from civilization and Christianity eighteen hundred years.
It must seem strange to them that a government founded and built upon the broad foundations of justice and equality should, after having stood in the high places of its power for a hundred years, and with outstretched arms welcomed to its shores the oppressed and downtrodden of the whole earth; that a people who have grown rich and powerful and prosperous through the skill and courage and labor of this wide index of men from every land and clime; that a nation which for a century has marched to success and victory under a banner upon whose broad folds is enshrined, in characters of living light, the immortal words of liberty and equal rights, should for fifty years pass over the law—I say it must seem strange that such a people should, in the noontide light of such a history, forget their record, repudiate their principles, and tarnish their good name by placing upon the national statute book a virulent enactment which not only violates a solemn compact, but makes a distinction between races, but which actually discriminates against labor.
I regard the principle of the right of every man to live, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness the corner-stone of our republican edifice, and this principle carries with it the right to seek that liberty and happiness anywhere on earth he may choose to go. This right of emigration is a part and parcel of his liberty, an inherent, vested, God-given right, indispensable to his happiness, and one which is far above and beyond all human laws and constitutions.
The Congress of the United States long ago declared by public statute in the most solemn manner that this right is beyond the legal control of the Government when it said:
"Whereas the right of emigration is a natural and inherent right of all people indispensable to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and
Whereas in the recognition of this principle this Government has freely received emigrants from all nations, and invited them with the right of residence:"
The late Senator Morton, when speaking of this subject, declared:
"That a man's right to withdraw from his native country and make his home in another, and thus cut himself off from all connection with his native country, is a part of the natural and inherent rights of every man: it is confirmed in the Constitution, by the admission that the right to liberty is natural, inherent, God-given right, and his liberty is imperious unless it carries with it the right of emigration."
This was the principle and undenying denial of this great principle of rights; it flies in the face of the spirit and genius of our institutions, and it would become a law to fix a stigma and a blot upon the history of our country of the last one hundred years.
The title of this bill indicates, as I have already said, that its object is to create certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese."
Now, sir, in order to ascertain whether this is the true intent and purpose of this legislation, let us look for a moment at the terms of the treaty made with China in 1880, relating to this subject of immigration.
In article 1 of that treaty it is declared that:
"Whereas the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States, or their residence therein, affects, or threatens to affect, the interests of the communication of Chinese with the said country or any locality within the territory thereof, the Government of China agrees that the clause of the said treaty which limits the coming of Chinese to the said country shall be reasonable and shall apply only to Chinese who may go to the United States as laborers, but not for the purpose of settling among or remaining in the United States, and that the aforesaid clause shall not be construed as prohibiting Chinese from anywhere going to the United States to take up any business, enter into any occupation, or engage in any trade or calling, and shall not be construed as prohibiting Chinese from the said country from going to the said country, it absolutely prohibits them for twenty years. I contend, therefore, that this bill in its present shape is in open defiance of the plain terms of that treaty."
In view of this undeniable conclusion, I desire to ask gentlemen whether they think this great Government of ours, which claims to be the light and guiding star of the world, will have the courage to violate a solemn compact entered into with China, weak and inoffensive though she may be? I beg gentlemen to pause and reflect before they permit such a wrong to be done, and place us in such a false and cowardly position before the world.
It is said that 3,000,000 of people demand the passage of this bill. All they do are to pass it, if it is wrong, to please them. They are 3,000,000 to control and dictate the legislation of this country to the other 47,000,000! But, sir, I deny that 3,000,000 people can ask us to violate our obligations with China and abandon the teachings of our fathers. The masses of the people of California and the other States of the Pacific slope care very little about it, except as they are moved and acted upon by a class of men who are influenced by the lusts of office, by avarice or political ambition.
If the one hundred and five thousand Chinamen now in this country were armed with the freemason's great weapon of defense, the ballot, you would never have heard of this bill, the eloquent lips of gentle men who advocate it would be silent, and we should not now be hampered with the nightmare of "Chinese cheap labor." It is because they cannot vote, because they are helpless to defend themselves, that these gallant gentlemen are now charging upon them with all the forces of hate, prejudice, and barbaric despotism. And do they fear the power of the ballot, even in the hands of these "heathen Chinese," that in order to guard against all contingencies, they provide in section sixteen of the bill that "hereafter no court or court of the United States, or of any State or Territory, shall be competent to hear or decide any action or suit for or against the Government of the United States, or any of its officers or agents, touching or shadowing in any manner such coming or residence of Chinese laborers, and this power is accompanied with an affirmative declaration that we can "not absolutely prohibit it." It seems to me that this point needs and admits of no argument. No statement could make it plainer, and no argument can change the simple terms of this contract.
After looking at the terms of this treaty and the provisions of the bill, no sane man will dare to deny that, instead of regulating, limiting, or suspending the coming or residence of Chinese in this country, it absolutely prohibits them for twenty years. I contend, therefore, that this bill in its present shape is in open defiance of the plain terms of that treaty.
I do not mean to say that the Chinese are not entitled to as much rights as the whites, but their coming here to this country is not injurious to our American institutions; it is injurious to our American interests; it is injurious to our American agriculture; it is injurious to our American industry; it is injurious to our American labor, and in every sense an injury to our American independence. And yet the Chinese are entitled to as much right to the enjoyment of those rights as the whites. They are entitled to the same rights as every other race of people that have come here, and are 3,000,000 to control and dictate the legislation of this country to the other 47,000,000! But, sir, I deny that 3,000,000 people can ask us to violate our obligations with China and abandon the teachings of our fathers. The masses of the people of California and the other States of the Pacific slope care very little about it, except as they are moved and acted upon by a class of men who are influenced by the lusts of office, by avarice or political ambition.
Mr. Speaker, some gentlemen on this floor will remember when both the great political parties in this country fell upon their knees in the dust and besought the haughty slave power of the South to save them. One of them died at the time, as it deserved to, and the other has been nothing but a walking corpse ever since, waiting for burial.
The great Whig party went down with all its power, its strength, and its glory; the Democratic party remained, only to be from that time onward the adversary of every wrong and the support and stay of every rotten institution, from the black curse of slavery down to treason, rebellion, and polygamy.
Sir, with the platform of the Democratic party I have nothing to do; a party is made up of a body of men who are ever ready to sell their birthright for a mess of political potage: but I deny most emphatically, and challenge contradiction, that any word, sentence, or clause can be found in the Republican party's platform, or in any paper or public address of that party,Inferring or shadowing such a measure as this. That platform is before me, and I will call the attention of the House to the plank relating to Chinese immigration.
Since the authority to regulate immigration and intercourse between the United States and foreign nations rests with Congress or with the United States and its constituted or delegated power, the Senate, in resolving the question of the admission of the Chinese as an evil of great magnitude, invoke the exercise of those rights and powers in the constitution of such laws, reasonable, and reasonable provisions as will produce that result.
Mr. Speaker, there is no prohibition in that platform; there is no violation of any treaty; there is no regulation of long and well settled principles, but just plain old-fashioned, unadulterated, shadowing of just precisely such a bill as the treaty authorizes, and as I am ready and anxious to support and vote for to-day. It proposes, when necessary, to limit, restrict, regulate, or suspend—not...
absolutely to prohibit for twenty years—the immigration of the people of China. The legitimate and right error is when it is put into a law. The people of this country, the man object, and such a bill would command the voice and vote of every Republican in this House. I would by all just and reasonable means, if necessary, regulations limiting our people to the existing evils of the so-called “cooly labor,” from criminals, from prostitutes and diseased persons, by providing by the most stringent regulations should not be allowed to come across our shores from China or any other country. Such a law would be just whole-some, would protect the people of California and Nevada, as well as every other portion of the country, and would violate no established principle.

But, sir, I desire to say further than this, that while I believe in the principles of the Republican party; while I am proud of its history, and its perseverance for power by its presence in the Government of this country, by God I believe it will perish; yet, if it could so far forget its origin and inspiration, if it could for a moment lose sight of its past achievements and great possibilities and command me to support this bill of outrage and national dishonor, I would refuse, for the first time, to obey its mandate.

This is a question not of sentiment or policy, but of right and justice. It addresses itself to my judgment and conscience, and in its decision and settlement no man nor party can control me. What I conceive to be right, to be my duty, I will be unaffected by any platform and unavowed by any party.

Now, sir, amend this bill as I have suggested, so as to exclude from your shores all slaves and criminals and prostitutes and diseased persons from every country and clime, and then pass it, and I will guarantee that with the aid of proper State legislation you will be able to effect the people and satisfy every demand of justice and humanity.

The claim made that the Chinese should be excluded because they do, and never will, assimilate with our people, is scarcely worth our serious consideration. Any objection would be made to the Irishman under the lead of the Know-nothing organization, and to the negro, previous to 1851, by the people of the South; but these prophecies have never been fulfilled. Are the Chinese, then, the only people, the Irishman and negro both vindicated their claim and right to American citizenship in the great struggle for national life we have since passed through.

Again, the unusual and cruel manner in which these quiet and inoffensive Chinese have been treated by the people of California would be so almost impossible for them to assimilate, if they were disposed to.

When the Englishman, the Irishman, the German, the Frenchman, or any other man, comes here he extends to him the hand of wel­come and give him an equal chance with the rest; but when a China­man appears, who has just as good a right to come here to better his condition and seek happiness as the others, you pelt him with stones and brickbats from the moment he leaves the vessel, and when at last he finds protection among his persecuted countrymen, you refuse to employ him, you will not allow him to enter your schools, you exclude him from the jury-box, you do not allow him to have, exercise, or enjoy any of the rights of citizenship, and now, to complete the long list of his wrongs, you declare by this bill that he shall never be admitted.

Now, sir, how can you expect he will mix, assimilate, and become like you, when you drive him to his overcrowded hovel and will not allow him to live in competition with American laborers? Can you expect from such a man to come reclining in the lap of luxury? How can you expect him to become Americanized or become familiar with your ways and customs, when you will not tolerate your presence or allow him to make his home with your people? How can you expect him to become educated when you shut the doors of your schools and colleges upon him, and deprive him of every opportunity to learn your language or become acquainted with your literature? How can you expect him to assimilate with your people, or take an interest in your Government, when you exclude him from the jury-box and will not allow him to take any part in the administration of justice? What right have you to expect him to assume the form and spirit of citizenship, and interest himself in public affairs, when you declare by solemn act of Con­gress that he shall never be naturalized?

This violent attempt to prevent by Federal law the civilization of Chinese labor in competition with American labor, betrays a weakness and cowardice not at all commendable, or in keeping with our history or the spirit of our people.

If I do not believe, and I am not willing to admit, in the blazing light of the victories of almost nineteen hundred years, under the banner of the cross, that Christian civilization cannot stand in the day of spiritual speculations, and is in the false gods of China, I am not ready to concede that free, educated American labor must crouch down and abandon the field when brought in competition with any class of labor from Europe and Asia.

No, Mr. Speaker, let them come, and wherever and whenever these two civilizations, or these two classes of labor come together, you will find there will be given way to the cross, and freedom from the triumph over slavery; and instead of destroying the votaries of that false religion and degrading dogma, Christianity will enroll them among its supporters and use them to extend and strengthen its kingdom.
Mr. ORTH. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ORTH] is recognized.

Mr. DUNNELL. Will the gentleman from Indiana reserve ten minutes of his time for me?

Mr. ORTH. I yield the gentleman from Minnesota ten minutes now.

Mr. DUNNELL. I have sought an opportunity to address the House upon a question of such vital importance as the question of immigration, and I have felt that it was my duty to do so. I have sought an opportunity to express my views upon it, and I embrace this opportunity to do so.

I am without very great fear as to the influence of a few Mongolians upon the civilization of the country, but believe that the civilization of the United States is not at all to be affected by the incorporation of five millions of Mongolians, and that the United States is not at all to be damaged thereby. I am without very great fear as to the influence of the five millions of Mongolians upon the civilization of the country, but believe that the civilization of the United States is not at all to be affected by the incorporation of five millions of Mongolians, and that the United States is not at all to be damaged thereby.

Mr. Speaker, that this result not simply from our political and civil institutions but also because of our Christian civilization. Our civilization is not simply a matter of institutions, but also a matter of spirit. That spirit is that which makes us the most independent people to-day than we have ever been in the history of the nation; American republicanism has gathered strength year by year, and now we are able to receive into our emporiums a nation whatever may come to us.

Mr. Speaker, that this result not simply from our political and civil institutions but also because of our Christian civilization. Our civilization is not simply a matter of institutions, but also a matter of spirit. That spirit is that which makes us the most independent people to-day than we have ever been in the history of the nation; American republicanism has gathered strength year by year, and now we are able to receive into our emporiums a nation whatever may come to us.

Mr. Speaker, that this result not simply from our political and civil institutions but also because of our Christian civilization. Our civilization is not simply a matter of institutions, but also a matter of spirit. That spirit is that which makes us the most independent people to-day than we have ever been in the history of the nation; American republicanism has gathered strength year by year, and now we are able to receive into our emporiums a nation whatever may come to us.

Mr. Speaker, that this result not simply from our political and civil institutions but also because of our Christian civilization. Our civilization is not simply a matter of institutions, but also a matter of spirit. That spirit is that which makes us the most independent people to-day than we have ever been in the history of the nation; American republicanism has gathered strength year by year, and now we are able to receive into our emporiums a nation whatever may come to us.
The United States of America and the Emperor of China cordially recognize the right of each to change his home and allegiance, and also the mutual advantage of the free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects respectively to the other country to the other for purposes of curiosity, of trade, or as permanent residents.

I ask you, is all this merely a "sentiment"? Our people have at least shown a most laudable persistency in adhering to it until it has become a part of our laws and customs. Is it not the result of the invitation we have given and the promise we have made to all peoples: to come to our shores, without regard to race or religion, and enjoy with us the benefits of free government.

Now it is proposed to strike down this principle, to restrict, to suspend—yes, virtually to destroy this right of migration. In this view of the question have I stated the least shown of a change in the policy which we now propose to enact and to the principle which its advocates hold.

In 1882, the Congresional Record-House of Representatives was discussing the Chinese Exclusion Act, which aimed to restrict Chinese immigration to the United States. The act was passed in 1882, marking a significant moment in U.S. immigration policy, limiting the entry of Chinese laborers to the United States.

The document highlights the legislative debate about the right of emigration and the protection of citizens' rights. It references historical events, such as the Chinese arrival in the United States, and discusses the implications of the proposed law on the rights of Chinese immigrants.

The text also references the importance of preserving the rights of emigration and the benefits of free government. It advocates for the protection of these rights, emphasizing the importance of preserving individual freedoms and the rights of citizens to change their residence.

The Chinese Exclusion Act was a significant step in the U.S.'s efforts to limit Chinese immigration, reflecting broader trends in the late 19th century to restrict immigration from certain countries, particularly from East Asia.
but leaves that question to the individual conscience of every citizen. As I have already stated, the exclusion of aliens upon account of their religion or his want of religion. The Christian and the Hebrew, the Mohammedan and the heathen, all occupy the same platform of religious equality. We send our missionaries to convert the pagan in China when he voluntarily places himself within the reach of our Christian civilization?

Fifthly. He takes no interest in our Government. Do you mean by this that he is not immediately interested in his arrival to the "sand lot" of San Francisco and harangue the boisterous multitude upon their special duty on election days? This objection comes with a poor grace when it is known that we refuse to recognize his interest in our Government or permit him to assume the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. We deny to him the rights which we conferred on other immigrants, and as if to emphasize this denial the sixteenth section of this bill provides "that hereafter no State court or court of the United States shall admit Chinese to citizenship; and all laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed."

Sixthly. He takes his money back to China and thus impoverishes the country. Does he not leave in the country a dollar's worth of labor for every dollar he carries away? And if he works cheaply, as is alleged, he leaves with us two dollars' worth of work for the dollar he takes home.

Seventhly. Why does his bones are taken back to his native country. This is rather a praiseworthy sentiment. But let me ask, why do you wish to have his bones if you object to having his body here?

There are other reasons given for the passage of this bill to which I shall presently allude, to show that in my judgment they are equally unfounded. Let me adduce to the general impression, and as a thorough investigation of this subject, appointed a joint committee of both Houses, of which the late lamented Senator Morton was chairman, to go to the Pacific coast and enter upon an exhaustive examination of all facts bearing or tending to throw light upon this much-talked-of Chinese question. The testimony which came before the committee is an abundance of opinion, and the occupation in life, forms a volume of 1,553 pages, and is found among the archives of Congress.

Although Senator Morton did not live to fully complete and present his report to Congress, he had nevertheless progressed far enough to give his "views" upon the leading points which had engaged the attention of the majority and the minority of the Senate, and which he expressed in his testimony contained in said report.

I am for this bill because it will restrain crime and prevent pauperism and disease.

Do not understand that the bill before the House is obnoxious to the points made by Senator Morton.

That the Chinese has totally misapprehended the position of Senator Morton if he supposes that his "views" are at all in accord with the provisions of this bill. The following extract from the Massachusetts lever may be quoted in contradiction:

As Americans, standing upon the great doctrines to which I have referred, and seeking to educate the masses into their belief, and charged with the administration of the laws by which equal rights and protection shall be extended to all races and conditions, we cannot now safely take a new departure, which, in another form, shall reconstitute and re-establish those odious distinctions of race which brought upon us the late civil war, and from which we fondly hoped that God in his providence had delivered us forever. If the Chinese in California were white people, being in all other respects what they are, I do not believe that the committee, after it is made against them would have existed to any considerable extent. Their differences in color, dress, manners, and religion have, in my judgment, more to do with this hostility than that alleged vice or any actual injury to the white people of California.

And the following extract serves to confirm what I have already said as to the position of the late Senator:

Mr. CALKINS, in his remarks favoring the passage of his bill, said:

"While Senator Morton recognized the right of this Government to take such steps as would prevent crime, pauperism, and disease, as well as other things, his conclusion was that attempt to exclude them altogether, or so restrict immigrants as would practically amount to exclusion, would be an innovation upon that which we had regarded heretofore as one of the great rights or pillars of our Government."

I am for this bill because it will restrain crime and prevent pauperism and disease.

Do not understand that the bill before the House is obnoxious to the points made by Senator Morton.

That the Chinese has totally misapprehended the position of Senator Morton if he supposes that his "views" are at all in accord with the provisions of this bill. The following extract from the Massachusetts lever may be quoted in contradiction:

As Americans, standing upon the great doctrines to which I have referred, and seeking to educate the masses into their belief, and charged with the administration of the laws by which equal rights and protection shall be extended to all races and conditions, we cannot now safely take a new departure, which, in another form, shall reconstitute and re-establish those odious distinctions of race which brought upon us the late civil war, and from which we fondly hoped that God in his providence had delivered us forever. If the Chinese in California were white people, being in all other respects what they are, I do not believe that the committee, after it is made against them would have existed to any considerable extent. Their differences in color, dress, manners, and religion have, in my judgment, more to do with this hostility than that alleged vice or any actual injury to the white people of California.

And the following extract serves to confirm what I have already said as to the position of the late Senator:

In dealing with this question, we should consider and act upon general principles, and shudder before adopting a new policy which would be at variance with those principles. I think it is only fair to say that the principles upon which we professed to establish our Government in the beginning, and upon which it has never ceased to exercise its functions, have yielded to no internal or external disorder, or unworthy. They are the principles on which our institutions are established, and to the education of our people in them, without regard to any temporary interest or condition.

Another reason given for their exclusion is that they are unhealthy and bring with them a disease in which humanity in which they are located, and especially that the loathsome disease of small-pox prevails constantly among them.

The examination of the testimony reported by the joint committee falls entirely to corroborate these statements, and the following from page 645 of said report:

Mr. BROOKS. Q. What is your business? A. I am a physician.
arrival become members of one or the other of the Six Companies of San Francisco, for whose benefit they labor. This is the only way by which they can receive and limit these seventy-five thousand dollars for the establishment of the Chinese labor. I am opposed to this bill because it excludes the Chinese laborers from the class of labor with whom we are on friendly terms. The most of the Chinese who come here are of a higher class of labor. They are not bungling ones. I oppose it because it violates a solemn treaty of the United States and China which has been long in our possession.

Since 1852, when I came to the State of California, I have been there twenty-six years. It is not at all surprising that such doers of business, such skillful mechanics, such frugal, industrious people, should be at the present day employed in California. There is a demand for their labor. They are not too numerous to be employed, and I think that in my neighborhood there must be, perhaps, some five hundred Chinamen employed. It is principally a vine-growing industry that is engaged in cultivating the grapes for the farms.

As Charles B. Rhodes, who visited China to study the people and their civilization, has reported, Laboring Chinamen, when poor and in debt, live, save, and thrive on wages for better times. They have no notion of the idleness of life, because honesty is inculcated in their religion; but experience has shown that after they are foreclosed, they become more free in the distribution of their wealth. It is a better illustration to human nature is singularly alike the world over. It is natural to use the gains our labor has brought, but not to use them as we often see in handicraft, frugal, industrious, patient, and industrious. They make excellent house-servants, and may be trained to cook skillfully. When taught by French cooks it is difficult to exceed them. With one explanation thoroughly understood, they will need no further instruction in any branch of domestic service, but never stupid. They are not given to excessive hilarity, but are quiet, peaceful, and persistent. Their manufacture of cochineal is extraordinary. They would make dexterous cotton-pickers; never bungling ones.

Q. How long have you been here in this State?
A. Twenty-six years.

Q. What has been your business?
A. I have been engaged in the railroads.

Q. How long have you lived on this coast?
A. Thirty years.

Q. Have you been acquainted with the operations of the Chinese since their first arrival here?
A. Yes, sir.

Q. State what, in your judgment, is their effect upon white labor, whether they have the sufficient power for the return of many a large access, or have had that effect at any time.
A. I think that they affect white men labor. I think that their presence here affords to white men a more elevated class of labor. As I said before, if you should destroy the Chinese, you would take seventy-five thousand white men from an elevated class of labor and put them down to doing this low class of labor. Instead of elevating white labor to that extent. For any man to rise through California, from the lowest to the highest station, it is necessary that he should have a long line of possession of land, and in the mountains millions acres of timber, and the foot-hills waiting for some one to go and cultivate them, and then talk about them being too much labor, then I say, is a very palpable and erroneous statement.

Other arguments failing, the Republicans of the House are admonished that they must support this bill because our late national platform contains this provision; namely:

"I will vote for a bill (as we have an undoubted right to do) to prohibit, or cooly labor; but I am opposed to this bill because it excludes the Chinese laborers from the class of labor with whom we are on friendly terms; and I think that in my neighborhood there must be, perhaps, some five hundred Chinamen employed. It is principally a vine-growing industry that is engaged in cultivating the grapes for the farms."

The "views" and conclusions of Senator Morton are based upon a thorough examination of the subject and substantiated by a large mass of testimony collated by his committee, some of which I beg leave to quote particularly in this introduction of the House and the country:

Q. John H. Hill sworn and examined. I came to California in July, 1859; have resided principally in Sonoma County. The late Chinese have displaced the former Chinese; they are my place of residence; have been a farmer in Sonoma County; cultivator of fruit principally. My practice is to employ Chinese labor. I find that as they are, by their own nature, frugal, industrious, honest, and good laborers, creating no trouble whatever; is a common practice of my neighborhood to employ Chinese.

I think in my neighborhood there must be, perhaps, some five hundred Chinamen employed. It is principally a vine-growing industry that is engaged in cultivating the grapes for the farms."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] is recognized by the Chair as entitled to the floor.

Mr. PAGE. If the gentleman from Illinois will yield for that purpose.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. PAGE. I move that the House now adjourn.

This motion was agreed to. The House then adjourned at seven o'clock and fifty minutes a.m., Thursday, March 23d) the House adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following memorials, petitions, and other papers were laid on the table of the House, under the rule, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. BREWER: The petition of the State board of visitors of Rutgers Scientific School, of New Jersey, praying for the establishment of an educational fund, &c., to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORNELL: The petition of 30 citizens of Shandaken; of Jacob H. Tremper, jr., and Jacob H. Tremper, sr., of the State of New York, praying for the establishment of a subscription library, and the distribution of an educational fund, &c., to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CURTIN: The petition of citizens of Du Bois, Pennsylvania, praying for the establishment of a competition to act as will result in the selection of an American citizen now confined in British jails—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIES: The petition of 130 citizens of Apalachicola, Florida, for an appropriation for the improvement of the harbor at that place—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DEZENDORF: The petition of Benjamin P. Loyall, of Norfolk, Virginia, to be paid the sum of $435.93 now standing to his credit on the books of the Treasury Department for services rendered in the United States Navy to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, papers relating to the claim of Nathaniel Nash—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The petition of Joseph H. Rainey, praying to be reimbursed for balances due him for actual and necessary expenses incurred in contested-election cases in the Forty-fourth and Forty-fifth Congresses to the Committee on Elections.

By Mr. FISHER: The petition of ex-soldiers, now residing in Huntingdon County, Pennsylvania, for the passage of the bill to establish a soldiers' home at Erie, Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARRISON: The petition of the mayor, common council, and citizens of Fredericksburg, Virginia, for an appropriation to construct a road from said city to the main line of the national railway—to the Committee on Railroads.

By Mr. HALL: The petition of William Waterhouse, John Osgood, Rev. F. L. Doane, and citizens of Barrington, New Hampshire, praying that the suppression of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. HAMMOND: Memorial of Jesse H. Jones and others of the State of Louisiana, praying that it shall not be made legal in any Government transactions—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, the petition of Henry I. Haedenberg of what is known as Weiss beer, in relation to a bill to regulate the tax on the same—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: The petition of nearly 3,000 citizens of Paterson,
New Jersey, for an appropriation for the erection of a public building in said city—charters of the city of Fort Myers, in favor of the erection of a United States marine hospital at New Orleans; which was referred respectively to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KING: The petition of citizens of Vidalia, Louisiana, and Natchez, Mississippi, for the improvement of the harbors of Vidalia and Natchez, respectively—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LACEY: The petition of H. J. Day, A. A. McComoughy, and others, citizens of Marshall, Michigan, for legislation for the suppression of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGINNIS: Three petitions, signed by officers of the United States Army, in relation to the disposition of personnel who have been dismissed by court-martial—severally to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE: The petition of Joseph Frye and others, for the passage of the French spoliation claims bill—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MULDWOR: The petition of J. Russell and others, citizens of Zion, Lowndes County, Mississippi, for the restoration of fractional currency—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, the petition of C. A. Sullivan, of Mississippi, for an appropriation for testing a patent for aerial navigation—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NOLAN: The petition of Oklahoma Quadrangle Survey; 30 others, citizens of Albany, New York, for a reduction of the duty on sugar to a rate not exceeding 25 per cent. ad valorem—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL: The petition of the Vessel-Owners' and Captains' Association of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for an appropriation for the improvement of the Delaware River—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. POUND: The petition of George Woodhall and 229 others, citizens of Marquette, in the State of Michigan, for the restoration of unsurveyed lands in St. Clair County, Michigan—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TELLER: A petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the United States, praying for an amendment of the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic beverages throughout the national domain; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN: I present the petition of Hon. T. J. Simmons, judge of the superior courts of the Micanopy circuit, Georgia, and a number of other prominent citizens of Bibb County, Georgia, praying for the immediate appropriation to present the harbor of Savannah in that State; which I move be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WINDOM, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom were referred the bill (S. No. 799) in relation to the Venezuela awards and the bill (S. No. 895) in respect to the Venezuela claims and awards, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was ordered to be printed, and the bills were postponed indefinitely.

Mr. VANCE. I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom were referred the bill (S. No. 1410) for the relief of Albert T. Whiting, and the bill (S. No. 1373) for the relief of Thomas Evans, to report a substitute for them. As they are both for the same object, they are incorporated into one bill.

The bill (S. No. 1561) for the relief of Albert T. Whiting and Thomas Evans was read twice by its title.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 1440) relating to the registration of trade-marks, reported it without amendment.

Mr. HAMPTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 881) for the relief of Lieutenant Edward S. Farrar, United States Army, reported it with an amendment, and substituted a new thereto, which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Agriculture, to whom were referred the bill (S. No. 392) to establish a department of agriculture and commerce, and the bill (S. No. 558) to make the Agricultural Department an Executive Department, and to enlarge its duties and powers, reported a bill (S. No. 1592) to constitute the Department of Agriculture an Executive Department and enlarge its duties and powers, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MAHONE, from the Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 593) for the establishment of a bureau of cooperatives and to provide for the promotion of industrial and economic co-operation, reported it, and the bill was referred to the Speaker.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1564) for the relief of E. T. Pilkenton; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. FREY asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1565) to provide for the formation and admission into the Union of the State of Washington; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FREY asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1566) for the establishment of a national university; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1567) for the establishment of a national university; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WYCK asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1568) to provide for the compensation of officers and employees of the army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. VAN WYCK asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1569) to amend the homestead laws by providing for the establishment of a national university; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education.

Mr. KELLOGG presented a memorial of the board of health of Louisiana, in favor of the erection of a United States hospital at New Orleans; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. KELLOGG presented a memorial of the board of health of Louisiana, in favor of the erection of a United States hospital at New Orleans; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the United States, praying for an amendment of the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic beverages throughout the national domain; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the general defect of the bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PAPERS WITHDRAWN AND REFERRED.

On motion of Mr. CAMERON, of Wisconsin, it was ordered,

That the papers relating to the claim of Elias H. Powers be taken from the files and referred to the Committee on Claims.