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

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

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. In the ninth district the Senator from Georgia moves that the salary shall be $1,500, and the Senator from Maine moves 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. I would move to proceed to the consideration of executive business, but for the fact that I think there is very little to be done in that respect.

Mr. TELLER. I ask the Senator to withdraw the motion to adjourn, and move to go 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.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BUCHANAN, indefinitely, on account of the dangerous illness of his wife.

REPORTS OF THE UNITED STATES FISH COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from Professor Baird, of the Smithsonian Institution, requesting that 1,500 copies of the reports prepared by the United States Fish Commission for the Census of 1880 be printed for the use of and distribution by said commission; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

MAIL SERVICE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Postmaster-General, transmitting a report of the offers received under the advertisements of October 15, 1880, and March 10, 1881, for carrying the mails in certain States, and under the advertisements of February 10, 1881, for mail messenger, transfer, and mail station service; also a report of all mails established or ordered within the year which ended June 30, 1881, other than those let at the annual letting; also a report of the allowances made to contractors during the year which ended June 30, 1881, and of all orders whereby expense is incurred beyond the original contract price; also a report of all curtailments in the service and pay of contractors within the year which ended June 30, 1881.

The question was upon the reference of the communication.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the documents accompanying this communication are very voluminous and the printing of them would involve a very considerable outlay. The Chair suggests that the printing of them be not ordered at this time, but that the papers be referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, for such recommendation as that committee may hereafter think proper to make.

There was no objection; and the communication, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT NO. 4.

Mr. RANDALL. On yesterday the subject of printing the fourth number of the statistical abstract of the United States as prepared by Government officials was under discussion. The object which the Chair then had in view, and which I had in harmony with him, was to secure the printing of that fourth number in the same manner and form as the three prior numbers had been printed. These statistics are transmitted to Congress under chapter 3812 of the Revised Statutes, which requires the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish a condensed statement of the aggregate amount of exports to and imports from foreign countries on or before the 1st day of November of each year. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] objected yesterday to the printing of this report, upon the idea that it had already been ordered. I have, and I think the Chair has also, taken the trouble to make full inquiry on this subject, through the journal clerk, and I find that the gentleman from Illinois was mistaken; and I am informed by him that he is now willing to withdraw his objection, so that this fourth number of the Statistical Abstract may be ordered by the House to be printed.

This is one of the most useful productions of the Government. It enables us to transact our public business with full information upon the subject of the productions of the country, and other statistics of interest relating to our country. If the definition is true that statesmanship consists in one knowing the resources of his own country, this is the way to make statesmen of us.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggested yesterday that this fourth number of the Statistical Abstract should be transferred from the Committee on Printing to the Committee on Ways and Means, and that it be ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPRINGER. I was under the impression yesterday that an order to print this document had already been made. I was misled by having before me the document corrresponding to this which was submitted to the last Congress. A copy of that was before me at the time, and I supposed it was the one to which reference was made by the Chair. I was therefore misled as to the matter of printing.

The subject is now before the Committee on Printing, and we have instructed our chairman 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.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the reference be changed from the Committee on Printing to the Committee on Ways and Means, and that the document be now ordered to be printed.

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 Chinese 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. 5370) to authorize the Secretary of War to direct the officer in charge of the Muscle Shoals improvement to furnish necessary seeds 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 BY MISSISSIPPI OVERFLOW.

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

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the House of Representatives at the earliest possible date what further relief, in his judgment, from the information now before him, is necessary for the relief 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.

HEIRS 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 Back 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 $97.80, 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 Fredericksburgh, in the State of Virginia, 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. DUVALL.

Mr. TALBOTT, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

No. 5376) for the relief of John C. Duvall; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

CANNON FOR SOLDIERS' MONUMENT.

Mr. COX, of New York, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. No. 5377) to authorize the Secretary of War to deliver certain cannon, &c., to the Saratoga Monument Association; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is——

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. Before the House proceeds to the consideration of the regular order, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from California, [Mr. PAGE.] When we proceed to vote on the Chinese immigration bill, if the previous question is operating, some amendments may be excluded which I believe the gentleman from California is quite willing should be entertained. Therefore I would like to have an understanding with him that amendments may be received and voted upon in the order of their presentation and their application to the bill. I believe he does not object to such an understanding.

The SPEAKER. That arrangement can be made before the previous question is ordered.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Speaker, I shall agree undoubtedly that amendments may be offered before the previous question is called.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. And may be voted on after the ordering of the previous question, as if they were in order under the rules.

Mr. PAGE. Amendments offered before the previous question is called will be in order any way.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. They may not be in order strictly under the rules.

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. Without regard to their number, if an arrangement be made that more amendments than the rules allow may be pending at one time.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. That is the arrangement I am seeking to make now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts will probably be able to make that arrangement with the gentleman from California.

Mr. PAGE. I do not want any misunderstanding; and I do not think I understand the gentleman. I said that before the previous question is called I would consent that amendments may be offered. All amendments not offered prior to the call of the previous question will be excluded, as a matter of course.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. And those offered will be voted upon in the order of their application.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will see that any arrangement made between the gentlemen, with the consent of the House, is carried out.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would like to know what has been agreed upon between these gentlemen.

The SPEAKER. Nothing definite, except the gentleman from California suggests that before the calling of the previous question he will give an opportunity to offer amendments, which may be considered after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. SPRINGER. Without reference to the order of their application or to the number of amendments that may be pending?

The SPEAKER. That is a matter to be determined hereafter. Debate is not yet closed.

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 want to say, so that I may not be misunderstood, that I am opposed to all amendments. But I had agreed when the debate begun that before the previous question should be called there might be an opportunity to offer amendments germane to certain sections of the bill. I had no disposition whatever, Mr. Speaker, to prevent the House voting on such amendments as it wishes.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS. I suggest when general debate is ended that the gentleman from California shall allow the bill to be taken up and read by sections, for the purpose of having amendments offered and voted on, and also for the purpose of having the debate proceed upon those amendments under the five-minute rule.

Mr. PAGE. I have made no such agreement as that.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. Let me inquire whether the gentleman from California agrees to the arrangement I have suggested.

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 arrangement agreeable to all sides of the House?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no objection to indulging gentlemen, 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 Massachusetts, but will defer it till later in the day. In the mean time I will talk with the gentleman from Massachusetts on the subject, as well as with other gentlemen upon this floor.

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 objection by insisting upon the enforcement of the rules. If we can come to an arrangement, which I understand the gentleman from California is willing to make, for he has said so, I think it had better be done now.

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 willing 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 to keep us for two or three days engaged in voting upon them. Therefore, before I make any definite arrangement I propose to talk with those that intend to support this bill as it is—with my colleagues on the floor and with those who feel an interest in 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. PAGE. No; not in the least.

Mr. LORD. Does the gentleman intend to call the previous question 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 yesterday 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 from debating 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 crowd the bill through.

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

Mr. HATCH. Say four o'clock.

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

Mr. PAGE. Very well.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

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 joint resolutions of the following titles:

An act (H. R. No. 2736) 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' reunion to be held at Grand Island, Nebraska, in the month of August, 1882; and

Joint resolution (H. R. No. 132) granting the use of articles, tents, &c., at encampment of Grand Army of the Republic of the Department of Pennsylvania, on the battle-field of Gettysburgh, in July, 1882.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

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

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the further consideration of the bill (S. No. 71) to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese, 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 general subject embraced in this 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 purpose the restriction, suspension, 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.

This question 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 serious 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 the consequences so remote that the average citizen east of the Rocky Mountains has felt that, so long as his own section of country was not likely to be invaded by any influx of this immigration and cheap labor, he could safely postpone consideration of the subject, leaving it to be dealt with by those who had already had to meet it face to face: like Artemus Ward, who did not care to go to the war himself, but was entirely willing to sacrifice all his wife's relations.

Until within a comparatively short time the people on the Pacific slope have had to deal with this question almost single-handed, having received little of either moral or other support from their fellow-countrymen on this side of the mountains. But the time seems to have come when a disposition is shown to meet this question fairly; and the Government is not only asked to determine its policy with reference to it in the future, but its power is invoked to put an immediate check to the further extension of the evil.

But there is even now, it seems to me, a disposition on the part of many to underestimate the magnitude of the subject and belittle the dangers likely to arise from this immigration, and while there are some who, as a matter of principle, would do nothing to restrict it, there are many who think no immediate danger at hand and no seriously bad results imminent.

Why, it is said that under the census of 1880 there were only about one hundred and five thousand of these people in the United States, or that the entire Chinese population was only about one five-hundredth part of our whole population, and hence the conclusion that no serious harm can come to our system of labor or no peril to our institutions or our civilization. But this statement is misleading. If this small proportion was equally distributed throughout our entire population there would seem to be little significance in the fact. But, when it is understood that of this one hundred and five thousand, seventy-five thousand are located in one State of the Union, and of these a large proportion is in one city, the true state of the case becomes more apparent.

And we should not forget that this Government has never been called upon to deal with any great evil or danger but that had its small beginnings, and was first looked upon with substantially the same indifference as to future and permanent results as this question is now looked upon by many.

Why, the African slave trade commenced in a very small way. No one was specially alarmed when the slave traders landed their first cargoes of human beings on our shores. In the first settlement of the country cheap labor was needed even more than now, and the institution of slavery in those early days was not looked upon with any great apprehension, nor likely to occasion serious consequences by the people either North or South. It was regarded as somewhat immoral, it is true, but as only of a temporary character, and which at any time could be easily checked and controlled. But as property in human beings became profitable, or was thought to be so, its power of extension and expansion became irresistible, until it was able to cast its withering blight over a large section of the country.

It is not necessary to remind any one living in this generation what followed the first false step which permitted African slavery to acquire a foothold on our soil; the prolonged and bitter struggle between slave and free labor for supremacy in the Territories, the civil war that followed with its frightful cost of treasure and of blood, are all too fresh in our memories to need to be recalled at this time.

How short a time since polygamy has been regarded with any great apprehension! But what a few years since was only a speck on the horizon has already become a black and threatening cloud.

When the Mormons folded their tents and abandoned their temple on the banks of the Mississippi and turned their footsteps toward the wilds of Utah, they passed from observation and from mind; and not until they had intrenched themselves in the fastnesses of the mountains and had extended themselves and their shameless practices over a large region of country has the Government realized how difficult a problem it had upon its hands, and that legislation of a radical and unusual character had become necessary.

I refer to these two instances in the history of our Government only to show that there is no time like the present to deal with an existing evil, however small proportions that evil may have attained. Indifference and procrastination lead only to difficulties and dangers. I therefore feel that there is no better time than the present for the Government to meet squarely and deal definitely and effectively with this question of Chinese immigration and cheap labor. I believe that the Government should meet the question unhesitatingly, and on the very threshold, and not leave it longer for our countrymen on the Pacific coast to wrestle with single-handed and alone, as they have done hitherto; and that we should not hesitate to enact into law a remedy for what, unrestricted, will develop into a condition of things that the people of this country cannot afford.

We may as well understand first as last that if this Chinese immigration is to continue unrestricted it will not be confined for any great length of time to California and the Pacific States, but will seek all sections of the country where it can find a foothold.

New England, with its varied and extensive industries scattered through every valley and upon every hillside, will have no immunity. The immense commerce of the great cities of the seaboard must accept it, and those occupying the prairies of the West must in turn adapt themselves to this system of labor. Are we as a people prepared for this experiment? I do not believe we are.

It is claimed by those who oppose legislation of this character 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 invite all from every region and every clime to come to our shores and enjoy the blessings that our free Government can bestow. This is true, but with some qualification. We do invite the people of all nations who desire to come here with the view and for the purpose of becoming citizens, and taking upon themselves the responsibilities of citizenship in the broadest and fullest signification; but we do not, as I understand it, by this broad and generous invitation, intend to open the door to a character of immigration that does not make American citizens, but which brings with it another citizenship and another civilization.

And here is where the analogy fails when the comparison is made between Chinese immigration and all other immigration that comes to this country, and it is right here that the high-sounding phrases of those who oppose the principle embraced in this bill, and who favor without restriction this class of immigration, are misleading and unfair, and it is right here they make their great mistake.

We invite the downtrodden and those that are not downtrodden of all lands to come to our shores, that they may improve their conditions and enjoy the blessings vouchsafed to ourselves under our free institutions and our liberal form of government. We not only invite them but we welcome their arrival. We welcome the Germans, the Irish, the French, the Italian, and the hardy liberty-loving Norsemen, yes, the representatives of all nationalities who come to the country for the purpose of becoming citizens in fact.

At the present time this class of immigration is being poured into every section of the Northwest, coming largely from the north of Europe by the thousands and hundreds of thousands. They come "like an army with banners." They come with their wives, with their children, with their household goods and all their earthly possessions. They come for the purpose of making homes and to become of us. They assimilate with our ways. They learn our language. They send their children to our schools and which they help us to support. They attend our churches and in every way adapt themselves to our customs, education, and manners. They renounce allegiance to the government they have left behind and become naturalized citizens with all the ambitions and aspirations of the native-born.

Not so with the Chinese. They come with no such purpose. They do not desire or expect in any way to become citizens. They have in no way assimilated with our people, our manners, or our customs. In all the centuries they have never assimilated with the Anglo-Saxon race, stolid and unimpressible as they are. They have never adopted our customs, our religion, or our civilization, and in coming to our shores they have no such purpose. They seldom if ever renounce their allegiance to their own country, but having accumulated what money they can, they expect to return there to die.

Hence, I say, there is no analogy whatever between the ordinary immigration that we invite and welcome to our shores and that which the bill now before the House seeks to repress, and the attempts of gentlemen to confound are entirely misleading and I think inconsistent. One comes to adapt itself to our institutions and our civilization; the other brings with it its own institutions and its own civilization; and while we invite an immigration that adapts itself to our own civilization, we do not necessarily invite another that adheres to its own semi-barbarous civilization. The leopard does not change its spots, neither has the Mongolian race in the long centuries changed its characteristics. It is to-day what it was before and since the Christian era. Instead of having been affected by the influences and teachings of the Christian religion and the high civilization that has followed it everywhere, it has driven Christianity from its very birth-place, and no where in all the Mongolian world does it to-day find a resting place, and yet we are invited under the inspiration of a morbid sentimentalism to open wide our doors to a race of people who have not now and never have had the first sentiment or impulse in common with our own Christian civilization, which has developed its highest type and found its fullest fruition under our Government and our free institutions. Holding as I do these views, I feel that it is not only a proper exercise of power but the imperative duty of this Government to restrict in every reasonable way the class of immigration that this bill is intended to reach, and to take all necessary precautions to prevent this land of ours from being overrun with a race of people who will inevitably bring with them *that greatest of all calamities, the degradation of labor*. During the entire existence of our Government we have been taught to look with apprehension upon anything that would tend to degrade the intelligent laboring class of this country, that has no counterpart on the face of the globe, and which ever has been and is now the sheet-anchor of our republican Government and institutions.

I was bred and educated in the political school of protection to American industries, and one of the strongest arguments in favor of a policy that has developed and enriched our country to so wonderful an extent none addressed itself to my judgment and conscience so strongly as that which was adduced in favor of protecting our own labor against the competition of the pauper labor of the old world. And yet we are expected to invite, or to at least tolerate, a cheap,

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 manufactures of New England and 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. We have already permitted this to be done to a great extent in the States on the Pacific slope, and are now asked to place no barriers to prevent its extension over all parts of the country.

Cheap labor has, or may seem to have, its attractions and fascinations. The people of the South once thought that the cheap labor of the slave was indispensable to their prosperity and well-being, and they held to it with a tenacity worthy of a better cause; but when we introduce, or permit to be introduced, a system of labor of a lower grade, if possible, than the slave labor of the South, we do for the whole country what slave labor did for the South, and in so doing strike a blow at the very foundations of our free Government.

We can afford no step the tendency of which is to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. The great danger that more than any other at the present time threatens our institutions and Government is the vast accumulation and aggregation of capital in the hands of a few.

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.

It is the part of wisdom and broad statesmanship not to degrade labor, but to bring capital and labor in accord, giving to capital its fair return, at the same time adding dignity to labor and insuring it a just reward.

We have heard 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 New England, of the Central States, of the South, and of the West courses in the veins of that population. Upon the whole, they are probably no better or no worse than the average population of the country. But these people have been brought into contact with this class of labor. They have had means of observation, facilities for judging of its effects and influences better than those who are so far removed, and I will say that I have never yet seen the man or woman who has lived on the Pacific slope in whatever sphere of life he or she may have moved, whether high or low, but that regards this Chinese labor as degrading, debasing, and in every way injurious and detrimental to the best interests of society and to the material prosperity of the country. It seems to me that the distinguished gentleman from California who has charge of this bill, [Mr. PAGE,] and who has passed the riper years of his life in the State of his adoption, has had better opportunities of judging of the effects of this class of immigration and labor than my other distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. RICE] who addressed the House the other day in opposition to this bill and who from the serene heights of theory and sentiment spoke such disinterested words of wisdom and advice.

Let us for a moment suppose the conditions changed. Let us suppose that 25,000 of these Chinese laborers had been dropped into the city of Worcester, Massachusetts, instead of San Francisco, California. Does any one suppose the gentleman from Massachusetts would view such an invasion with the same equanimity and stoical serenity as he does substantially the same occurrence in San Francisco? If so, let me ask the gentleman what he would propose to do with the intelligent laborers who would be necessarily displaced by the injection of this cheap labor with which from the very nature of things they cannot compete? He will say, as other gentlemen have in this discussion, no doubt, that while the labor now employed may de displaced, yet it will be advanced, and that cheap labor does not degrade but elevates all classes of labor. But where do you find an example in this direction? The slave labor of the South degraded all other labor with which it came in contact, and brought, as a natural, inevitable consequence, the degraded labor of the "poor white;" and I venture to say there is not a gentleman on the other side of the House who comes from the former slave States but will say that of all the bad effects of American slavery the degradation of all other labor was the worst. For one, I cannot see why Chinese cheap labor, wherever introduced, shall not have substantially the same effect. While slave labor in the South produced the "poor white," Chinese labor in California has produced the "tramp" and the "hoodlum." And let me tell you that when these systems of labor are brought in competition there can be no other result.

This may be very well for rich, cultivated, and æsthetic New England, but I assure you the sturdy pioneer of the Northwest neither pines nor hankers for any such condition of things.

Mr. Speaker, the people whom I represent on this floor are engaged in a great variety of industries, greater perhaps than almost any constituency from the new and more recently settled States. My own city is more especially a manufacturing and industrial center. We there have an unusually large representation of what is commonly called the laboring class. These people are thrifty, intelligent, and patriotic. They have wives and children; they have homes and all the surroundings of an enlightened civilization; they support our schools and attend our churches, and, in a word, combine all that goes to make good citizens; and it is, I believe, to the presence of so large a class of intelligent laboring-men in its midst that this city owes much of its almost phenomenal growth and prosperity in the past few years.

Now, sir, for one I do not propose to leave anything undone within the range of proper legislation to prevent this class of labor from being brought into competition with the lowest and most disgusting class of cheap labor that has ever cursed this country. I propose to do nothing that will encourage the introduction of a laborer that will live munificently on twenty cents a day to displace another laborer, who, receiving the just reward of his honest and intelligent toil, is enabled to support and educate in a decent way those dependent upon him. I should feel that I had been unmindful of the best interests of a constituency that has honored me with a seat upon this floor, and false to my own judgment and convictions of duty if I did anything less.

I desire, Mr. Speaker, before I close to say one word with reference to the attitude of the Republican party on this measure—a party that has stood foremost in all its existence as championing the rights of man and the dignity of labor. The last Republican convention at Chicago spoke with no uncertain sound on this question of Chinese immigration. I would ask the Clerk to read the plank from the Republican platform of 1880 bearing on this subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 treaty-making power, the Republican party, regarding the unrestricted immigration of the Chinese as an evil of great magnitude, invokes the exercise of those powers to restrain and limit that immigration by the enactment of such just, humane, and reasonable provisions as will produce that result.

Mr. WASHBURN. I supposed, and the people of the country believed, when this plank was placed in the Republican platform at Chicago, that it was something more than empty declamation or a mere subterfuge to catch the votes of the Pacific States; that, on the contrary, it was the well-considered and well-determined policy of the Republican party on this subject.

And this belief was confirmed, if confirmation was needed, when James A. Garfield, in his admirable letter of acceptance, used this emphatic language:

The material interests of this country, the traditions of its settlement and the sentiment of our people have led the Government to offer the widest hospitality to immigrants who seek our shores for new and happier homes, willing to share the burdens as well as the benefits of our society, and intending that their posterity shall become an undistinguishable part of our population. The recent movement of the Chinese to our Pacific coast partakes but little of the qualities of such immigration, either in its purposes or its results. It is too much like an importation to be welcomed without restriction; too much like an invasion to be looked upon without solicitude. We cannot consent to allow any form of servile labor to be introduced among us under the guise of immigration. Recognizing the gravity of this subject the present administration, supported by Congress, has sent to China a commission of distinguished citizens for the purpose of securing such a modification of the existing treaty as will prevent the evils likely to arise from the present situation. It is confidently believed that these diplomatic negotiations will be successful without the loss of commercial intercourse between the two powers which promises a great increase of reciprocal trade and the enlargement of our markets. Should these efforts fail it will be the duty of Congress to mitigate the evils already felt and prevent their increase by such restrictions as without violence or injustice will place upon a sure foundation the peace of our communities and the freedom and dignity of labor.

Such were the emphatic words of General Garfield when he accepted the Republican nomination for President. "It is too much like an importation to be welcomed without restriction; too much like an invasion to be looked upon without solicitude. We cannot consent to allow any form of servile labor to be introduced among us under the guise of immigration." And this is precisely what the pending bill has to say on the subject.

The Republican party was called into existence and organized to resist the aggressions of slavery and the carrying of degraded labor into the new Territories. In all its grand history it has never failed to respond to the appeals of the oppressed; neither has it ever failed to recognize the great truth that dignity of labor, coupled with universal intelligence of its people, is the bed-rock upon which all governments of the people can alone securely rest.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of their clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. No. 4440) to establish a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River from a point between Wabasha and Reed's Landing, in Minnesota, to a point below the mouth of the Chippewa River, in Wisconsin.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the bill (H. R. No. 124) to establish distinct United States courts with distinct officers in the northern and southern judicial districts in the State of Georgia, in which amendments the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. No. 864) to confirm certain instructions given by the Department of the Interior to the Indian agent at Green Bay agency, in the State of Wisconsin, and to legalize the acts done and committed by the said Indian agent pursuant thereto;

A bill (S. No. 1290) to amend sections Nos. 2586 and 2587 of the Revised Statutes of the United States by creating the collection district of Yaquina, in the State of Oregon, and authorizing the appointment of a collector therein; and

A bill (S. No. 1432) abolishing the military reservation of Fort Abercrombie, in the State of Minnesota, and authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to have the lands embraced therein made subject to homestead and pre-emption entry and sale the same as other public lands.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

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 nation. My purpose now is to offer a few thoughts 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 proposed act, under the provisions of the recent treaty with China, provides for certain essential restrictions upon the importation of that class or portion of Chinese subjects whose presence in our land have proven so productive of distress and contentions 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 assumption, and I lay it down as a sound proposition, that in this grand 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, the dangerous, or the refuse element of any foreign nation 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 America free for the inundations of the rag-tag or the worst elements of any heathen country. In the Republic of America we each assist in governing the rest, and it is a matter of the very greatest importance to us each that every other person in this broad land, in whose keeping our laws or our form of government intrusts our property, our liberty, and our lives, shall be possessed of those essential qualifications which alone can insure the success and blessings of wise and free and secure government. 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 for self-government. Our American nation, grand as has been her success heretofore, is yet an experiment of but a single hundred years' trial; and you well know that had it not been for the intelligence, patriotism, and virtue of the people of our country we long since would have been numbered among the nations that were but are not now.

All agree that these essential individual and national requisites must continue to exist, or self-government, or rather the government of each by all and all by each, 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. More especially is this true in our Republic than in any other form of government, and far more so than in despotic countries where arbitrary power over the masses is centered in one.

In this land of liberty and freemen, broad though it be, there is neither room for hot-beds for the imperial ideas of Europe or thriving receptacles for pagan serfdom from Asia. I assert that it is just as much our right and our duty to exercise care in intrusting to others in addition to ourselves the reins of authority as it is 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 his or her own nationality or place of relocation than it is for 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 significant light alone we should view all questions relative to the admission of members of other races and other nationalities into this Republic.

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 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 proposes to exclude is a proper and safe one for indiscriminate admission. Is it intelligent, and does it possess the requisite virtue? If not, will it in a reasonable time attain to a sufficient degree in these respects? Does it ever desire to become so? Will it ever be a patriotic element in our nation? Will it appreciate and learn to 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 blood, build up our national bone and sinew, or will it poison and canker all its surroundings? Too great care in the accretion of this foreign population cannot be taken.

It would be well to state here that many of our eastern people have formed favorable but false or erroneous opinions of the class hereafter to be excluded, derived from articles in books and papers referring to a different and better class of Chinese, an upper caste in China, and differing from the lower caste, the servile coolies who are imported here. Some of the better class are on our coast, and both the treaty with China, and, consequently, the bill before us, 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 hordes of the lower classes already here 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 cooly 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 first place, pure, genuine immigration is never eastward, always westward. No instance otherwise exists, to my knowledge, in the world's history. The great tide of immigration has been, and is now, westward around the world. This has been the great immutable law of the universe.

From Asia westward to Eastern Europe, westward over Europe, and still westward to America, and on the American continent we well know that along the line from Eastern to extreme Western States or the far-away Pacific, the "star of empire" has taken its course. 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 energy, the vitality of our western coast has come from 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 imported from there are fossils in all social and mental respects. We have nothing to hope for from an infusion of their blood, or their ideas, or their institutions. Nothing at all. It is neither the pluck, nor the energy, nor the brain of the Chinese individuals flooding our shores which causes them to come to America as our immigrants come from Europe. It is rather the energy of a company, an organization, a concentration of corporate capital which buys and owns, imports and sells the time and labor of these lower classes of Chinese. Six companies to-day carry on the importation of men as others do cargoes of tea. These companies, trading and trafficking in this species of cheap labor, buy it and bring it here to compete at ruinous rates with our American citizen laborers. Through their habits of life, brought about by years and ages of forced necessity, deprivation, 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 and the quality of the great Chinese reservoir from which is drained the dregs that flood our Pacific homes.

I incorporate into my remarks the following facts, gleaned from a recent official report from the American consul-general in China, Hon. O. N. Denny, who has given this subject much consideration and study. These facts will give our American people some faint idea of the ordinary daily life of these classes in China—to wit, well-to-do farmers, skilled workmen, and ordinary laborers. Compare the condition of these classes with similar classes in America, and remember that our Chinese importations are from the last and poorest class, and composed of the more abject of these, and tell me whether by our votes we should inflict our laboring classes longer with this ruinous and degrading competition.

WELL-TO-DO FARMER.

Two and one-half acres of good arable land, with a house, the material of which consists mostly of mud and reeds, or bamboos, sometimes of stone or brick, with a roof of straw or reeds—seldom of tiles, a bullock, buffalo, or cow, a couple of pigs, a few fowls or ducks, and finally a few primitive agricultural implements, constitute the property of a well-to-do farmer. Say the family consists of man, wife, and two children of seven to ten years of age. They live almost entirely on the productions of their own soil; two hundred copper cash, or about twenty cents a day is about the marketable value of the food consumed by such a family. The ordinary daily fare is rice, or, as in the north, bread made out of wheat-flour and millet, also some salted vegetables and a light decoction of the commonest tea. On festive occasions some pork, or salted eggs, and a cup or two of samshee, (wine,) form all the "extras" these frugal people indulge in. The budget of a farmer's family stands on an average about thus:

Value of two and one-half acres of land	$400 00
A good animal of draft	20 00
Manure	10 00
Irrigation	10 00
Seeds	3 00
Help at harvest time	8 00
Taxes, $1.10 on the gross yield of rice or wheat	11 00
Total expenses	62 00

The two and one-half acres, which the two adults, with the assistance of an animal of draft and their children, can work, will yield, if the land be of average fertility, and under ordinary climatic circumstances, in—

Rice	$120 00
Second crop, beans, cotton, or barley	40 00
Or, say, in all about	160 00

Deducct from this the cost of living of the family, $73, and the total of other expenses as above, $62=$135, and there will be an income for the year of $25. There are besides some other small sources of income which are under the control of the

women, such as the raising of chickens, pigs, the making of yarn and cloth, &c. These must be set off against other expenses for clothing, &c., not enumerated in the foregoing budget.

SKILLED LABORERS.

The grand average of an income under the head of skilled labor is as follows: For a master, per week, $3; $156 per annum. For a workman, per week, $1.50; $78 per annum. For youngsters or females, per week, fifty cents; $26 per annum. The expense of living will be, respectively:

For a master per annum:	
For food, &c	$72
For rent, &c	36
For clothing, &c	12
Total	120
For a workman per annum:	
For food, &c	45
For rent, &c	12
For clothing, &c	8
Total	65

The females and youngsters are considered to absorb all they earn. The master lives generally at his workshop, where he has perhaps two rooms, besides a place to cook in. The household furniture may be estimated at from $20 to $30. The ordinary workman, if married, will share a small house with a friend and occupy one room and have free access to the kitchen. He may live with his parents, in which case his earnings go to the common fund. Under such circumstances $10 to $15 will cover the value of his household furniture. If a bachelor, and away from his family, he will either sleep at his employer's for a consideration, or stay with a friend; in either case the whole inventory consists of a box with his clothes and his bedding. The main motive of practicing economy with every Chinaman is, first, to be able to take a wife; secondly, to perform his duties to the manes of his ancestors; and, thirdly, to defray the expenses of his own funeral.

ORDINARY OR COOLY LABORER.

Herein are comprised the carriers, boatmen, the wheelbarrow men, &c. Taking the rates ruling at the great commercial centers of this empire the grand average of a man's earnings is about one hundred and fifty cash, or fifteen cents a day, which is equal to $4.50 per month. But it varies so considerably, according to supplies and demand in different localities, that the minimum is as low as five cents a day, while the maximum is as high as thirty cents, without food or lodging. Much also depends upon the physical strength of the men; the endurance and strength of some being actually marvelous. Take, for instance, the tea-carriers in the mountainous parts of Western China. They carry on their backs a load of from three hundred to four hundred pounds' weight across difficult mountain passes, and travel with it for twenty consecutive days. They are considered well paid at twenty-five cents a day. An ordinary cooly's monthly account would stand about thus:

Receipts in wages		$4 50
Expenditures for food	$3 00	
Expenditures for lodging	50	
Incidental expenses	50	
		4 00
Net income		50

He hires himself out by the day, the month, and, less frequently, by the year. The value of his labor varies according to the season. During harvest-time he gets, besides the meals, worth about ten cents, from ten to fifteen cents per day, or seventy cents to $1.05 a week. If his employment be by the month he gets $1.50 to $2 a month, besides board. For permanent employment, or employment by the year, the wages are lower, averaging about twelve dollars per annum, with board and lodging. When working for short terms lodging is no great consideration with him, for he always will find rough accommodations with a friend or relative. Men of this class defray their house rent with about fifty cash or five cents a month. About two dollars per annum will keep his wardrobe in a state adequate to his scanty wants. A man who saves $3 to $4 a year does fairly well, but the majority live from hand to mouth, and their whole life is but a hard struggle to fight the hungry wolf from the door.

How do you suppose our American laborers with large families to support, and forced to compete with the poorer of these elements, and to struggle against these odds for their daily bread—how do you suppose they relish the picture I have unrolled before you? Judge Denny adds in his report that the Chinese Empire can supply the world with this class of cheap labor.

I know it has flooded us with several hundreds of thousands coming and going constantly, and the number has only been limited by the excitement and resentment aroused wherever they have come in contact with our race. Impossible as it is for the census correctly to estimate their number now here, yet I suppose upon our coast there are from one hundred to one hundred and fifty thousand, almost entirely males, only a very small percentage being females, but without the relation of marriage. Probably not one in the whole class which this bill proposes to hereafter exclude would ever bring a wife or marry one during his stay in America, and the women generally who do come carry along with them the pestilential scourge of combined female slavery, concubinage, and prostitution.

For nearly a third of a century this class of laborers have been with us on our coast, during which period you well know, Mr. Speaker, what wonderful progress and gigantic advancement the Caucasian race and the American people have been making. Only a few days ago the statement was made by a gentleman addressing one of our committees that the first engineer that ever rode upon a railroad engine in America is living to-day in the city of New York. The same day the present minister from the Hawaiian Government informed me that he was a member of the American Congress when the subsidy was given Morse, the great inventor of the telegraph, to test his wonderful discovery.

These incidents occurring on that day serve to recall the surprising development of our age. It is so grand and glorious that it is the sublime theme of orators and the problem of study for statesmen, and nowhere in the wide world has it achieved the wonderful zenith it has in America; but how has it been with the Mongolians among us? I defy any one to truthfully say that in all their stay among us they have made any appreciable progress whatever, and it is especially true that they have made none in assimilating with us.

True to their time-sacred custom of exclusiveness, they import large quantities of their food and clothing from the old country, and with their wages they return there if alive, and if dead their bones are transferred by the living. Notwithstanding this is a land of real property-holders, not one of them to-day owns a homestead. A lease simply of a piece of ground is occasionally acquired, and then only for temporary purposes. They do not come for homes; they come for greed, and so blind is their adherence to their pagan abode in China that generally so soon as their needs are supplied they return, and the few dollars earned in America place them in affluence comparatively in China.

Those here still speak a foreign language and worship a pagan deity and they yet live in blind veneration of the idolatries and superstitions of their dark ages of the past. At home China stands to-day where she has stood for thousands of years, firmly wedded to her Joss and to her idols. While other nations are looking forward she is gazing backward—venerating the paths trodden by her idolatrous ancestors and with no interest in any ideas or any institution or any civilization or any religion save her own.

No Chinese laborer reads our papers, attends our gatherings, frequents our resorts, patronizes our schools, supports our churches, or in any way seems to be a part of us. They know but little and care less about our Government or our institutions. Their manners, habits, socialisms, and government are diametrically opposite to ours. Occasionally, of course, there is an exception, but for all practical purposes it need not be taken into consideration.

They are a law unto themselves, governed by their own superstitions, regulations, and tribunals, and a block in the way of enforcing the laws of our country. The vast body of them arrive bound hand and foot by the restrictions of cooly serfdom and from the lower classes of China, from the classes described by Bayard Taylor, the great traveler, as the most debased people on the face of the earth.

Now, compare if you please, Mr. Speaker, the intelligent American laborer married, surrounded by his wife and his children, trying to pay for his own homestead, supporting his school and his church, obeying the law and loyal to America, with these cooly laborers from China—ignorant, superstitious, childless, unmarried; no home but a China hovel where many brood and hover in narrow contracted space, and all pagans and idolaters and of a different race. And what American can view with anything but the gravest apprehension the result where these foreign elements largely prevail and where their spread is practically unlimited? Do not call this immigration. Do not abuse the significance of the word or the idea. We on the Pacific slope are as desirous of emigration as any country can be. We are now anxiously awaiting the completion of transcontinental railroads and the inauguration of steamship lines to bring to the golden land of the Pacific the brain and the muscle and the capital and the patriotism of immigration.

Give us of your people. Give us of the people of our race. Give us the English, the Irish, the Scotch, the German, or the Scandinavian. Give us those who will come with their families, who will assimilate with us, help diversify our industries and build up our institutions, but do not force upon us the very opposite—the class to which I am now referring.

No one need be misled by false assertions that we would talk differently if these Chinese were voters. Even were such the case it would not alter the facts to which I have briefly referred. But who, let me ask, in this broad land would have them voters? Where is there a Representative within the sound of my voice who will rise in his seat and proclaim that over 100,000 pagan idolaters, ignorant, neither able to read nor to write nor to speak our language intelligibly, who are not possessed of any of the material qualifications or sympathies of electors, who come and go in herds or under the control of some of the Six Companies that buy and sell them as they please, should have placed in their hands the elective franchise? As well give any other subject of China the suffrage, for whether here or in Asia, they are equally foreign to everything which we as loyal and true Americans hold dear. I call the earnest attention of the law-makers of the nation to this fact. If you allow this vast body of China coolies to be admitted into this Republic one of two things must result: they must either remain as the lower strata of cheap menial laborers for commercial purposes, to be bought, used, and sold for profit by capitalists, corporations, or monopolists, or else you must do with them as you do with the Caucasian from Europe, make them citizens and voters and intrust to them governing power over our American homes and institutions and Republic. One or the other. There is no escaping it. Which shall it be, serfs or citizens?

No, this is not a subject for a demagogue, but one calling for earnest, careful, patriotic, and statesmanlike consideration. As to the benefits derived from this class they are almost entirely those growing out of so-called "cheap labor," and much of the profit thereof has gone to enrich the corporate monopolies of the East and of our coast. But, Mr. Speaker, the true policy of our country is not to "cheapen" labor. The blessings of home life, the payment of the little debt upon the homestead, the education of the children, the support for charity, the spare contribution to the cause of religion, and leisure for essential recreation, and time for study, and for reflection upon the duties of citizenship—all of these are dependent in

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 "cheapen" the labor of the great mass of self-governing American citizens.

Oh, no; cheap, servile, ignorant labor may do for a despotism where thousands of bodies and souls weigh but as a feather in the 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 is a sovereign and must have the power to maintain his sovereignty and independence.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PAGE. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Oregon be 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 civilization, and who venerate 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 this matter. I believe in dignifying and protecting labor. I believe in legislation in behalf of our American citizens and laborers for reasons before stated, and because in our form of government, where wealth, or large brain, or trained intellect commands ultimately almost any power, it is necessary to legislate in behalf of the weaker brain or the uneducated mind, or the intelligent but poor citizen 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 the intelligence, independence, and virtue of the mass of our people, and to preserve that proper equilibrium between the various elements and interests in our land. It has been the policy of our Government for years in her tariff regulation to endeavor so 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 legislation we have placed restrictions upon the entry of the products of cheap foreign pauper labor; 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 you 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 fairer 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 importation 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, excepting some in the larger cities, have heretofore made a living, such as it has been, despite the Mongolian, but let there be an inundation of Chinese upon any of your eastern cities as we have had in the cities of the West, and there will be just two things for your poorer classes to do, either to retreat before the Mongolian or starve. It is simply a question of cold mathematics.

But you say you are in no danger. Ah! 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 Empire of China. And indeed they can 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. These Chinese companies are, however, closely watching events, flooding our desks 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 observations on this question have extended, and now remembering the past and looking the future earnestly in the face, I announce my firm conviction that there is an irrepressible conflict that must continue until one system prevails. Paganism, with cheap, ignorant, servile labor, and civilization, with intelligent, fairly-remunerated, and free labor, are so radically different, are so diametrically opposed to each other, that such portions of our country and our coast where they meet must either become Mongolian or American. Which does 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 in the past, and now the yellow race demands our attention, coupled, as it is, with the labor problem, and interwoven with questions affecting our civilization, our religion, and our Government.

No careful, reflecting mind can dismiss this grave question with the ill-applied boast that America is the land of refuge of all people from all countries. There is reason in everything and true and false applications of all principles. I know the downtrodden of all lands who desire to lay here broad and deep the foundations of human liberty, and the blessings of the most perfect of human governments, where may be realized the full strength and highest cultivation of human intellect, and who hope for the attainment of the great triumph of civil and religious liberty, 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 right. We are the custodians of America. On us rests the responsibility of so ruling and so guiding our Government as to preserve its blessings for us and those we think safe to invite to our shores, our homes, and our power. By all the principles of the law of nations every country has a right to protect itself and to refuse admission to any if an evident danger or manifest injury is a probable result. 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 imprison one of its members for the public welfare, much more may it exclude, if necessary, for the same reasons, those of a foreign shore. We as individual Americans have the right to protect our own homes and our own households from dangerous intrusion; so have we to protect our great American home. Let us hear no more of misapplied governmental principles or national boasts, for there is no room or proper place for sentimentality in the 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 in the balance against the flesh and 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 inundations of capital-owned foreign labor. There we have met what the lamented Garfield said was "too much like an importation to be welcomed without restriction and too much like an invasion to be looked upon without solicitude." That great, noble-hearted, patriotic, good man was not misled by name or false applications of principles as I fear others have been.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that civilization began its growth and course ages hence in distant and ancient Asia—wended its way through and over Europe and westward to America and now sits enthroned on the distant Pacific as elsewhere in this broad grand land of ours. But from that same old moss-grown Asia, wedded to and fossilized in her superstitions and her idolatries of the past, now rolls eastward her worst elements of paganism and barbarism and the clash of the conflict is resounding wherever the billows of the Pacific roll upon the sands of America.

History tells us of other nations of wealth and power overrun by less numerous but equally dangerous foes, and we may well pause and reflect.

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

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

Mr. McLANE. I wish the gentleman from Illinois would take some other occasion to make his inquiries than the present.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. I understand——

Mr. McLANE. I do not yield the floor to the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. Then I rise to a question of order. I desire to know, Mr. Speaker, as 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 a member 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 he is entitled to recognition at this time.

Mr. DIBBLE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I believe as a member of the committee that I am entitled to one hour after 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 is going to follow the list.

Mr. McLANE. I hope the Chair will call the gentleman to order so that I may proceed.

Mr. DIBBLE. 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?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that that is not a parliamentary inquiry; and furthermore that the Chair has no list.

Mr. McLANE. I beg the gentleman from Illinois not to interfere with me further. I have said that I would not trespass upon the time of the House but for the turn that this debate has taken. I do not think this discussion actually involves the treaty obligations of the Government, but it has been alleged that it does, and that is a serious question. I do not think the question raised by my eloquent friend from Mississippi, [Mr. HOOKER,] or the honorable gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. TAYLOR,] who represents a somewhat historical district, and who indulged in the same tone of philosophy and argument that the honorable gentleman from Mississippi chose to pursue on yesterday, would have drawn me into this debate. But when I am told that a bill which I regard as full of merit, a bill which in my judgment is designed to protect and defend nine millions of workingmen in this country, is a bill full of iniquity, is a bill which violates the treaty stipulations and sacrifices the honor of the country, I feel that I ought to embrace the opportunity, if permitted, to vindicate the vote I mean to give in the affirmative.

I take it, 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 morality, religion, and knowledge. Not only did our own forefathers in their formation of a system of government base all law and all rule upon these principles, but when as a Congress of the United States we were first called upon to institute a government for the people not embraced within the States, we laid that down as a fundamental principle of all government.

So I do not question at all that, whatever 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 laws of our country. I take it that there is no man in 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 if the honorable gentleman from Mississippi on my left, and the honorable gentleman from Ohio, whom I do not now see in his seat—if they mean us to understand from the abstract declaration that all men are born free and equal that it involves an obligation to receive into our community the people of all the countries in the world without condition and without limitation, that we regard them as born free and equal and entitled to come to us with or without our 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 itself.

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 itself. I do not dream, therefore, that I am called on in this debate to oppose or to reply to a general assumption that the men of Africa and the men of China and the men of India or the men of Europe are free to come here without our permission.

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 of the land, and that was the sentiment of the country from the extreme north to the extreme south. No man in New England, no man upon the Gulf coast, ever desired to naturalize as a citizen of the United States any but white men, until in the course of time we 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 that the emancipation by war was not a legal emancipation. That sword which crushed out the rebellion wrote in the fundamental law of the country the freedom of the black man. And being free North and South, the statesmen of this country recognized that he had to be a voter. On that question there was no difference of opinion. Go to the Legislatures of the Southern States and the conventions that formed or reorganized the State constitutions and you will find no hesitation in the minds of southern men any more than in the minds of northern men that that problem having been solved by war, the colored men of the country should have the rights, civil and political, of the white man.

But, Mr. Speaker, is it any reason because this great war necessity was imposed upon the country that we should go forward voluuntarily with all the experience of the past and impose upon the country another such necessity? Nor is it any reproach to the statesmen of this country that thirty years ago they thought the Chinaman would be a good citizen? When we acquired California, men for the first time in the history of this country occupied themselves with the question of Chinese colonization. That distant empire, California, a country acquired as an indemnity by our war with Mexico; not peopled, difficult to defend, fabulous, almost romantic in its history; untold millions supposed to be on the very surface of the earth; no communication with it except by a long voyage by the Horn; impossible to defend, it excited our interest and anxiety; a great country like England, angry and jealous and resentful that we had acquired it, watching our every step; a British fleet sent to the Gulf of Mexico and to San Juan, in Nicaragua, hoisting the British flag at San Juan, placing on a miserable throne a half-fed and half-clothed Indian and proclaiming him to be the Mosquito king; harassing us in Texas with the British minister opposing annexation; menacing us in every quarter of the globe with hostility, naturally stimulated our anxiety, and excited the country to look for and encourage any population for the Pacific coast. Under those circumstances, for the first time in the history of our diplomacy, you will find instructions from the State Department to negotiate for Chinese immigration.

What rights had we in China then? Permission to land at five points on the coast, and to have residences where the Chinese Government chose to give us residences, and they gave the residences outside of their cities; permission to anchor our ships at the mouths of their rivers and send up in junks 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 took 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; our public ministers received in warehouses outside of the cities if received at all, and most generally not received at all. A distinguished citizen from the State of my honorable friend before me, [Mr. CARLISLE,] Humphrey Marshall, of Kentucky, was sent to China by Mr. Fillmore, and for months he remained at the gates of Canton asking admission to present his letter of credence, and was told from time to time—and I have all the dispatches at my hand if it were necessary to refer to them—that the imperial commissioner had not time to receive the letter; that there was nothing material to be attended to; that when there was he 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 present his letter. And he went on his way from port to port to find some man who would receive his letter. There was no intention to insult us seriously, but an aversion, an absolute aversion to hold intercourse with us. Non-intercourse and non-resistance, too; astute as astute can be, but trifling withal, childish withal.

Need I say, Mr. Speaker, that this treatment extended to the American minister was also extended to the British minister time and again? Look at their dispatches. Why, sir, I have in my hand the very documents written by these imperial commissioners to the Emperor of China, with the vermillion penciling on their communications, saying, "well done, faithful servants; keep out the foreign devils even unto the end, spies, vicious, wicked men as they are; 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."

Why, Mr. Speaker, let me say it, no intercourse 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 China on the part of our citizens.

Never was there an American citizen allowed to go to China at all, until he went under the protection of British cannon. No American minister could ever make a treaty with China that was not made under the protection of British cannon. That is not extravagant language. I would tell my honorable friend from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] if he was here, that that was literally truth.

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. What was that anecdote, for the gentleman did not tell it all? We had tried throughout the whole summer, and for years before, to obtain an opportunity to present the credentials of our minister. We had gone from viceroy to viceroy. We had been received, but received at the hazard of our personal dignity, and personal safety too. No American minister ever went into a Chinese city that he did not incur danger, even under the guard of Chinamen and under the guard of American soldiers and sailors, side by side with the Chinese officials. And yet he would be spit upon, literally spit upon by the Chinese officials and the Chinese people. And that is not much changed now.

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 organized by the British mission the American mission could 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 up to the day that Mr. Burlingame went to China.

Mr. MILLS. 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 three successive summers, the American minister and the British minister had sought the poor privilege to present their letters of credence, and to be received as one gentleman might be received by another; and they had failed. They had gone from viceroy to viceroy, until at last they got to the gates of Peking. Finally, there at the gates of Peking, they were delayed until the snow and the ice of winter overtook them. Then they were invited, in terms as polite as it would be possible for my honorable friend from Mississippi to use, to go back to Canton, to go back to the point from which they started, and that once there they might make known their wishes, and that if they 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 procedure—"would send word to his 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, had been neglected, and that communication was absolutely impossible between the British officials and the Chineses 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 criticise the action of either of the tw governments. I am only leading up to my anecdote about Tatnall. The two governments took very different views. Great Britain ordered out a fleet to China, and she sent an invitation to Washington and to Paris, inviting the French and American Governments to send out fleets also. The French Government accepted the invitation and sent a fleet.

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 diplomacy by force; but that 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 fleet followed along, brought up the rear, 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 sued for peace.

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 who 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 carried his steamer into the Chinese bay and rescued the admiral of the British navy by towing up to him the ships he could not otherwise reach.

That was the anecdote connected with Tatnall. Thus instructed to observe, he could not 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 remain in the distance. He gave his moral support. Urged as far as politeness would permit by his French and English associates to do more, but held down by his instructions, he stood back silent until the French and British treaties were signed.

Then he made a treaty which I hold under my hand. It was the first treaty under which any American could go into the interior of China. And he can do that, because we have in our American treaty 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 after 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.

Now, 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 come that near the throne,) I asked him what interest France had in this that she separated herself from the United States. He said: "Well, we have some poor Christians there to take care of." The privilege to preach was put in for the French, and 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 preaching. The fruit of the trade was stated yesterday by my honorable friend from Mississippi, [Mr. HOOKER.] Look at it; it is in the RECORD this morning. You will find that millions come into this country and very little goes out. Some poor pieces of long cloth; that is all—not much. A little American long cloth, being better than English muslin, goes into China. And to this may be added those trade-dollars that the honorable gentleman from Mississippi talked of yesterday; and when this trade-dollar does not suffice we send the wheat of our western country that goes to London; and the American merchant draws a bill on London. It is the grain of the West that goes to London and pays for the teas we get from China. We send nothing worth speaking of into China. Considering the trade of China with this country, our great importations of the teas, the silks, and other products of China, the export trade we send in return is insignificant. As I have said, we have little or no intercourse, when compared with our great and growing commercial intercourse with the rest of the world.

That was the state of things until we made the Burlingame treaty; and, having told you the Tatnall anecdote, I hope my friend from Texas [Mr. MILLS] will agree I am at liberty to speak of the Burlingame treaty; but my friend from Georgia, [Mr. HAMMOND,] who sits beside me, says he would like me to tell you the fruit there has been from the preaching. Mr. Speaker, somewhere about 1848 a Chinese scholar obtained a copy of the Bible from an American missionary in Canton. Infinite pains had been taken for ten years prior to this time to get the Bible into China, but it was impossible. As I have said, no American was allowed to go into the country at all. If he went even within one of the cities of the five ports, his life was in danger. Read the beautiful narrative of Abbé Huc, who went with the cross, that was so much talked about yesterday, to the very mountains of Thibet, and learn how he had to disguise himself as a Chinaman and to pass off the Roman Catholic chapels as Confucian or Buddhist chapels to save the lives of the missionary priests and the few Chinamen who chose to listen to him. But if you do not want to take the pains to go through that narrative, take the executive volumes of this Government and learn from them that no man could go out of the foreign settlement into a Chinese city; that any American merchant or missionary doing so did it at the peril of his life. So that until by an accident the Bible never got into China at all. This accident was that one of the missionaries gave a Chinese translation of the Bible to a Chinese scholar.

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 mountains of Thibet, at the headwaters of a river 1,500 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 ever studied it. He studied it till he knew it word by word; for 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 gave to that Chinese scholar this copy of the Bible, and could tell some very interesting anecdotes of him. He was one of the cleverest men we 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 has sent me to preach this Gospel to you; I am his second son; Jesus Christ is my elder brother, and has commissioned me to gather you together if you believe, and to exterminate you if you do not believe." He had read the books of Moses to some purpose. [Laughter.]

Thus preaching, he was naturally interfered with by the police The distance between the poor miserable Chinamen to whom he preached and the official governing class is almost inconceivable to a man educated in this country. This immense gulf between the governing class and the masses is the great characteristic of Chinese civilization. When my honorable friend from Mississippi talked of 460,000,000 Chinamen, he ought to have told you that the mass of these are in a state of abject poverty and submissive slavery 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 resentful and vicious as any oppressed people in any country.

What there is of commendation for them in that statement I am as free to make as the honorable gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. TAYLOR,] who spoke of their industry and their love of liberty; and this preacher, this custodian of the Bible, attacked by the police, defended himself, and the crowds came to him, and he overthrew the authorities in his native village, and set up the Christian banner; and he marched from that point over 1,500 miles, and when I met him he was at the head of 100,000 men, and he was in possession of the ancient capital of China, the city of Nankin.

And I took with me, when I went to see him, the missionaries of my own country and England too. The whole American and English population were alive at that time with this new revolution. I remember the Bishop of Victoria told me, when he asked to take a missionary in the ship, "Sir, that Bible has at last reached the interior of China." And now, mark his language, because in the course of my narrative I shall give you a wonderful similarity to it in the language of the Chinese chief himself. Said he: "That Bible when it reaches no matter whose hands, and no matter where, will do its

own work. We have no fear now for China, now that I know the Bible is in the interior of the country and in the hands of Chinamen."

Sympathizing with him fully and hopefully I invited him to send the best man he had, and I took with me the senior of the Presbyterian Church, a noted missionary, and I took with me a young fellow of infinite genius and talent that I had known at West Point, of the name of Culberson, and several others of lower degree. And we all went together to Nankin. And what did we find? Why, we found this 100,000 men and women in the lowest and most bestial condition. Our missionaries were received politely. We saw the Bible and the tracts, and the tracts were almost infinite in number and they were all true and literal transcripts and narratives from the Bible. There was no evasion of it, not the least. There stood the younger brother of Christ, and at his side stood his prime minister whom he introduced to us as the Holy Ghost, the Comforter. And day by day he gave the law to these 100,000 people upon the minutest matters of municipal and domestic control.

And two things resulted. The missionaries came back not only disgusted and revolted, not only humiliated and in wonder that such results could flow from these missionary efforts, but they came back baffled, intellectually speaking. They contended with these people, and now, to appreciate my narrative, see where the trouble was. This was not only a pagan people, but it was a material people. It was a people without imagination, without spirituality. It had plenty of intellect, it had beautiful physical proportions, but it was without imagination, it was purely and simply material; and two things appeare . Not only it had materialized our holy religion, but it had brough down, as they said in their phrase, a personal god; and there were the missionaries baffled. Said the chief:

You, like ourselves, know our god is but a personal god, that each man has to have a personal knowledge of him, and he has not left me in the doubt that he has left you outer barbarians because he has given me his own revelation. Here he is at hand, my eastern king, the comforter, and he will enlighten you outer barbarians.

These were the American and English Christians.

You outer barbarians, go home and study that book—it is your book, and it is our book—go home and study it and pray to God to enlighten you. And when you have, on your knees, prayed to God to enlighten you, you will return and fall on your knees and worship the eastern king, my prime minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, right in that connection let me say that was all taken down, and is in the archives of the State Department—every word of it. These missionaries made their official report. There they are to-day. Mr. Burlingame had access to them, and so had Mr. Reed. And Mr. Reed discovered when Canton was captured by the English, the very reports of their ministers themselves rendering their accounts of the American and British ministers. All that is in our archives. We are not left to any speculation.

What occurred? Not only were these missionaries baffled in their hope and in their expectation that this Christianity of ours had found its way into China, but they came back loathing the people with whom they had intercourse.

And decent language cannot describe their life. Men and women, all laborers, all living in common, all carrying loads of wheat and corn and rice on their backs, the women kicked by the men if they lagged behind, and this very comforter I have spoken of, this very eastern king in one of his decrees from heaven, brought back by our missionaries and now on file in your Department of State, explained how wrong it was to kick women who were bearing these sacks of wheat and sacks of corn, and who under the dispensation of God had heavier burdens still to carry.

For them, women were of no account except to carry bags of wheat and corn; for in their bestiality they could live without them as well as with them. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the history of the Chinese laborer to-day. Those 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 that are reciprocal with the Americans that are allowed to go to China.

Men can come here to trade or to travel or to teach, and our citizens can go to trade or travel or to preach, but not to occupy 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; and now there is a pressing necessity to deal with that very 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 colored people in a perfect equality of all their political and civil rights. But if we were at the beginning, if we were where we were at the time that the English brought the African to this country, at the time when our fathers protested and remonstrated, and in spite of their remonstrances, 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 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 slavery to be introduced, and we find a question to-day in California equally demanding our attention.

The honorable gentleman from Mississippi read the evidence of the Six Companies, perjured wretches that they are! No man believes the Chinaman on oath. He (the Chinaman) despises the oath when he takes it, and would not be bound by it. He would not have lied that way in a court of justice in China. It would have been more than his life was worth. He would not dare to have violated his word there. This is a matter of fact. It has been shown since the Burlingame treaty went into effect that those laborers 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 old negro jail or a barracoon waiting to be shipped to this country. 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, without question. And you will not be surprised, Mr. Speaker, that they put these laborers in jail simply because it is the readiest mode of sending them to America.

That is the way laborers come to this country, and yet the Burlingame treaty forbids involuntary emigration. It is the cooly trade itself. That is the trade, vile as it is, that this bill, as I understand it, strikes at.

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 limiting this immigration. I know that more than one honorable gentleman here, who has already spoken on this bill, thinks we have no right to suspend this immigration for twenty years.

Why, when Mr. Trescot, Mr. Angel, and Mr. Swift negotiated this treaty, they communicated 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; and they say distinctly 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 about it. But the American minister said to the Chinese minister that nothing short of the right to suspend would satisfy the United States.

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 this 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 understand what "reasonable" fares meant, and that 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 how long I shall suspend this immigration, you present a question that may be regarded differently by different individuals, and as between nations no tribunal can adjudicate, each being sovereign judge of its own discretion. Now I hope my friend from Massachusetts will bear with me.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I certainly have no desire 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 nations and that is a matter which cannot be adjudicated like 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 exercise of discretion left to the United States it can bring the matter to the attention of the United States Government and make it the subject for negotiation.

I do not wish to consume time or repeat my argument, but I beg the House to observe that when you come to talk about a reasonable rate, a reasonable fare, or a reasonable time, as between two men, why there is an arbiter, there is a court, there is a tribunal that can settle it between them. If you and I have a contract and I have a right to do something that is reasonable, and I am unreasonable in your opinion, why you can go to the courts of the country and the courts of the country will arbitrate between us and see whether I am reasonable or not. But as between nations there is no tribunal but the conscience of the nation.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. 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. HUBBELL. 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 if it means nothing. 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 does, why was not the word "prohibition" put there; because if you may suspend without regard to limit then you may absolutely prohibit, which the treaty says you cannot do. And further, in that conversation between the commissioners to which the gentleman has referred, he will notice the Chinese commissioners in interpreting the meaning and extent of the word "suspend" say they think it might be endured perhaps for one, two, three, or five years, and they ask our commissioners what they may expect will be the character of the legislation of the United States; and our commissioners—and I ask you to look at it there—our commissioners say the Chinese Government can well trust the good faith of the United States to legislate reasonably on this matter.

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 do the point 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 smarting under the presence of the Chinese in this country. They had already 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 State of California perfectly inconsistent with the Constitution 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 ministers 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 conceded.

Now, my friend from Massachusetts will observe that when the Chinaman in this negotiation concedes the right to suspend, he stipulates for his remedy. He knew very well that when he submitted 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 can show what were the exigencies, general or local, which induced us to suspend immigration for a greater or a 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. China could very well have said, "You may be very unreasonable, and if you are, why then we must have an arbitrator; Great Britain, or France, or some other friendly power, must judge between us." But no, China stipulated for no such arbitration. She chose to leave it absolutely to our discretion. But she did provide that if we exercised that discretion unreasonably, according to her judgment, then she had a right to take us to task, if you please to use that word.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. Then, under the treaty, the gentleman understands "suspends" as being equal to "terminate?"

Mr. McLANE. No, sir; I do not. I believe that "suspend" under the treaty means precisely what "suspend" means everywhere else; that it means to suspend for a time. And I submit now, in reply to the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts, whose astuteness I appreciate, how can he distinguish between suspending for five years, if in my discretion I choose to suspend for five years, and my suspending for twenty years? The Chinaman may think it just as unreasonable to suspend for five years as he thinks it is unreasonable to suspend for twenty years. He gave himself away, and he had to give himself away.

I wish to conclude what I have to say upon this bill by the further statement that it is your duty, gentlemen of the House of Representatives, it is the duty of this Congress, which is the only power on earth which can relieve the people of this country when they are oppressed by a treaty, to relieve the people of California from this great evil. It is California that is suffering, and she cannot relieve herself, and our treaty contemplates the local grievance as it does the general grievance, and, treaty or no treaty, it is the duty of this Congress to give the people relief and remedy.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Maryland says the Chinaman gave himself away. I suppose he gave himself away to a Christian nation that wanted to carry that Bible into the heart of China to make the Chinese people Christians. He trusted the American nation to interpret reasonably, according to the doctrine of common sense and justice.

Mr. McLANE. He thought a Christian nation was a dog of a nation. That was the estimation in which he held us; but we all the same should, and I have no doubt will, do justice not alone to China but to our ourselves.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. And does my friend want him to find it as mean a dog as possible?

Mr. McLANE. No, sir; and there is nothing in the case to justify such a conclusion. When he gave himself away to this country he was astute enough to know, as I have said before, that he had reserved every right and remedy necessary to defend his treaty right and obligation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KASSON. I desire that the gentleman be allowed to finish his sentence.

Mr. McLANE. I only wish to complete my reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HAMMOND, of Georgia. I ask that the gentleman be allowed ten minutes more time.

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

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' additional time. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. McLANE. I want the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBINSON] to understand that when this Chinese negotiator 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 well 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. It was fully our right to abrogate it, and it would have been our duty to abrogate it.

Astute and intelligent statesman as the imperial commissioner was, he understood perfectly well that he would gain most by giving us the right to suspend, and reserving to himself the right to protest and to negotiate. And he has that right, and I have no doubt he will exercise it. I have no doubt at all that if he thinks himself in any way injured he will write to the Secretary of State and remonstrate. And the Secretary of State will find it his duty, if he cannot satisfy China that we have exercised our discretion reasonably and wisely, to communicate the information to Congress, and if need be, in the last resort, he will have to come to this Congress and tell us that we ought to abrogate that treaty and relieve our people not only on the Pacific coast but everywhere else from a population that we do not want to receive, and which by a fair construction of the Burlingame treaty we were under no obligation to receive and which we will not receive, treaty or no treaty!

I have not yet heard a man on this floor say that he wants to receive the Chinamen as citizens of the United States; not one. The gentleman from Mississippi, who made a most eloquent and exhaustive opposition to this bill, concluded by expressing a desire to vote for it if the limitation was made for ten years. And the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLOR] who started the original opposition to the bill concluded his speech by saying that he deplored Chinese immigration. No man has yet expressed, and in my judgment no man ever will express, a desire or a willingness to receive these Chinamen as citizens of this country. [Applause.]

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they 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 terms of the district and circuit courts in the northern district of New York.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. KASSON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, after a careful reading of this bill, I prepared some amendments which have been printed, and which in my judgment, if adopted, would make this bill infinitely more acceptable to the average judgment of this House and of the country. Those amendments have been printed in connection with this bill, and I propose as briefly as possible to state to the House the objects sought to be accomplished by them. I shall afterward have something to say in answer to what we have just listened to from the gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. McLANE.]

What, then, is the bill which we take from the Speaker's table, the Senate bill, and upon which our votes are to be given, and which

it is demanded of us to pass in its entirety? The first section suspends 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 every frontier of the United States approached by water. It punishes the violation of its provisions by a fine not exceeding $500 and imprisonment for not more than one year.

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, or who may have come within the United States before the expiration of ninety days from the passage of this act. It also provides that it shall not apply to any vessel putting into a port in distress or under stress of weather. But it makes no provision for a foreign or domestic vessel touching at one of our ports in the prosecution of her voyage.

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 them certain duties at the office of the collector of the port from which they leave, and before their return it requires a *visé* 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 sundry other regulations before they can enjoy the privileges which the treaty says they shall have. And they are to be described and identified by offensive requirements.

The sixth section is of somewhat doubtful construction, owing to the language. It covers all entitled under the terms of this act to the privilege of entering and residing in the United States. And it covers all classes of Chinese, 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 similar objections.

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 Chinese passengers as he does of cargoes, and inflicts punishment for his failure or refusal to do so.

The other provisions it is not perhaps necessary to rehearse, except to say that every person who shall aid or abet 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 is to be expelled to the place whence he came at the expense of the United States. This, then, is the general character of the bill before us. I have two objections to the bill. One is that it is hostile to the civilization of the United States, hostile to the traditions of our Government and people, hostile to our system hitherto of dealing with all foreigners, and that it sounds like that language of two thousand years ago when "a decree went out from Augustus Cæsar that all the [Hebrew] world should be taxed."

The other objection is that it goes beyond the intentions and language of the treaty which it proposes to execute, and is needlessly cumbrous and harsh.

Certainly it is possible to pass a bill that shall answer all the just demands of the people of California and the Pacific coast without doing violence to the judgment and conscience of the people in other parts of the country. There is on the Pacific coast an admitted danger to our existing system of labor. There is an admitted justifiable expectation on the part of the people of the Pacific coast that something shall be done to relieve them from what is regarded by them as a danger to their social organization. Pledges have practically been made that they shall have this relief. Governmental action has been taken in that direction. The executive government of the United States has initiated and completed a new treaty with the Chinese Empire to give effect to that just demand of the people on the Pacific coast. Now, with power under the treaty to do a certain act, with the occasion for the exercise of that power admitted, is there no middle ground on which we can all stand that shall be in harmony with the previous history of our country and with the judgment and conscience of both sides of this House?

Sir, with no small delight I have listened to some of my friends of both parties on this floor who have debated this question in the light of American history and of American humanity. When such men as the gallant member from Mississippi, [Mr. HOOKER,] the honored member from Massachusetts, [Mr. RICE,] and that other honored member, [Mr. TAYLOR,] the successor of Garfield, from Ohio, take common ground in recognition of fundamental principle, nay, more, of fundamental sentiment dominant in the people of this country, and appeal to this House to respect it in this legislation, it is time for both sides of this House and for the friends of the bill themselves to pause and ask whether they ought not to modify the bill so as to secure the moral strength of the House and country which goes only to fair, reasonable, and human measures.

I venture to affirm that four-fifths of this House will unite in granting reasonable relief if the friends of this bill will accept reasonable relief and not force us into the position of violating our principles, our conscience, and our duty under the treaty. To be sure, sir, no one rises in his place here and says, "let us accomplish our object and violate the treaty if it is necessary to do so." Nobody says that; but, as suggested by my honored friend from Maryland, [Mr. MCLANE,] there is a manifest disposition to take advantage of the confidence the Chinese Government has reposed in our justice and fairness. Sir, the most absolute good faith is merited by China by reason of China's action heretofore in respect to the very subject under discussion. I wish not to live long enough to see the time when China or any other government on the face of the globe shall revive the memory of the Carthagenians of old and instead of "punic faith" characterize the reckless disregard of treaties as "American faith." Sooner, much sooner, would I act decidedly and fair within the power given to us by the treaty than I would tread one hair's breadth beyond a just construction of its terms.

Now, the object to be accomplished (and it is admitted by the treaty to be just) is to limit, regulate, or suspend reasonably the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States. The treaty provides expressly that we shall not exclude any class but "Chinese laborers." These are the words:

> The limitation or suspension shall be reasonable, and shall apply only to Chinese who may go to the United States as laborers, other classes not being included in the limitation. Legislation taken in regard to Chinese laborers shall be of such a character only as is necessary to enforce the regulation, limitation, or suspension of immigration; and immigrants shall not be subject to personal maltreatment or abuse.

There is an illustration of the spirit of the treaty; and by the second article all others are to be allowed to go and come at their free will. The language is:

> Chinese subjects, whether proceeding to the United States as teachers, students, merchants, or from curiosity, together with their body and household servants, * * * shall be allowed to go and come of their own free will and accord, and shall be accorded all the rights, privilges, immunities, and exemptions which are accorded to the citizens and subjects of the 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 "laborers," and who the treaty itself says shall not be interfered with, but shall 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 certification to be made, that they have permission of the Chinese Government, and shall state their "physical peculiarities," who their fathers were, where they lived, &c., facts far beyond anything known in the passport of any civilized country on the face of the earth. This is wrong, this is unjust; it is not within the treaty with China.

It is well settled that we cannot without the consent of China make, by our separate legislation, new conditions upon the enjoyment of the rights secured by the treaty to Chinese subjects. On that point I quote the following:

> In dispatch No. 110, March 3, 1876, Mr. Fish says: "This involves the question whether one of the parties to a treaty can change and alter its terms or construction, or attach new conditions to its execution, without the assent of the other; whether an act of Parliament passed in 1870 can change the spirit or terms of a treaty with the United States of nearly thirty years' anterior date." "This government does not recognize any efficacy in a British statute to alter, or modify, or attach new conditions to the executory parts of an existing treaty."
>
> Mr. Fish, in support of his views, quotes Lord Stanley, her Britannic majesty's secretary of state for foreign affairs, as saying that "international courtesy demanded that a treaty should not be materially altered without communication with the other party." In the same debate Lord Cairns, then attorney-general, speaking of proposed legislation with reference to a treaty with France, said: "It proposes to introduce a new ingredient into the bargain, which did not exist at the time the bargain was made, and to introduce it now is simply to break the bargain which the sovereigns had made and Parliament ratified;" and "to put such words into an act of Parliament which did not exist in the treaty would only be offering a gratuitous insult to the foreign power to whom it applied without securing any advantage."
>
> In his dispatch of May 22, Mr. Fish says: "The United States adheres to the position announced in my former instruction, that it will recognize no power to alter or attach conditions to an existing treaty without its previous consent;" and he declares in the same dispatch the binding obligation of treaty provisions "upon all courts, both State and national;" and, further, "while the treaty shall be in force the Government of the United States would be strangely forgetful of the dignity and rights of the country if a foreign state were permitted to exact stipulations or engagements pursuant to her law, but foreign to the treaty, as a condition of obtaining the performance of treaty stipulations."

I propose therefore to amend that part of the bill by substituting for the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh sections, containing cast-iron requirements with reference both to laborers and non-laborers who may come to or reside in this country, the provision which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 4. That in order to secure the rights of the Chinese laborers mentioned in section 3 of this act, and further to faithfully execute the provisions of the treaty between the United States and the Empire of China, ratified July 19, 1881, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States, after consultation with the Government of China, to prescribe the rules and regulations which may be necessary and convenient to secure the identification of Chinese subjects residing in or proceeding to the United States, according to their classes and rights as provided respectively in articles 1 and 2 of the said treaty. After the promulgation of such regulations any Chinese subject refusing or neglecting to conform thereto shall be regarded as not entitled to the rights and privileges prescribed by articles 1 and 2 of the treaty aforesaid until he shall comply therewith.

Mr. KASSON. Now, Mr. Speaker, the subsequent amendments proposed are chiefly confined to harmonizing the existing provisions with that change in respect to rules and regulations, my object being

to make it the duty of the executive department of the United States to carry out under our laws and in unison with them the provisions 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 complaint and answer and good reasons.

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 tax very heavily 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 you to fine any citizen of the United States who, from charity or from necessity, may have taken across the Canadian or other frontier into the United States some poor young Chinaman to relieve his wife from household work in his home. I doubt whether "aiding" or "abetting" a single Chinese laborer to come into New York, New England, or Louisiana, is not disproportionately and excessively punished by the enactments of this bill. It reminds many of us born in the northern part of the country of the time when penalties and imprisonment were imposed upon the man who took care of a poor fugitive slave from the South on his way to a free country, or harbored him for the night or gave him bread by day.

I do not like (and I say it frankly) these features of the bill. I want, if possible, to accomplish the result aimed at without them. I wish it were in the hands of a committee who could so trim the bill as to accomplish what the treaty calls for and what the rest of us desire to be accomplished, the prevention of masses of these men coming in such numbers as to overthrow our system of labor or endanger the peace of communities. At the same time I should be glad if this poor miserable pursuit of one Chinaman crossing the frontier or stepping off a ship in order to see a town, might be stopped; that he might not be pursued by the police, hazed into prison, and robbed of $100. My soul revolts at that sort of individual persecution of an ignorant foreigner coming to this country, unable to speak our language, and not knowing our institutions and laws. This is one of the most vulgar forms of barbarism.

Mr. HAMMOND, of Georgia. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. KASSON. Certainly.

Mr. HAMMOND, of Georgia. Is it not true that in many Northern States, notably Indiana, up to the passage of the fourteenth amendment, it was a crime for any free negro to go into those States?

Mr. KASSON. Yes, sir; and I do not want to go back to that infamous system of legislation. [Applause on the Republican side.] Does the gentleman?

Mr. HAMMOND, of Georgia. No; I do not wish to go back to it, but I wanted to point out the hypocrisy of your party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KASSON. Call it what you please, it was as mean as you can make it to refuse to feed or take care of these poor people, whether North or South. I admit its meanness, and you can have no issue with me on that subject.

Mr. COBB. I will state to the gentleman that the last time Indiana was heard from on that subject it gave ninety thousand in its favor. It must have been pretty bad. [Laughter.]

Mr. KASSON. Those who heard that remark tell me that was under Democratic rule and before the Republicans took possession of the State. [Applause on the Republican side.] Our party wiped everything of that kind from the statute-book.

To proceed. What I greatly desire is precisely what I have attempted to state, to stop masses of these men coming and changing our system of labor and interfering with the peace of communities, leaving alone the individual stray Chinaman who may come over our border and remain by the desire of some citizen of America to relieve the burdens of his family or afford him needed help.

I ought to say perhaps that I am not so absolutely ignorant of the character of this labor and the troubles in California as might be supposed, from the fact that I reside near the Mississippi River. On two occasions of prolonged visits in California I have learned what I could of this subject, and have tried to discover what was the evil of this Chinese immigration. At the sime time I walked into the Bank of California and I saw behind the counter in a responsible position, as cashier or book-keeper, I forget which, a Chinaman, with his long pig-tail hanging down his back, respected by the president and all the officers of the bank and intrusted with their fullest confidence, as they have long enjoyed that of the American merchants in China. I did not see danger to the peace of my country or the organization of society in that case.

I passed to another quarter of the city and saw great crowds or masses of these people herding together, disassociated from all the rest of the community as far as possible, and separated from the American civilization. I thought that was wrong and dangerous. But the gentleman from Mississippi told us yesterday that it is in harmony at least with the spirit of the laws of California which requires them practically to herd together, and he quoted the law.

However that may be, sir, I return to my theme, which is that we want a bill which shall not operate harshly upon individual American citizens, or upon an individual stray 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 we are not required or permitted to do under the very language 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 California 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.

In this bill, which is entitled "A bill to execute certain treaty stipulations" with the Chinese Government, I find at the very close of the bill a clause regulating naturalization in the United States. What has that to do with the enforcement of the treaty stipulations? The treaties have nothing to say about it. It is entirely out of place. I am one of those, sir, who believe that a judge of a court of the United States has no authority, has no right under existing law, to naturalize such a Chinaman as is portrayed by the friends of this bill. Under the present law he cannot do it. The law requires proof of attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States. It requires a proof of residence for five years. It requires good moral character. How many Chinamen can be admitted under the naturalization laws of the country in view of the testimony which has been adduced against them during this discussion?

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 apportionment of Representatives?

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, and remit it to my friend in charge of the bill when he makes 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 point toward a violation of the letter or spirit of our treaties. I ask 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 undoubtedly 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, [Mr. McLANE,] who spoke this morning. I ask the Clerk 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 the Ta-Tsing Empire, concluded June 18, 1858.

ARTICLE I. There shall be, as there have always been, peace and friendship between the United States of America and the Ta-Tsing Empire, and between their people, respectively. They shall not insult or oppress each other for any trifling cause, so as to produce an estrangement between them; and if any other nation should act unjustly or oppressively, the United States will exert their good offices, on being informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement of the question, thus showing their friendly feelings.

Mr. KASSON. I will ask to 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 civilized 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 most Christian sentiments, are expressed in reference to their relations to the United States. I refer to article 11.

All citizens of the United States of America in China peaceably attending to their affairs, being placed upon a common footing of amity and good-will with the subjects of China, shall receive and enjoy for themselves and everything appertaining to them the protection of the local authorities of government, who shall defend them from all insult or injury of any sort. If their dwellings or property be threatened or attacked by mobs, incendiaries, or other violent or lawless persons, the local officers, on requisition of the consul, shall immediately dispatch a military force to disperse the rioters, apprehend the guilty individuals, and punish them with the utmost rigor of the law.

We all know how they received Mr. Burlingame, and afterward made him one of their own embassadors. More recently, when a distinguished citizen of the United States was traveling in China at a time when war was threatened between China and Japan, the confidence of China was still further expressed in this country and people, as shown by the fact that they requested the intervention of that distinguished gentleman [General Grant] to bring about peace between the Chinese Empire and Japan. I care not where you go or where you search in the entire history of our intercourse with China you will find nothing but a strongly expressed desire to

retain the most kindly relations with and confidence in the Government of the United States.

In this very treaty they stipulated not only our rights but add if they should afterward give to any other people or country additional rights they should instantly, without further treaty execution, pass to the citizens and Government of the United States. Always friendly, to-day friendly, they now again yield at our request this great point, which was a request only for the people of the Pacific coast, in its fundamental character, urged by them rather than by the whole country. They yielded to that, and now we are asked, under these circumstances, to stretch their concession to the last point tolerated by an adverse construction of the treaty and given against the interest and feeling of China.

I, sir, am opposed to going to that extent. Our commerce—if you will consider simply our material interests—demands of us to manifest more friendly respect for the Chinese Government. Our commerce has grown since our relations commenced from about twelve or thirteen to thirty-three millions in the last year, and that, too, mark you, Mr. Speaker, at a time when China is only yielding year by year to the demands of civilization and foreign commerce, each succeeding year making it more easy to yield than it was the preceding year. Already is reported the commencement of railroads, which they positively refused a few years ago to be allowed to be built; already building and manning their own steamships, which communicate between open ports and the interior; already opening up from year to year markets for our cotton goods and our hardware and other manufactures. If you will not yield to the principle of justice, fairness, and right, yield then to the demands of your own commercial interest as against your great rivals of the Old World, and be just to China.

Much, sir, has been said about the character of the Chinese. I think much misappprehension has existed. There is a low order of Chinamen who are pagans, (as the whole country has been called here erroneously to-day,) and who are idolaters, and who are not good citizens. I no more deny this than I deny that those white people who went to John Bidwell's plantation in California and murdered five Chinamen were low, bad American citizens. I admit that there is a large class of Chinamen who are not good elements in our population, and ought to be excluded so far as we have the right to exclude them under the powers given to our Government.

But, sir, what is China as a government? What is the China which we know by our treaties? Is that pagan? No, sir. Is it idolatrous? No, sir. The China that we know as a government, embracing a religion whose adherents are estimated at 100,000,000, is without an idol. It adheres to the teachings of Confucius, who before the Christian era announced doctrines which to this day have the respect of the civilized and the Christian world. Every official of China is obliged to pass a civil-service examination, including an examination in that moral code and system known as that of Confucius, before he can enter an office in China. Among those moral principles was that which in another and more perfect form we bind close to our hearts every Sunday. It characterizes the great system of Christianity and was willingly incorporated by China in the twenty-ninth article of the treaty of 1858, where she secures the rights of the Christian religion and missionaries in China, because their faith is to "do unto others as they would have others do unto them." Upon that principle China has stood for nearly 3,000 years, as we have stood upon it for 2,000 years. Let us stand upon it to-day in our legislation touching the rights of a friendly nation.

That Government of China is the government with which we have to deal. After Confucius, who made a prediction that a new and a better religion would come after him into China, and would come from the West, after his period there was introduced into China from India the religion of Buddha, which now embraces over half its population, and which has fallen in successive generations so low that it has become base material idolatry. In its origin it was spiritual, highly moral in tone and character, but has degenerated into the wretched idolatrous exercises of which we hear and read to-day.

While I am on this subject may I, without wearying the House, add one other note from the history given us by the old documents? It was said by Confucius that later there should come further light and more truth, and that it should come from the West—that was about five hundred years before the birth of our Saviour—and the history of China shows that the government sent out commissions in the course of later generations to inquire of the new religions of which they had heard. One of these reported of Buddhism. You read in your New Testament that at the birth of Christ "three wise men came from the East" in search of a new-born King. There is more reason to believe that these wise men came from this much abused empire than from any other people, came in search of this new light and new truth which their great philosopher and teacher, Confucius, had predicted, and of which they were in search during successive generations, as shown by their books of history.

No, sir; it is not a debased empire. Its higher authorities are the peers of European and American statesmen. When you speak of it as a government, it is not a government acting upon low or barbaric principles unworthy of our commendation or respect. There was a famous house of American merchants in Canton at the time of the famous opium war. Ah! do you remember, my colleagues on this floor, when you speak of the comparative "Christianity" of nations, that while China stood with all her worthless armament of battle, but with all her moral power behind it to keep her people from becoming debased and falling into the wretched opium drunkenness which now characterizes the shops of San Francisco, Canton, and other cities; when she sought to prohibit the importation of opium, as temperance men in this country are seeking to prohibit drunkenness from liquors? Your "Christian" nation across the water it was that sent her naval forces to compel China to break down that barrier and admit Indian opium, that the people of that empire might continue in spite of their enlightened government to become beasts, debased at the hand of her "most Christian" majesty's government. At that time, at the close of that war, this American merchant, whose name is known and honored—and I may speak it—Mr. Forbes, handed a memorial to the representative of the imperial government in the province. In that memorial he alluded to the imperfect military system in China, and recommended to that government to send to the United States and obtain twenty, more or less, graduates of West Point, and guns and ammunition and examples of military armament which should better defend the empire and show the way that "Christian" nations made war upon each other, that China might use similar means for her own defense.

The Chinese official indorsed it, referring it to the imperial government at Peking. The answer came in about sixty days, and reads something like this, as was told me by a member of that mercantile house: "The imperial government, knowing the friendship of Mr. Forbes for China, departs from its usual custom of receiving such papers in silence, and not only notifies him that it declines the proposition but gives the reasons why. The memorial proposes to educate this government in the art of war. War is barbarism and belongs to a state of barbarism. China long years ago passed that stage of her existence and has no desire to return to it."

There is your paganism; there is your idolatry; there is your debased country, which has been defamed on this floor! Sir, I appeal to gentlemen here to make the discriminations due from fair-minded men, discriminations not founded on costumes, not founded on the way of wearing the hair, not founded on ignorance of our language, but discriminations based upon better and higher principles and facts than these paltry distinctions.

We have here representatives of that people who are orderly, who are seeking education, who are in responsible places, and who are entitled to respect. On the other hand, you have bad classes who are not entitled to respect, and against whom it is legitimate to legislate. Let us frame our bill in this spirit of accomplishing purposes admitted to be just. Let us be careful that we do not forfeit the friendship of a great empire, to be still greater in the future, when she shall have accepted more and more of the principles of progress that animate us. Let us take care that we do not forfeit that friendship, that we keep within the treaty, and assure that great government of the honesty and good faith of this Government and of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

I now yield ten minutes of my time to the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. LORD.]

Mr. LORD. Mr. Speaker, it is expressed in the title of this bill that it is "to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to the Chinese." The execution of the treaty as contemplated in the bill before us is mainly directed to the following article of the treaty of 1881:

ARTICLE I. Whenever in the opinion of the Government of the United States the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States, or their residence therein, affects or threatens to affect the interests of that country, or to endanger the good order of the said country or of any locality within the territory thereof—the Government of China agrees that the Government of the United States may regulate, limit, or suspend such coming or residence, but may not absolutely prohibit it. The limitation or suspension shall be reasonable and shall apply only to Chinese who may go to the United States as laborers, other classes not being included in the limitations. Legislation taken in regard to Chinese laborers will be of such a character only as is necessary to enforce the regulation, limitation, or suspension of immigration, and immigrants shall not be subject to personal maltreatment or abuse.

I claim that the bill as it stands instead of being true to its title is substantially a bill to abrogate in important respects the treaty to which it refers, as known to be understood by the commissioners who negotiated it on the part of the Chinese.

I certainly maintain, though I shall not attempt to make it formally, that a point of order would lie against the bill for radical defect in title. When the Chinese commissioners refused, as they did, to treat with our own on the basis of prohibition of immigration of their laborers, including skilled laborers to the United States, it is not in the least degree probable, not even supposable, that they would have consented to negotiate upon a proposition to prohibit such immigration for twenty years.

Twenty years covers the whole emigrating period of a man's life. To interdict a man for twenty years in such an interest as this is to interdict him absolutely. To prohibit for twenty years on a subject such as is now before us is to prohibit absolutely one entire generation of men. Twenty years is a long term of years in human affairs. Of those who occupy seats in this House to-day, and who will vote on this bill, not one in twenty of them but will twenty years hence be by the majority of their countrymen—

As much forgotten
As the canoe that crossed a lonely lake
A thousand years ago.

I contend that the bill is contradictory to its title, and contradictory to the treaty.

The treaty stipulates that "the limitation or suspension shall be reasonable," and that no prohibition was contemplated by either party to the conference is assured by the fact that on that basis China refused to confer, and more, the treaty stipulates against it.

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 a suspension. 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 also a suspension.

If an amendment is made to the bill limiting the suspension 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 this continent.

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 that locality, be in some degree obscured even for ten years.

If this bill must be passed, not because the evils to be remedied endanger the nation, but because, as set forth in the preamble, it "endangers the good order of certain localities within the territories thereof," for the sake of arresting an immigration declared to be dangerous to a locality in these United States, I would depart from the eternal principles of rectitude in government only for the briefest time indispensable to an exceptional purpose, to meet an exceptional difficulty in the form of a moral epidemic limited in the area of its influence.

It is, Mr. Speaker, as certain as the advance of time and progressive development in human affairs that if this bill is passed we shall have to retrace our steps as a people to the solid foundation to which I have referred; and if the departure is only for ten years, and better if but for five, we shall find our way back more certainly and with less divergence manifest in the luminous and what should be the unswerving direction of our onward march.

There is much in the bill, and in the theories and arguments of those who favor it, that would invite discussion if time were allotted.

Questions of this kind present themselves: while for forty years and more we have been sending missionaries to China, and at considerable expense translating the Bible, on which we base our civilization, into the Chinese language, should we legislate to exclude our converts, and those whom we would convert, from beneath our Christian flag and from out our promised land? Shall we exclude a Christian Chinese laborer, especially skilled in some department of useful industry, who wishes with wife and children to immigrate to one of our States and open a shop or conduct a manufacturing industry?

If gentlemen shall say that this is supposing an extreme case, then it may be said again that extreme cases illustrate principles, and this bill goes to the extent of the illustration.

While the promoters of this bill charge upon the Chinese laborers that they do not come here to stay, they admit that they press them earnestly to be gone and will scarcely allow them to stand upon the order of their going.

They charge them with providing for the removal of their bodies to China when they shall have died, but neglect to inform us that opposition would cease, if we were permitted to retain perpetual custody of their bones, until the morning of the resurrection.

Their opposers charge upon them that they come without their wives, but omit to state that opposition would cease, or that they would be welcome if they brought their wives and families with them.

They charge that they are cooly laborers, under a form of slavery offensive to our atmosphere so recently made free, and then they construct a bill and ask us to pass it into a law, excluding skilled workers in the arts, as well as honest toilers with the spade or at the loom, who may be as free as any man in the Pacific or Atlantic States.

They are charged with coming here without any design of citizenship and with no intention of assimilation into our national citizenship, and then propose a bill that if passed enacts that "no State court or court of the United States shall admit Chinese to citizenship."

I am disposed, in the consideration of this bill, to go very far to meet the declared necessities of the Pacific States as represented especially by one of their eloquent and able members of this House; and if the bill be so amended as to shorten the time of its prohibition so as to bring it clearly within the intent of the treaty to which it relates and which it is its professed purpose to execute, my present intention is to vote for it. If such amendment is not made I shall await further argument from the friends of the measure before I decide to vote for its final passage as it stands.

Taking a lesson from the early history of the ancient people with whom we treat, the promoters of this bill propose to build a wall about the entire Republic to afford protection to certain "localities within the territory thereof." In that wall the Chinese gate shall, as against the bulk of that nation, be barred for twenty years to begin with.

Lest it might be remotely suspected by the Chinese Government that we were in that way to disclose a breach of faith as to the treaty of 1881, we declare on the contrary that it is our method of good faith; because, while the treaty provides against prohibition, yet prohibition for twenty years means in English only such reasonable limitation and suspension as the treaty stipulates. Then comes the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. RICE,] who spoke in opposition to the bill and gave that kind of faith an old Latin name, *punica fides*, which I fear will be hereafter spelled in Chinese if this bill passes, and by that hitherto trusting people held in abhorrence.

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 he would be justified in voting for it even if it did. Now, if that were a national view of the case I would advise a reference to any good writer who is an authority on international obligations, and see if he does not call it perfidy.

It is not true statesmanship to govern according to the capricious and violent inclinations of any people; and it is better to look to the nature of things than to be guided by the present humors of men whose headlong desires may become their politics only for the time being. Such men, while under such influences and impulses, are not safe as constituents; and legislators should deliberate profoundly on propositions emanating from disturbed and exceptional conditions. These are old maxims which have been repeated over and over again by orators and statesmen during the last two thousand years for the instruction of mankind.

Mr. KASSON. I now yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. ROBINSON.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. There are ten minutes remaining.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I would not wish to take the floor now unless I can have more time than ten minutes.

Mr. PAGE. Then you had better wait until to-morrow, and take the floor in your own time.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. If the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DIBBLE] 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. DIBBLE. 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. There will be no objection to that.

Mr. DIBBLE. With the statement that I am in favor of this bill and will vote for it as it is, I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] thirty minutes of my time, after which I propose to yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. HAWK,] and the remainder of my time to my colleague, [Mr. RICHARDSON.]

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 parallel for the information of 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 or twenty minutes. I cannot pass this opportunity, however, without a brief notice of some of the gentleman's citations.

He referred eloquently to the Scriptures, and said that the boundaries of races were fixed by the divine dictum. This may be true to some extent, Mr. Speaker, but the gentleman has no right to apply it as special pleading to this particular case. It would have been better for his case had he generalized. Many special instances may be cited directly against the proposition 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 for making 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 so; that it is rather an untried experiment. So he runs the parallel between these races, the negro and Mongolian, 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. Of course it is not to be expected that the members of this race will spring at once into the front rank of civilization after this long period, during which they were crowded down with the brand of servitude upon them. Neither is it expected that these Mongolians, having drifted along for a period of many thousands of years in one channel, can spring at once from the peculiarities that have so long environed them and take a front rank in our Anglo-Saxon civilization. But why shall we continue to keep them down by unfriendly legislation? I am as much opposed to the introduction of China as *China* into this country as any man on this floor, but when men from Eastern Asia come here with the avowed intention of becoming part and parcel of us, I am in favor of giving them a fair chance in our unprecedented march of progress.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I before stated, my time is limited, and I will not devote more to these topics.

It will not be expected, after the able discussion of the last few days, that I can materially enlighten the House upon this bill. I shall therefore confine my remarks in the time allotted to me to a statement of my views upon two principal points.

First, the length of the time of suspension of Chinese immigration as expressed in the first section of the bill, to wit:

That from and after the expiration of ninety days next after the passage of this act, and until the expiration of twenty years next after the passage of this act, the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States be, and the same is hereby, suspended; and during such suspension it shall not be lawful for any Chinese laborer to come, or, having so come after the expiration of said ninety days, to remain within the United States.

It is submitted, Mr. Speaker, that the prohibition herein stated is a most remarkable and extraordinary departure from the long, fixed policy of this country upon the subject of immigration, and in my judgment should be at least materially modified. I am opposed on general principles to sudden and radical changes in laws which affect a principle of long standing, and which carry with them the tests of experience and the fixedness of age; not that I would oppose the radical and sudden change of law or precedent that brings evil and danger to the body-politic, but it is a question, a debatable one at least, whether the introduction of Chinese cheap labor, other than by coolies, is an unmitigated evil. Gentlemen of learning and experience in Congress indulge in appeals and learned arguments in advocating the theory of it being a benefit to our country.

Since the commencement of this debate the subject has been discussed with great earnestness from a humanitarian stand-point. Arguments have been presented that the introduction of cheap labor into the country enriches it materially in the aggregate, and that in a philanthropic sense we should not deny the humblest of God's creatures the right to better his condition, especially when the attempt to do so is based upon a desire to render manual service in its accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this being at least debatable ground, and in view as well of it being the opinion of many able and conscientious gentlemen that it is in violation of the spirit, if not indeed of the letter, of treaty stipulations existing between the two nations, would it not be wise to so amend this section that the limitation of the period of suspension referred to be made ten years? It is believed that the accredited representatives of the Chinese Government to this country will not object to the extent of a protest to the passage of a law with a ten-year limitation; and it is reasonable that our commercial relations with that country will not be so likely to be unfavorably affected by such limited restriction as by that of twenty years.

And when the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCKER] speaks of members on this side of the Hall fixing the limit in an arbitrary manner, I desire to answer that this bill also fixes the limit in an arbitrary manner; and why may we not, after due consideration, reasonably reduce the period which the bill indicates as proper?

The most to be apprehended from the radical change proposed by this section of the bill is, that should it become a law it may raise the clamor that, having prohibited for so long a time the immigration of cheap laborers the same rule in principle should be applied to all laborers proposing to immigrate to our country. It is answered by the friends of the bill, who do not favor modification in this respect, that these people will not, and from the very nature of things cannot, understand, enter into, or become interested in our political organization any more than in our social; that they will not permit themselves to become absorbed into and become a part of the body-politic, and this may be true under existing laws. And why? It is because they are denied the right to become citizens, and not being such can have no interest in our governmental system. Treaty stipulations are opposed to their naturalization. And in the proposed enactments of this bill for the enforcement of such extreme stipulations it is sought to be made more binding and effective for their exclusion from all rights of citizenship.

This brings us to the examination of the second chief objection to this bill, to wit, the absolute prohibition of all Chinese from becoming citizens of the Republic. It matters not should these people come in good faith to make their permanent homes, casting their lot with us, willing to become subject to our laws, renouncing all allegiance to their former sovereign, and manifesting a desire to rehabilitate themselves with our new, advancing, enlightening, Christian civilization, they cannot under the sixteenth section of this bill do so. It is as follows:

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.

What, indeed, could be more un-American than the sentiment here expressed? The proposed adoption of such a law so unnatural to our system, when the boast is constantly indulged that this is the land of the free and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, certainly cannot meet with a favorable response from this House, composed of the representatives of the people, basking, as is our boast, in the full sunshine of the brightest blaze of civilization the history of the world has ever known.

I certainly cannot conceive of any evil to result from taking a better and broader view of this portion of the question. I would much prefer for the honor and consistency of our nation that the law in this respect be liberalized by the adoption, as a substitute for this section, of the following from the substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. MCCOID:]

SEC. 12. Residents of the United States from the Empire of China may be admitted to citizenship according to the provisions of the uniform naturalization laws: *Provided*, That they shall have resided therein ten years, and for five years previous to their naturalization shall have adopted the manners, customs, dress, and general habits of citizens of the United States.

I fully acknowledge the power of this or any other government to protect against such evils as may threaten the happiness of the subject or citizen. Certainly, no gentleman upon this floor would for a moment doubt the power of Congress to prohibit the importation of criminals, paupers, diseased persons, or coolies, be their services owned by masters either at home or abroad.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLOR] most earnestly and eloquently inveighed against this bill, characterizing its advocates as actuated by the same feelings and motives that controlled the slave owner and driver of the days of African slavery in our country. I, however, most earnestly protest against such characterization. I am not so clear that his honored predecessors, the great and revered Garfield and Giddings, as well as Smith, Hale, and Sumner, might not, were they living, be found advocating at least some of the principles contained in this bill.

One fact is certainly most apparent throughout their public career, and that is the determination to completely rid the Republic of anything that savors of the ownership of one human being by another. 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 Asia, America, or any other portion of the globe, the bill meets my most hearty approval.

Nor do I believe it to be any the less our duty to protect labor in this country from unequal and unnatural competition of cooly immigration whose labor is completely owned by others, than it is to indirectly protect it through a tariff upon imports against the cheap or pauper labor of Europe.

But I had not intended, Mr. Speaker, to consume so much of the time of the House as I have already done in the presentation of my views upon these portions of the bill. I had not thought to say a word during this discussion, but I feel it due myself at least that I present a few thoughts as they suggest themselves to me, and that I give reasons for the vote which I expect to cast upon this bill.

First. I would modify the prohibition of this bill to ten years, that no room for accusation of failure on our part to sacredly maintain our treaty obligations can be made against us.

Second. I acknowledge the right of Congress to pass such laws as shall appear wise and proper for protection against the importation of paupers, criminals, diseased persons, and coolies, and in so far as this bill reasonably looks to the accomplishment of these results it has my support.

I believe in the protection and elevation of the laboring classes of the country, hence oppose the immigration of coolies under contract, or their control by any individual, corporation, or association having such purpose in view.

Third. I would, by striking out section 16 of this bill and the adoption of some such plan as that suggested by the amendment of Mr. MCCOID, make it possible for such of these people as come to our country with the purpose and determination of casting their lot with us in good faith to become citizens. With the amendments suggested, I can heartily support this measure. Without such modifications as indicated, or at least some one or more of them, I shall feel obliged to vote against the bill, for the reason that it is in the direction of a too sudden and radical change of established usages, and because I believe without these changes it is contrary to the spirit of solemn treaty obligations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDSON] is now entitled to the floor.

Mr. CONVERSE. If the gentleman from South Carolina will yield, I would like to move that the House adjourn. It is now five o'clock.

Mr. PAGE. I hope the gentleman will not press that motion. I would like to ask unanimous consent that the House take a recess until ten o'clock to-morrow morning and that the previous question on this bill shall be considered as ordered at two o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. RANDALL. And that no business shall be done during the first two hours of to-morrow's session.

Mr. PAGE. Nothing but debate on this bill.

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

Mr. PAGE. Then I will make the motion that the House take a recess until to-morrow morning at ten o'clock, and will give notice that if this be agreed to I shall call the previous question at two o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. KASSON. I desire to ask the gentleman from California at what time it will be agreeable to him that I offer my amendments, so that they may be considered as pending.

Mr. PAGE. I have no objection to the gentleman offering them at any time that may be agreeable to him.

Mr. KASSON. Then I will offer them now, so that they may be pending.

Mr. PAGE. Let them be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. KASSON. They are already printed in bill form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KASSON] asks

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.

Mr. HOUSE. 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 now by unanimous consent be 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 my friend will 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 the 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 till 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 CHINA.

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, 1860, I transmit to Congress a copy of two additional regulations established in accordance with the fifth section of that act by the envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States accredited to the Government of China, and assented to by the several United States consular officers in that country, for the service of summons on absent defendants in cases before the consular courts of the United States of America in China.

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.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *March* 22, 1882.

WHITE MOUNTAIN INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. DAWES, 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 VOORHIS. 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.

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. 4222) making appropriations for the support of 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.

FORTIFICATION BILL.

On motion of Mr. FORNEY, by unanimous consent, the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. No. 3208) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, and for the armament thereof, 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 until to-morrow morning at ten o'clock.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 72, noes 17.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. DUNNELL. Before the vote is announced let me ask a question. Is it the understanding that no business is to be transacted?

The SPEAKER. This will be the regular order, and no other business can be transacted unless the gentleman from Minnesota and every other gentleman consents.

Mr. MILLER. And the gentleman from Illinois has given notice that he will object.

And then (at five o'clock and five minutes p. m.) the House took a recess till to-morrow morning at ten o'clock.

MORNING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House at ten o'clock a. m. (on Thursday, March 23) reassembled.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

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

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 why we should pass the bill in its present shape. But I will not consume the time of the House, already wearied with this long discussion, to point out the arguments I do not give my assent to nor yet 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 wish to say, first, that I would like to have the bill modified 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. I would avoid this in appearance as well as in fact if 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 we can do this I have no doubt. The bill will be just as effective and will accomplish for our friends upon the Pacific coast just as much for the time for which it will run if it be limited to ten instead of twenty years, and will look much fairer and more in keeping with our treaty. Then at the end of ten years, if it be found to be needed, 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, so much in 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 "home of the wanderer" and "the asylum of the oppressed of every clime," and to proclaim "that our doors are open to all who love our free and republican form of government." And it does very well that this should be the case within certain limitations and restrictions.

But, Mr. Speaker, I hold that it is a higher and better patriotism to look first after the interest and 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 the right, to exclude from our shores all who bring or are likely to bring with them any pestilence or disease which may injure the health and physical well-being of the people of any portion of our country. Have we not the same right, and is it not an equal duty, to exclude

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 whose interest we are sent here to look after and protect? I am one of those who hold that the one duty is as sacred as the other.

From all we know of the Chinese laborers, the coolies, a population, as has well been said, diseased morally and physically, who can doubt that their unrestrained and unlimited introduction into our country and a general intermingling of these people with our laboring population would have the effect of increasing vice, immorality, and crime among them. I believe it would have this effect generally in the North, the East, and the West, wherever they are introduced; but no one who knows the colored people can for a moment doubt what the effect will be if these Chinese coolies are allowed to freely intermingle in the South with our colored population. No one who does not know the negro as we know him, and who has not seriously reflected upon this aspect of the subject, can imagine what would be the state of society and the condition of things in the South among that people if the Chinese coolies were injected among them. It is idle to say there is no danger of their going South. With the population that China has, if our ports are kept open to them, the day is not very far distant when they will not only fill the factories and workshops of the North and East, but when they will seek the workshops and the rice-fields of the South. Now, while we are able, let us make provision against the evil which threatens our future. It would be unwise to wait until we are crippled by its actual presence.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another aspect of this case to which I desire to call the attention of the House and the country; and one which with some may be regarded as a stronger if not a higher ground for the passage of this or some similar bill. And I desire to emphasize this ground as the main reason why I shall give the bill my support, and I believe the main reason why this side of the House will give it their support. It is this: because the bill looks to the interest and comes 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 with us, Mr. Speaker, and everywhere except at the South is made up of our own race—bone of our bone, 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 on this floor 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 exclusively or entirely, but they make up the great body of the laboring class of the South. While it would be a blow and a grievous injury to the laboring classes of the rest of this country to allow Chinese coolies unrestrained immigration to our country, to the colored people of the South it would be a disaster and almost utter ruin. The Chinese laborer or cooly, as a general thing, as we all know, comes here without any family to support, and nature has adapted him to live on very little; he would thrive on what the colored man would starve. He does and can afford to work for one-half the wages which the colored man must have in order to get along.

As a friend, then, to the laboring classes all over our country, but especially as a friend to the colored man, and as in part his representative here, I can never consent to allow the Chinese cooly the right to enter the factories, the workshops, the farm and rice fields of the South to drive out our own people, white and colored, and supplant them as our laborers. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I have felt it my duty to raise my voice in favor of this bill and to give it my vote.

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 willing to allow the Chinese laborers unrestrained liberty to come 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 from those who, so far as I have been able to judge, have always professed 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 its present cost. But, Mr. Speaker, we must look beyond the mere saving of dollars and cents, and ask ourselves what then is to become of the American laborer? To what may such a result drive him? So far, our country has been comparatively free from serious strikes and riots, but if this competition is allowed without restriction or control, who can tell what the future may have in store for us?

On the other hand I am glad to see the unanimity with which this bill is being supported by our Democratic friends. And when the final vote shall come to be taken I hope that the vote of this side of this House will show to the country where the friends of the laboring man are to be found.

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

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*, (Mr. PACHECO.) Does any other gentleman desire the floor?

Mr. SHERWIN. I believe I am now entitled to the floor, but under the circumstances, with the present surroundings, lacking the exhilaration necessary to enable me to make a speech, I do not care to proceed at this time, and I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. TILLMAN. Perhaps other gentlemen who desire to speak may drop in before twelve o'clock.

Mr. RANDALL. If gentlemen who proposed to speak are not here I think they cannot expect those who are here to wait for them.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair would suggest that the House take a recess until eleven o'clock.

Mr. PAGE. I make that motion.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at ten o'clock and twenty-five minutes a. m.) the House took a recess until eleven o'clock a. m.

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at eleven o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*, (Mr. PACHECO.) The House resumes the consideration of the bill (S. No. 71) to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese.

Mr. PAGE. A number of gentlemen on both sides of the House have expressed a desire to speak on this bill, and if there are any here who desire to proceed I presume they will be recognized. I propose to call the previous question to-day at two o'clock.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, it is easy to follow the multitude and champion that side of a controversy that receives its applause. It is agreeable also to be in accord with personal and political friends, and if on this occasion I antagonize popular opinion and political associates it is because I believe in loyalty to right as I am permitted to see the right. In putting on the record my protest against this bill I speak for no one but myself. What I may say is chargeable to no party. If I dissent from any creed or platform it is because I feel that it is safer to follow the principles of honesty and justice than mere party utterances.

As this bill stands I cannot support it. While it is said to be a measure to prevent the introduction of disease, crime, pauperism, and servile labor into the United States, the language and spirit of the bill prove that it aims only to exclude Chinese laborers regardless of their moral, pecuniary, or physical condition. It is caste legislation aimed at the Chinese now, but furnishes a precedent for the exclusion hereafter of every foreign-born laborer.

Again, in my deliberate judgment the bill violates the treaty recently made between ourselves and the Celestial Empire.

Moreover, sir, this measure is supported by a spirit of intolerance and race prejudice at war with my ideas of right, and upheld by a logic in which I hear the crack of the master's whip and read the doom of a race recently taken from the chattel lists and put into the manhood of the nation. I doubt a measure that brings such logic to its support. It recalls an era of excitement and danger when a political party was seeking to exclude from any participation in the Government all foreign-born persons "that America might be saved to Americans." Then it was said, "We invite the foreigner to get into our wagon and ride with us, but we intend to hold the reins and drive the team;" and now comes the harsher declaration "that wherever the Chinaman sails he must sail in his own boat."

In that day of hate party platforms announced that this is a "white man's Government, without any admixture of color in it; that we view with alarm the attempt made by the Republican party to force the proud Caucasian race down to a level with the savage Indian, the loathsome Chinaman, and the filthy and ignorant negro." However, Mr. Speaker, I could support a measure looking to the regulation, limitation, or suspension of Chinese immigration if it were so shaped as to do no violence to treaty obligations or the principles of liberty and humanity. If this bill shall be so amended as to suspend the immigration of the vicious, the diseased, the vagrant, and the imported contract Chinese laborer only, and the time of suspension be reduced to a reasonable period, say ten years, I will vote for it, but I do not hope this.

I freely admit it to be the duty of a political community to protect its citizens from the introduction from without of disease, pauperism, and crime. No nation may send to us its vicious, its diseased, or its vagrants; nor fasten upon us a system of degrading servile labor. From all such classes we must defend ourselves, and we need no treaty stipulations to enable us to do so. In doing this we exercise the right of national self-defense. If this bill did not go beyond this; if it aimed only to protect our people from an invasion of these classes, I would support it if the suspension was eternal in its duration, and if it embraced with the Chinese every other people on the earth. But, sir, this measure goes far beyond this, for its sole and manifest purpose is to wholly exclude from this country such Chinese as may work, and for no crime except that they are laborers. The Chinaman is not to be punished for bringing disease, vice, or pauperism; nor because he is servile, but because he brings brain and muscle and contributes to the development of our illimitable resources his skilled and unskilled industry. Let us see if I am correct. I read the first and seventeenth sections of the bill:

SECTION 1. That from and after the expiration of ninety days next after the passage of this act, and until the expiration of twenty years next after the passage of this act, the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States be, and the same is hereby, suspended; and during such suspension it shall not be lawful for any Chinese laborer to come, or, having so come after the expiration of said ninety days, to remain within the United States.

SEC. 17. That the words "Chinese laborers," wherever used in this act, shall be construed to mean both skilled and unskilled laborers and Chinese employed in mining.

It is clear that the twenty years' suspension applies only to skilled

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 clearly wrong. It is opposed to the well-settled principles of this 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. We have as a people clung to this doctrine as closely as we have to the sacred truths of the Declaration. On this question Senator Morton says:

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 his natural liberty, and without that his liberty is defective. We claim that the right to liberty is a natural, inherent, God-given right, and his liberty is imperfect unless it carries with it the right of expatriation.

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 that without this his liberty is defective. This bill puts this right of expatriation, this right "essential to perfect liberty," so far as Chinese who labor are concerned, in chains for twenty years. Senator Morton says further:

As to all other rights of foreigners coming to our shores to work or trade or manufacture and acquire property, we have never made any distinction. To do that now would be a great innovation upon the policy and traditions of the Government, and would be a long step in the denial of the brotherhood of man and the humanitarian policy inaugurated by our fathers.

Here is the very pith of the question. Have we ever denied the right of any other foreign people to come here to work and acquire property? Never. Why, then, deny this right to the Chinese? My colleague [Mr. CALKINS] supports this measure because it is to "restrain crime and prevent pauperism and disease." If this be its purpose how strange its wording! I deny again that such is the object of the bill. If there were no other ends to be attained than those announced this bill would never have been here. Who does the bill exclude? Does it say "it shall not be lawful for any Chinese leper or pauper or criminal" to come here? Nothing of the kind; it only excludes the Chinese workingman, whether he be skilled or unskilled, whether he works in the kitchen, the garden, the workshop, the fields, or in the mines. It is not the pauper but the laborer; not the idle but the industrious; not the profligate but the thrifty; not the diseased but the healthy, who are feared by the promoters of this bill.

I object to this bill in its present form, therefore, because it attacks the freedom of labor—the liberty to work. If you would elevate labor make it free. Servile service, such as slaves yield, is degrading, and such I would exclude from this country by making it free. But I insist that the right to work without trammel is a natural one, to be enjoyed alike by every race and color. In opposing the mean discrimination made in this bill against labor I am not speaking for the Chinese but for the dignity of labor, for freedom, for the right of man to live, his right to enjoy the air, the sunshine, the earth, and the fruits of his labor; for the toilers in the field, in the mines, and the workshop. I am for the largest possible liberty for every man and every people who engage in honest labor. God made man among the weakest of his creatures and sent him into the world where the very elements challenged his right to live. Nature provides him with neither food, raiment, nor shelter fit for use without toil. It holds in its niggardly grasp almost everything essential to man's comfort, and only yields them up in exchange for human effort. Man's necessities compel him to labor, for life itself is the price of labor. "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat thy bread."

If man has the right to life he has the right to employ the means to maintain it. As he must eat he must be free to pluck the fruits of his personal effort. To labor man must have a field for its employment, and to shut him out is to strike down both liberty and life. I believe a man has as much right to labor as to breathe. Moreover, I hold that man's ability to labor is his own property—that it belongs to him as much as do his hands or his eyes. He may employ it in lawful pursuits upon such terms as he may choose. If he cannot obtain a high price for it he may accept a low one. We cannot limit his right to contract his labor without assuming the power to prohibit it altogether.

I have, Mr. Speaker, been talking of a principle—a right, if you please—that I believe to be as sacred and as universal as the right of life itself. I admit that life may be taken, but only in rare and exceptional cases; and except in such to take a human life is a crime. So with this liberty of human labor. It, too, may be suspended in some great exigency of national or personal peril, but to suspend it without the gravest cause is a monstrous crime against human nature. It is my deliberate judgment, after patient and anxious inquiry, that no such danger threatens our people as will justify this extraordinary legislation. But of this I will speak hereafter.

I proceed to inquire, does this bill violate our treaty with the Chinese Empire? This is certainly a most important question. We cannot afford to be both dishonest and unjust. We degrade ourselves in the esteem of the civilized nations of the world if we even hesitate to keep our treaty obligations. We ought to keep faith even with the heathen and the idolater. We ought to take pride in maintaining a character for uprightness and fair dealing. We are too great to do a little thing or a mean one for any cause, much less to secure the end aimed at by this legislation. China—call her heathen if you will—has kept her every treaty obligation with us in the most generous good faith. She has never failed and never murmured. When we have become restive and discontented with the terms of an existing treaty she has magnanimously entered into another with us. In our first treaty of thirty-eight years ago she promised us "a perfect, permanent, and universal peace and a sincere and cordial amity;" and she has kept that promise with no Punic faith.

A quarter of a century ago, in the twenty-ninth article of the treaty of 1858, this "heathen" people said:

The principles of religion as professed by the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches are recognized as teaching men to do good and to do to others as they would have others do unto them.

Thus putting in harmony the philosophy of their great Confucius with the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. In the Burlingame treaty China and the United States both—

Cordially recognized the 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, for purposes of curiosity, of trade, or as permanent residents. The high contracting parties, therefore, join in reprobating any other than an entirely voluntary immigration for these purposes.

This is the American doctrine; we insisted upon its acceptance by the Chinese, and it was accepted, and, more than all, has been religiously kept. Let us profit by this heathen example of good faith. I need not say with what faith we as a people have acted toward China; how we have kept our solemn promise to "secure to Chinese subjects residing here the same rights, privileges, immunities, and exemptions accorded to citizens and subjects of the most favored nations." Have we kept this promise? Have we tried to do it? I will not speak of the atrocities to which the people of the Chinese Empire in our midst have been subjected by our most civilized and Christian people. The past must stand, but I do not care to recall it.

The events that brought about the treaty of Peking of the 19th of July, 1881, are too recent and too well known to need repeating. It is with that treaty we have to do to-day. Let us repeat so much of it as refers to the matter of Chinese immigration, and see what restraint may be put upon it. The article most important in this connection is the first, and reads:

Whenever in the opinion of the Government of the United States the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States, or their residence therein, affects or threatens to affect the interests of that country, or to endanger the good order of the said country or of any locality within the territory thereof, the Government of China agrees that the Government of the United States may regulate, limit, or suspend such coming or residence, but may not absolutely prohibit it. The limitation or suspension shall be reasonable and shall apply only to Chinese who may go to the United States as laborers, other classes not being included in the limitations. Legislation taken in regard to Chinese laborers will be of such a character only as is necessary to enforce the regulation, limitation, or suspension of immigration, and immigrants shall not be subject to personal maltreatment or abuse.

Here it is stipulated that the Government may regulate, limit, suspend, but not prohibit, the coming to the United States of Chinese laborers whenever, first, in the opinion of the United States the coming of such laborers into the country or their residence therein affects or threatens to affect its interest; or, second, whenever such coming or residence endangers its good order or the good order of any locality thereof.

This article further expressly stipulates that this limitation or suspension shall be reasonable, and that to enforce this agreement only necessary legislation shall be employed.

Now, sir, I will reverse in my discussion of this question this order of statement and submit, first, what is a reasonable period of suspension under this treaty? It is said that this question is left wholly to the judgment of the Government of the United States. I grant it, and for this reason I insist that it is our solemn duty to so guard our legislation as to do no possible wrong. It would be little less than infamous to take advantage of a discretionary power generously accorded us by a friendly nation to interfere with or impose unusual restrictions upon the liberties of its subjects. As a Christian people jealous of our honor we dare not do such a thing. The magnanimity that left the discretionary power with us strongly appeals to our sense of honor not to abuse it.

What, sir, do the words "reasonable suspension" mean in the connection in which they are used? They must be interpreted in the light of the subject to which they apply, of the circumstances surrounding the high contracting parties at the time of their employment and of the meaning, if any, given them at the time of the negotiation of the treaty. This bill wholly prohibits the coming here of Chinese laborers for twenty years. Within this period not a single subject of the Celestial Empire can come into the United States if he belongs to the laboring class. Is this long prohibition a "reasonable suspension?" It is said this suspension is reasonable, for it is a short time compared with the length of a nation's life, and with equal force the friends of this measure may say it is a very short time indeed when compared with the duration of eternity. Twenty years, sir, is a very long time when taken out of the term of a human life, or when measured by the life-time of a generation.

Construed by its surroundings, by the circumstances existing at the time this treaty was made, how does this question stand? The relations between China and the United States had for thirty years been friendly and cordial; for that period Chinese subjects had been landing upon our shores and residing among our people; they came

to us without restraint and under treaty stipulations which bound us to protect them and treat them with the same kindness and consideration that we extended to citizens and subjects of the most favored nations. For thirty years our people had been going to China for travel, for trade, and to reside. They received the fullest protection for person and property from the Chinese Government. Our commercial relations with that people were undisturbed, and our citizens resided among them secure in their rights, departing and returning without restraint. The two nations were at peace. China was satisfied with the situation, and did not desire to limit or suspend the immigration to her domain of citizens of the United States. The new treaty was made in our interest alone, and the only restrictions it imposes are upon the Chinese people. In the presence of these unquestioned facts, who dare say that to wholly prohibit Chinese laborers from coming here for twenty years is a reasonable suspension? To me such an interpretation seems monstrous.

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 words "regulate or limit or suspend," and consented to the latter words only on the condition named. The Chinese commissioners explained what they intended their concession to mean. They said:

By limitation 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 total number of Chinese now there, that no more should be allowed to go in any one year in future than either the greatest number which had gone in any year in the past, or the least number which had gone in any year in the past, or that the total number should never be allowed to exceed the number now there.

As to limitation in time they meant, for example, that Chinese should be allowed to go in alternate years, or every third year; or, for example, that they should not be allowed to go for two, three, or five years.

Mr. Trescot replied that—

"The United States Government did not ask the Chinese Government to regulate, limit, suspend, or prohibit immigration, but to leave that to the discretion and action of the United States Government itself; that under the Burlingame treaty as construed in practice the Chinese had the absolute right in any numbers to come to the United States. This had caused trouble and embarrassment. What the United States Government asked was that the Chinese Government should 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. Trescot 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 edict of the Emperor of China to execute a treaty power. That two great nations discussing such a subject must always assume that they will both act in good faith and with due consideration for the interests and friendship of each other.

That the United States Government might never deem it necessary to exercise this power. It would depend upon circumstances. If Chinese immigration concentrated in cities where it threatened public order, or if it confined itself to localities where it was an injury to the interests of the American people, the Government of the United States would undoubtedly take steps to prevent such accumulations of Chinese. If, on the contrary, there was no large immigration, or if there were sections of the country where such immigration was clearly beneficial, then 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 South and a surplus of such labor in California, and Congress might legislate in accordance with these facts. In general the legislation would be in view of and depend upon the circumstances of the situation at the moment such legislation became 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 power would be exercised. What had just been said gave them the explanation 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 a longer time. Mr. Trescot went further, and said the United States might never exercise the power of suspension at all, but if it did exercise it 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 has occurred, we are engaged in 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 in the bill, but read it as it appears in the spirit that stands behind it, and by which it is upheld, and it is for all eternity. This bill means no less than that the suspension shall be twenty years, renewable at the option of the United States forever. Will it be said that this is fair? To such legislation I cannot and will not give my assent.

Again, it 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 imposed by this bill on the Chinese and not required of any other people who come among us necessary? Is it necessary to visit the degrading penalties of fines and imprisonment upon every American citizen who aids or abets a Chinese laborer to come temporarily into 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 seaboard town or city? Shall it be a crime, I ask, for a Chinaman on his way home from Cuba or Mexico to step from the ship to the wharf at San Francisco? Is a law closing every port, walling about every town, and keeping the Chinese laborer from touching our soil at every point necessary to save two States beyond the Rocky Mountains from Chinese cheap labor? Such laws have brought reproach to our people in the past, but I have until now indulged the hope that they would disgrace us no more. 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.

First, we are to be frightened to support this measure. 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 fears of such an influx from China to this country as to crowd out those who now live in and inhabit parts of this Republic, and which furnishes one reason, and a strong one to my mind, why some restrictions should be placed on this immigration.

Can it be that any person regards the present or the future emigration from the Celestial Empire occasion for alarm? We all know that China has a reputed population of from 300,000,000 to 400,000,000, and that these people may reach our shores in thirty days, but we know also that the Chinese have come to us and gone from us at their will for thirty years, and that to-day there are not more than 100,000 on the whole Pacific side of the Rocky Mountains. We know them to be a quiet, working, peaceful people, not given to violence or strife. Is it possible that there is danger the Chinese will invade us, occupy our soil, and drive us out, unless we pass a law to keep Chinese laborers away? I confess I rather like the idea of defeating a foreign foe by statute. The method is neither dangerous nor expensive. But I have, until recently, indulged the opinion that China did not meditate our subjugation. A few days since I found on my desk a speech delivered in San Francisco on March 4, 1882, at an anti-Chinese meeting, by W. T. Coleman, esq. He held before his audience the danger we are in from Chinese cheap labor, as follows:

Even to-day she has a navy that puts ours to shame. She lies within thirty days of us and could, if occasion require it, place on our shores an army the equal of which modern times have not seen. This is not likely to occur soon, but it may come any day. The death of a single prominent Chinaman in this country, or a single American in that, or any mishap, might work a complication that would at once put us in arms.

It is said that in Great Britain there will be put afloat this year at least 1,000,000 of tons register of iron ships and steamers; more, probably 1,200,000 tons, or 1,200 vessels of a thousand tons each. If occasion required, China could buy one-half this fleet and, with her own, and such as she could get together, she could start a thousand vessels on short notice, bringing 2,000 men each, and hurl almost before we knew it 2,000,000 people on our coast. This could be readily multiplied so that five, ten, or even twenty millions could be here in a comparative short time. What would become of us in such a contingency? It is appalling to contemplate, and yet, unfortunately, it is all within the bounds of possibility. Survey the strategical and political situation and you will see that from Europe we have but little to fear, from China everything. Europe has a population of about three hundred millions, divided into a dozen strong, jealous, watchful nationalities, which will never probably admit of an overpowering European force reaching our shores, but with China's 400,000,000, one compact body, under one head, with a capacity to send five, ten, or even twenty million people here, or equal to half the population of the United States, and yet not drain her resources, we have a picture at which we may well shudder, and when we look at the campaigns and the devastations of Ghengis Khan and of Timour, and the other great captains that have led their hordes from Tartar China, we can better realize the possibilities.

Strange logic! To avoid invasion and conquest by one of the most formidable powers on earth we must oppress its people and disregard our treaties with it! It strikes me that if we would avoid the rage and devastations of the Ghengis Khans and the Timours we should treat the Chinese people kindly and fairly. But no one fears this. This fearful possibility is gotten up to frighten the timid. I would not have alluded to it, but reference to the same danger has been often referred to here during this debate.

The opponents of the Chinese—the champions of this bill—after demanding that the "Chinese shall go," or at least that they shall not come, because of their being filthy, immoral, diseased, and heathens, reach the real and only issue when they assert that if Chinese laborers are permitted to compete with our people in the labor market we will be driven out.

These gentlemen plant themselves upon the broad ground that it is our duty to prohibit Chinese immigration that American labor may be protected. After carefully studying this question I do not believe American laborers are in danger from Chinese competition. That they sincerely believe they are I have no reason to doubt, but the future will prove them in error or the whole past of human experience is at fault. Why, sir, we all remember the day—the youngest of us remember it—when our statesmen of the free States were devising ways for keeping negroes from coming within our borders to cheapen and degrade white labor. So frightened were we in the North that by statutes and constitutions we made it a crime for a colored person to come into the State. In Indiana we declared all contracts made with colored persons so coming into the State void, and punished our citizens with fines and imprisonment if they gave these ostracised men and women employment.

The people of Indiana voted by over one hundred thousand majority for putting an article into the constitution prohibiting negro

immigration. Other States did the same thing. It was done to save white labor from the dangers of an influx of African laborers. How eloquent our statesmen grew when they talked about alien colored people coming into the State to rob our wives and children of their bread. One of these gentlemen—since then governor of the State, a Senator, and a candidate for the Vice-Presidency—on the 8th of August, 1866, spoke as follows:

I thought it a wise and just policy when, by a vote of nearly one hundred thousand majority, the people of this State, in their constitution, provided that negroes should not immigrate within our borders. * * * Our policy was that our population should not be mixed, and that negroes should not come here to cheapen and degrade labor.

* * * * * * *

I tell you there will be hot blood when they are found here in such large numbers as to press hard on white labor. When the white mechanic or laborer goes home to his wife and children at the close of his day's work to tell them that a negro from Kentucky or Tennessee is seeking his place, and that a selfish employer 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 thought so wise and just has been 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 peoples have been permitted to come to us and abide with us, and white labor has neither been cheapened nor degraded.

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

I believe, as I have ever believed, that the admixture of the races is fraught with evil and curses to both, and with blessings to none. All history tells this sad, calamitous story. * * * There is not a spot of earth beneath the sun where the experiment has been tried that has not been blighted, often with ashes and blood, and always with a deterioration of both the races, and acceleration of all the vices of mongrels, and a backward flow of the tide of civilization. Nor will we in the future years escape this revolting doom if we persist in the attempt to absorb into the body-politic 3,000,000 of a degraded and inferior race. The wretched results 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 lazzaroni of Kentucky and other southern regions are in transportation to Indiana. * * * It will be for the laborers of the State, the white men who till the soil, the mechanics in the shops, to determine whether they desire this population in their midst. It will be well for the oppressed workingmen of every avocation and calling, who have nothing left save the civil rights of citizenship, to decide whether they wish to share them equally with the African.

I will appeal to them whether Indiana, a border State, shall be overrun with the refuse elements of the South. I will appeal to them whether they will encourage the presence of these elements in their fields, their workshops, and their firesides. * * * I fear that an imported mass of this race would overcome the patience of the laboring white man.

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 Chinaman who threatens them now. To run the parallel, I quote from a speech made nearly twenty years ago in this House by the distinguished member from New York, [Mr. COX.] He spoke as follows:

The right and power to exclude Africans from the States north being compatible with our system of State sovereignty and Federal supremacy, I assert that it is impolitic, dangerous, degrading, and unjust to the white men of Ohio and of the North to allow such immigration. By the census of 1860, in Ohio we have 36,225 colored persons out of a population of 2,339,559. As a general thing they are vicious, indolent, and improvident. They number as yet one black to about sixty-three whites, but their ratio of increase during the last ten years has been 43.30 per cent., while that of the white increase is only 17.82 per cent. About one-tenth of our convicts are negroes. I gather from the census of 1850 that four-tenths of the female prisoners are blacks, although they compose but one-eightieth of the female population of Ohio. In Massachusetts the convicts in the penitentiary are one-sixth black; Connecticut, one-third; New York, one-fourth. In Ohio the blacks are not agriculturists. They soon become waiters, barbers, and otherwise subservient to the whites. They have just enough consequence given to them by late events to be pestilent.

If the Senator could visit Green's Row, within the shadow of this Capitol, henceforth "Tophet and black Gehenna, called the type of hell," and note the squalor, destitution, laziness, crime, and degradation there beginning to fester; if he could visit the alleys in whose miserable hovels the blacks congregate, he would hardly be reminded of the paradise which Milton sang with its amaranthine flowers, [laughter,] its blooming trees of life, its golden fruitage, its amber rivers rolling over elysian flowers, its hills and fountains and fresh shades, its dreams of love, and its adoration of God. Alas, he would find nothing here to remind him of that high estate in Eden save the fragrance of the spot and the nakedness of its inhabitants. [Laughter.] If the rush of free negroes to this paradise continues, it would be a blessing if Providence should send Satan here in the form of a serpent, and an angel to drive the descendants of Adam and Eve into the outer world. If it continues you will have no one here but Congressmen and negroes, and that will be punishment enough. [Laughter.] You will have to enact a fugitive law to bring the whites to their capital. [Laughter.] The condition of the negroes here is not unlike their condition in Ohio.

How like the squalor, filthiness, and degradation of the Chinese quartered in San Francisco! If we strike from these utterances the word "negro" and insert "Chinese," they would be admirably suited for this occasion. The gentlemen who made them could not be induced to repeat them now. They have found their philosophy at fault. Perhaps the fact that the colored man is a voter has had something to do with this change of opinion. Facts set mere theories at defiance. It is a sad mistake to say that labor in this country is injured by the immigration of a working people. We have too many broad acres to till, too many forests to clear up, and too many waste places to make productive to be injured by any present possible increase of thrifty, healthy, and honest labor.

But I hear some gentleman say that every 100,000 Chinese laborers that come here displace that many white men. Is this true? If so, does not the coming of 100,000 subjects of the European nations who labor drive out that number of American laborers? Does not every laboring-man who crosses the Atlantic and takes up his residence here put his labor into competition with our labor? If not, why not? It will not do to say that the coming of these laborers from abroad does not increase the amount of labor in the market and add to the competition, for we all know it does. Why then, let me ask, does this European immigration not injure our laborers? I am answered that it is because these immigrants are of our blood and require the same food, shelter, raiment, and education we require, and must, therefore, earn the same wages our people secure.

This conclusion is a mistake. Suppose there is a demand for 100,000 laborers only, and these are already in this country, and then 100,000 more come in, what must happen? Either some of these laborers go without employment or labor cheapens. That our labor is not cheapened by foreign immigration proves that in this country the demand for labor is equal to the supply. So long as this equality exists the coming here of free laboring people will do us no harm. Bear in mind that I only insist upon the right of free and honest laboring classes to come and stay with us.

Labor, sir, is wealth, and every hour of honest toil given us adds to our material prosperity. Nobody doubts this. When labor injures us or when the influx of a foreign element bears hard on our laboring people I will help in every reasonable way to mitigate the evil.

In the past twenty years we have had an addition to our population of quite 2,500,000 furnished by Great Britian alone. Every year 300,000 to 800,000 foreign-born persons take up their abode in the United States, and a very large majority of these are poor laboring people. Shall we close our gates upon them? A single month sometimes brings to our shores as many foreign-born people as there are now of the Mongolian race in our country after an immigration of thirty years. Why not exclude all? Is there no danger of competition from this vast influx of laboring people from the Old World? Nobody fears this increase. Upon the contrary, we encourage it. Every observing man knows the demand for labor has kept pace with the ever-increasing supply. I can imagine some conservative politician appealing to the passions of the people and demanding that the application of steam to machinery be prohibited because it thus utilized is brought into competition with the man who relies upon his personal labor only to secure shelter, food, and raiment for his dependent family.

Watts and Boulton made their first successful steam engine a hundred years ago, and it alone; 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 workshop, of the forge, the furnace, and the field away from our navigable streams was carted to the distant market, giving employment to millions of men and beasts. The railroad now occupies this field. The whistle of the locomotive is heard in almost every village. Our every commodity is taken to market by steam. Is it not strange that this stupendous revolution in the matter of labor has enhanced rather than cheapened the price of labor and of horses and mules.

Every day we are increasing the competition with labor by increasing the labor-power of machinery, and all intelligent people encourage these labor-saving inventions. In fact, the nations of the world 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 still have 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 depraved, if contact with them endangers our health, character, habits, and superior civilization, they ought to be kept away. But are these charges true? We have enough perils of our own without borrowing from other civilizations. But what is the true Chinese character? Let Mr. Coleman, of California, speak. On the 4th of this month, at an anti-Chinese meeting in San Francisco, he said:

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 consideration of all questions involved, would not have been so favorable to them, namely, that physically, mentally, and politically they are equal, if not superior, to the average of mankind. Beyond that, the comparison is against them. Physically, as laborers in the field, on the farm, heavy work and light, in many departments, and as operatives and artisans, they show quickness, strength, sprightliness, endurance, accuracy, and fidelity in a great degree. Mentally, they are quick, acute, and correct in their perceptions, apt, strong, and tenacious in memory, and rarely fail in the lessons that have been taught them. In the higher walks we know that as scholars, statesmen, and

diplomates they are astute and far-reaching, and held in great respect. Politically, (and by politically I give that meaning which embraces politeness, adroitness, cunning, and artfulness,) they are shrewd and circumspect, and full of resources and adaptability.

This is from an enemy of the Chinese race, but even he admits that physically, mentally, and politically these heathens are equal to or above the average of mankind. Since this debate began I have studied this question with some care. I have examined as thoroughly as my time would permit the evidence given before the joint special committee of 1876, as to the habits, morals, and health of these people. I believe the following extracts of evidence from the report of this committee state as nearly as may be the facts:

CLEANLINESS AND HEALTH.

Page 643, Congressional report:

Arthur B. Stout sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What is your business?

A. I am a physician.

Q. How long have you resided in this State?

A. Since February, 1849.

Q. Have you practiced your profession from that time?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you held any office under the State connected with that profession?

A. Yes, sir; I am now a member of the State board of health. I have had no other official appointment, although I have been in the public hospitals as physician.

Q. Where have you resided?

A. In San Francisco, constantly.

Q. How near was your office and residence to what is known as the Chinese quarter?

A. Right in the midst of it.

Q. You built there before the Chinese came to that quarter?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. During your residence there have you known of any disease, any pestilence, originating and spreading in there, or spreading from there?

A. No, sir; none.

Q. The Chinese live in that quarter very closely, do they not?

A. Quite closely, sometimes.

Q. How is it that you account for the fact that under these circumstances they are apparently so healthy?

A. Their frugal life gives them more immunity from disease. They eat only what is necessary to live upon. They eat to live, and do not live to eat. They are clean in their habits, and they drink no whisky. I have never seen a drunken Chinaman in my life. They consequently obtain a better resisting power to the attack of disease.

Q. What is their habit in regard to ablutions?

A. They constantly wash themselves.

Q. The whole person, or only the face and hands?

A. My observation of the men is that they keep themselves clean. Their clothes are clean. As mechanics or workmen they keep themselves very clean.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the comparative mortality among the Chinese and the whites of this city—the death-rate?

A. The death-rate is greater among the whites than among the Chinese.

Q. What is the comparative mortality among adult Chinamen and adult white people?

A. The amount is greater with adult white people.

Q. Have they had epidemics in the Chinese quarter?

A. No, sir; the small-pox has been among them, as it has been among others; but I think there has been less small-pox among them—I mean the ratio and population allowed—than with the whites. When you come to take up the question of small-pox, I think I can exonerate the Chinese from the charges alleged against them of having introduced it.

Rev. Otis Gibson, connected with the Methodist Chinese mission for eight years at San Francisco, says:

After an experience of about twenty years among this people I do not hesitate to express my opinion that in simple brain power and possibilities of culture the Chinese race is equal to any other people in the world. They are capable of learning our language, laws, customs, principles of government, our theories and practices. We know nothing which the Chinese are incapable of learning. I believe the Chinese come here voluntarily in every case.

Rev. Frederick E. Sherrer, (page 631, Congressional report,) the stated clerk of the Presbytery of San Francisco and the Synod of the Pacific, says:

We have now an organized church of Chinese only, into which one hundred and eighty-seven have been received. In the place of worship two Sabbath-schools are held, and an average of one hundred and fifty receive instruction every Sunday. There are fifty-nine more Chinese communicants connected with various American churches in our denomination alone. Five of these were recently received into the church at San Leandro, and eight into the church at Los Angeles. Our mission work has grown until we have been obliged to appoint for it three Americans, all speaking the Chinese language, and to establish branch missions in Sacramento, San José, and Los Angeles. Connected with these missions are seven other Americans and several native teachers. We have schools in which nearly twelve hundred are receiving instruction in the English language and Christian religion. Hundreds of these have renounced idolatry and become interested students of Christianity. Some of them are connected with an undenominational Chinese Young Men's Christian Association in this city, which now numbers about one thousand members, and in which only those who formally renounce idolatry can become or remain members.

Page 581, Congressional report:

Rev. W. Brier, sworn and examined.

The Chinese are a cleanly people; they keep themselves neat and clean and nice; there is nothing offensive about them. Scarcely any of them ever swear; none of them that I have ever known drink whisky. I have never seen but one drunken Chinaman in my residence in California. I did see one man once with a bottle of whisky tied to each end of his pole, and he was reeling from one side to the other, and I said to myself, "That Chinaman is becoming Americanized." I have seen but that one drunken Chinaman. I have never had but one Chinaman come to my house and ask for anything to eat, or to ask if I had anything to give him; just one individual case, and I suppose there are more than a hundred fed there of white men of other nationalities every year.

George D. Roberts, (page 436, Congressional report,) the president, manager, or main officer of the Tide-Land Reclamation Company, testified:

To the general prosperity of the country I think they are a great advantage. I think they fill the places that white labor would fill very reluctantly, and it would be a long time before we could get white labor to do it. I think the wealth they produce stimulates prosperity to such an extent that it gives white men higher positions. I do not think the presence of Chinese here affects the price of intelligent labor. It is possible there may be a class of labor that is affected by it, but to sustain that class of labor alone, we would have to hold back the enterprise of the country.

In my opinion the aggregate product of the wealth produced by Chinamen in this State is equal to our mines, including the mines of Nevada and Dakota. Probably they produce sixty, eighty, or ninety millions a year in wealth.

There is a disposition among them now to turn their attention to farming. They think it a more quiet life; they get out of the excitement of the city. Many of them have rented patches, and are paying $25 and $30 a year per acre for lands.

Solomon Heydenfelt, associate justice of the supreme court, (page 504,) testified:

Have resided in California nearly twenty-seven years. I think California owes its prosperity very much indeed to the industry of the Chinese who have come to this country. I think without them we would not have our harbor filled with ships; we would not have had railroads crossing our mountains, and we would have been behind probably a great number of years. I think we would not have had as many white people here if the Chinese had not come. I think they are the best laboring class we have among us.

I see no reason why he is not equal in all respects to the European. I think that they are more faithful, more reliable, and more intelligent; they have more industry than the corresponding class of whites; they are thoroughly reliable and perfectly faithful to their engagements. I think their general intelligence is greater than that of Americans in the corresponding class. They exhibit also a ready intelligence, much more so than you will generally find among the ordinary laboring class of the whites.

Page 530, Congressional report:

Cornelius B. S. Gibbs sworn and examined.

Have been a resident of this State over twenty-eight years; my profession is adjuster of marine losses. As men of business, I consider that the Chinese merchants are fully equal to our merchants. As men of integrity, I have never met a more honorable, high-minded, correct, and truthful set of men than the Chinese merchants of our city. I am drawn in contact with people from all nations, all the merchants of our city, in our adjustments. I have never had a case where the Chinese have attempted to undervalue their goods or bring fictitious claims into the adjustments. There is not a merchant in this place with whom we do not have business.

Q. Could you say that much of the white race?

A. No, sir; as a class, I think the Chinese are more honorable than other nationalities, even our own. I think they are the best mathematicians I ever saw in my life. They are good business men; they are the only persons who will go through an adjustment and seem to understand it. I never met a Chinaman that if you gave him any figures to calculate he could not effect it. The average of Chinese merchants compare with the average of American merchants favorably in all respects. I never had a lawsuit with them or never had a complaint from them in my life. You have got to get their confidence and explain to them, and they generally go through with the figuring themselves. They can figure very fast and very correctly, and when they are convinced everything is right there is no trouble. There is no class of people that pay up as quickly as the Chinese. On Saturday we send them notice that the average is closed, and on Monday, by ten or twelve o'clock, all the certificates are paid. I have had fifty and sixty thousand dollars in a case, and they would come straight forward and pay it before twelve o'clock, while we have to send around to the other merchants a month, and sometimes two months, before we get it all from them. They are distinguished for their promptitude in business.

Page 532 Congressional report:

Hermann Heynemann sworn and examined.

I am engaged in importing goods, also in manufacturing.

Q. What character of manufacturing?

A. I am president of the Pioneer Woolen Factory and agent of the Pacific Jute Factory.

Q. Why do you employ Chinese in your factory?

A. Originally we could not get any others at all. At that time it would have been an absolute impossibility to have run the factory upon white labor, simply because we could not get white operatives.

Q. Would the factory have been established with white labor?

A. No, sir. As a matter of fact, even with the Chinese labor, competition has been so active that we have had no dividends whatever.

At page 18 of the report of Chinese immigration, in speaking of Chinese labor, Mr. Pixley says:

One of the dangers to our laboring population is because the Chinese do labor so well.

In response to the question, "What rate of wages do they receive?" he says:

The Chinaman begins to work for what wages he can get. A domestic servant will go into your family upon his immediate arrival in San Francisco for $3 a week. If the mistress of the house will teach him English, or if the benevolent maiden lady of his neighborhood will invite him to her class in Sunday-school until he can speak a little English, he will increase his wages, and as he learns to cook and learns to talk he learns to demand a higher and better compensation for his labor, until he finally reaches the highest point that his labor will demand, from three at first to eight dollars a week. Skilled labor receives, according to proficiency, from fifty cents to a dollar per day; railroad and tule laborers from sixty cents to $1.10 a day; farm hands a dollar a day; fruit-pickers about one dollar, and these various people boarding themselves.

This testimony and much like it was given by men of intelligence and of high moral character, by merchants, doctors, and divines, all of whom were made familiar with the facts about which they spoke by a long acquaintance and intimate intercourse with these people. These witnesses are men of courage and conviction. Their statements are before the country and the country will pass fair and honest judgment. Let us briefly recapitulate this evidence and see what it establishes. I protest I am not responsible if it contradicts what has been said by others on this subject here or elsewhere. I give it as it is written. If it is true it proves that these abused people have by their labor added largely to the material prosperity of the States on the Pacific; that they have built railroads and ships, redeemed

waste places, and planted the garden and the vineyard in the wilderness. As men they are faithful, reliable, intelligent; as merchants they pay promptly and are highminded and correct. As a race they are mentally quick, acute, and correct in their perceptions—strong and tenacious in memory. In the higher walks they are scholars, statesmen, and diplomates—polite, adroit, and shrewd.

These people seldom swear or become intoxicated. It has been asserted that they are always idolaters and are never converted to the Christian religion, but this testimony shows that in San Francisco alone quite 1,200 attend church, Sabbath-school, and Christian associations, and receive 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 bathe daily, and are received as cooks and house servants 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 as laborers. Their presence among us does 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.

But they are idolaters 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 overturned 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 truths of the gospel of peace and the brotherhood of man. But, sir, I do not care to pursue this branch of the question further.

What will be 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 let or hinderance? Will China not retaliate by excluding our citizens from her shores for twenty years as we have theirs? If she did so could we complain? Can we expect them to keep a treaty which we have flagrantly violated?

Years ago the Chinese were an isolated people; they held little communion with the nations of the world. Their ports were closed and we had no trade with them. We asked them, we importuned them, for a treaty of commerce, and it was granted. Our trade with them has gone on uninterruptedly for nearly twenty-five years, and our commercial transactions during these years, in goods and coin, amount to $507,000,000, or over $22,000,000 per annum. Are we ready to sacrifice this trade? Do we wish the Chinese wall rebuilt? True, we buy more from China than we sell it, but our trade is profitable and a wise policy and fair treatment may greatly enlarge it. 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 treatment of that people. If we expect our sails to whiten every sea and our products to find a market in every port, as is our boast, we must adopt a broad, generous, and honest policy in our dealings with the nations.

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. If we wish to extend our commerce with the nations we must show that in our dealings 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 citizens and subjects of other powers. Our past record, our present and future interests, demand the utmost good faith in the observance of every treaty obligation. I leave this question here.

Mr. Speaker, there has appeared in this discussion a 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 status in our political society for all time. I supposed the Constitution had assigned them a place in the body-politic and that they were to be equal with us before the law. I thought, moreover, that they were to abide with us. Indeed, sir, I was weak enough to believe that the spirit of intolerance and race-hate had been struck dumb by the cannon of our battle-fields, and that our civilization had forever hidden these monstrosities from human sight. I was mistaken. I am assured that the problem of citizenship so far as the colored race is concerned is not settled. The presence of the African among us, it is said, is a great misfortune and causes national intellectual stagnation. So it is said of the Chinese, and they must go. For the same crime the colored people must follow whenever it suits our interest or caprice to so decree.

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

> Does anybody pretend to tell me that it is a blessing to this country that those 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 to-day, and the question of the adjustment of the relations between the two races socially and politically is no nearer to a settlement now than it was the day Sumter was fired upon.
>
> The philosophy of the history of every age and our experience of the last seventeen years justify me in making the prophecy that the African race will never be permitted permanently to dominate any State of the South. The experiment of conferring upon them political power in proportion to their numbers has thus far proved a dismal failure, and in my judgment will so continue as long as human nature is as it is. The failure has not been because we have not done everything we could to make it succeed, but because laws independent of and above all human laws have irrevocably stamped upon the one race its superiority over the other.

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BUCKNER] echoes in bolder voice that the colored man, like the Chinaman, must go. He says:

> I have thrown out these suggestions with no expectation that the country is yet ripe for the temperate and calm consideration of the future of the African race on this continent. It may require scores of years of experiment before the country will be convinced that the African is an element of peril and weakness in our social and political system, which, like the Chinese, must be eliminated at any cost. But I have a fixed conviction that every recurring year will add to the number of those who believe that voluntary colonization and a separation of the two races can alone furnish a solution to this difficult problem. In the mean time I congratulate the country upon its return to the domain of practical wisdom and common sense in its treatment of the Chinese question and its repudiation of the fallacious dogma that men of every name and tribe and people have equal rights with ourselves in this Union of ours. And I congratulate my Republican friends who support this bill that they have emancipated themselves for once from the influence of transcendental theorists, sublimated humanitarians, jesuitical ecclesiastics, woman suffragists, and that numerous class who seek to
>
> Compound for sins they are inclined to
> By damning those they have no mind to.

These declarations sound the alarm. Is it true that the political relations of the colored race with us are no nearer a settlement than they were when the war began? Is the experiment of conferring political power on it a dismal failure? Must we "eliminate" the African as we do the Chinese? A measure conceived in a spirit of ostracism, and supported by the logic of hate, as this is, cannot have my vote. Call me theorist, transcendentalist, or what you will, no bill can have my humble support that intrenches itself in a doctrine that would destroy the rights and liberties of four million American citizens, however poor, black, or humble they may be.

Before I conclude, sir, I must refer briefly to another matter. It has been charged with great warmth that the Republican who votes against this bill violates his party pledges. I deny it. I deny that any platform ever committed the Republican party to support this bill, or to violate an existing treaty. On this question my party 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 down a solemn treaty made with the Chinese people, the Republican party was true to its faith and saved the nation from dishonor by an Executive veto.

The party is fully committed to 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 to human liberty. It will not surrender its traditions or its faith to accommodate the passions or prejudices of any section. It is to-day, as it has ever been, the friend of the laboring classes and of the oppressed and unfortunate. It converted three millions of slaves into free laborers, and smote the auction blocks and slave pens where laboring men and women were bought and sold. Its proudest achievement was in rescuing a helpless race, who were "hewers of wood and drawers of water," from the degredation and barbarism of servile slavery. This record of an accomplished work—a work wrought through persecution and martyrdom—is worth ten thousand confessions of political faith. Whenever, sir, the Republican party abandons the just for the expedient, or fails in its courage to denounce the popular wrong or defend the unpopular right, it will be unworthy its past glory or the respect of a Christian people.

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

Mr. DAWES. The evil to be remedied by the passage of this bill has been stated by the honorable gentleman from Virginia as the threatened danger of a conflict between the Caucasian and Mongolian races upon the shores of the Pacific. He has formulated the existing conditions by the estimate that there are now 150,000 Chinese in the midst of a million and a half of our own people on the Pacific slope. The rate of increase of this evil of Mongolian intermixture has been estimated by another gentleman as at 1,000 per month excess of Chinese immigration over Chinese emigration.

To legislate to protect a million and a half of our own citizens against the irruption of vicious, diseased, criminal, and lawless classes; to legislate to prevent importation of servile labor under contract, or the introduction of any form of serfdom or slavery, or organized oppression of the poor that degrades or debases them, or brings free laborers in competition or in conflict with laborers who are not free, would seem to be a duty of this crisis. To remedy the evils existing and threatened we are asked to pass this bill.

It is a proposition of the bill that no one of the 436,000,000 of people in China shall hereafter be admitted to citizenship in this nation. A proposition of this bill is that the laboring class of one-third of the population of the whole earth shall, for twenty years, be absolutely excluded from this nation. These startling propositions are so utterly at variance with our history, so at variance with the most cherished sentiments of our people, so at variance with the principles supposed to lie at the foundation of our political system, which presumes the universal equality of rights under the law of all men, that the burden of argument for their support is wholly thrown upon their defenders. They have accepted this fact and they have argued that this people, embracing a third portion of the human race, will not assimilate with our people—that those who have sought our shores are heathen in religion, leprous in body, infected with small-pox, that they are mere sojourners for a time with a fixed purpose to return their bodies or their bones to China, and that they

are vicious and beastly in their personal habits, and without virtue in their family relations, and that their cheap labor takes away from the American laborer his opportunity for employment and degrades his calling and his wages. It is argued also that this fountain of uncleanliness is but opened and unless its flow is stopped a foul and overwhelming stream will flow over the land and endanger if not submerge American civilization.

Suppose we grant every count in this terrible indictment against the heathen Chinee. Shall, then, this great nation acknowledge to the world that its fundamental proposition is a failure and that it cannot govern and restrain the vicious who are in its midst; cannot quarantine and exclude the diseased; cannot enforce obedience to its laws; cannot grapple with the simplest problems of police regulation with reference to a poor, despised, physically and politically powerless people in our midst? Shall our Christian civilization and enlightenment proclaim itself baffled by a handful of heathen in our gates, and shall we surrender our dearest principles and, as my colleague from Ohio has put it, following China, build a wall around ourselves that will exclude one-third of the people of the earth? There are fifty millions of us in this land and about a hundred thousand of them. The excess of immigration over emigration is 1,000 per week. Shall we strike our flag to this pusillanimous army? Cannot we treat with the enemy in some other way, if we are obliged to make terms? The day that this nation raises up a wall against laborers, Chinese, Japanese, or Portuguese, any other designation of nationality would equally illustrate the principle, that day it has receded from its place among the nations as the one free government of the laboring people, where all are welcome to enjoy the blessings of freedom and the universal equality of man under the law. Gentlemen say this is mere sentiment. But beware how you fly in the face of mere sentiment in this land. It is the glory and the safety of our nationality that the power of the people invoked by appeal to a noble sentiment has always borne down and overcome the power aroused by appeal to prejudice.

The men of Valley Forge had no shoes on their feet, no coats on their backs, no money in their pockets, but they had in their souls the sentiment that all men are equal and endowed by a common Creator with rights, and for that sentiment they tracked the snow with blood and fought the battle through. With their victory they established a Government with that sentiment of human equality and human rights for the corner-stone of the structure. For this sentiment, in one form or another, millions of hearts have swelled and thousands have died in battle, and hence was born this nation and hence it lives to-day. This bill is a measure of international policy. It is the first step backward in our history to adopt before the nations a measure that will be accepted by the world as our acknowledgment that so far as one-third of the human family is concerned, especially its laborers, we concede that it cannot, and we decree that it shall not, share in the freedom, the equality of rights, the civilization, the religion, the opportunity for enlightenment and progress afforded by this great leading government of the people on the earth. I will use the expression before it is forever robbed from our Fourth of July orations by the passage of this bill, "This asylum for the down-trodden and oppressed of all nations."

This bill asks too much. Its proposition cannot be safely assented to, and its passage in its present form should be resisted. I do not deny that the demand for some proper form of relief is pressing, and Congress should turn no deaf ear to the cry. Exclusion of the criminal class, exclusion, perhaps, of the incorrigible and grossly vicious, exclusion of the diseased will do, but exclusion of the laborer, exclusion of a people, cannot be excused in this nation. If this Government should enter upon a policy or assert a principle that would exclude one single, peaceably diposed, law-abiding laboring-man from Europe, all Christendom and the Democratic party would rise up and protest. Can we justify this action toward that vast nation of Asia by asking the world to believe that among her four hundred and thirty-six millions of people no peaceably disposed, law-abiding laborers exist? Or if we exclude them as laborers, have not we given warning that laborers are not wanted here?

Gentlemen cannot escape this dilemma by wild talk about the policy of protecting labor. It is a policy of excluding labor that you announce to the world. There are skilled and unskilled laborers in Europe as well as China. There are skilled and unskilled laborers in Asiatic Russia, and the line that divides them from China is but a shadow. Dare you fence them off in your policy of protecting labor? Gentlemen are safer in holding on to first principles and seeking some solution of this perplexing problem that does not involve their betrayal. They may find themselves straying into Democratic pastures where the prejudices of race against race, class against class, laborer against laborer, are played upon as pieces upon the political chess-board. The Republican party has no life or hope in any such policies, but it can have strength only in holding fast to and forever defending the principles of equal rights and equal justice and universal freedom that it was created to defend.

I do not believe that American civilization and progress are yet in danger of being obstructed or retarded in their onward flow; but I believe the pure and mighty stream will absorb and wash away all foulness from such admixtures as are likely to come from the stagnant pool of Asiatic civilization.

The problem to be solved is a specific relief for a specific evil. There is no impending conflict between the Mongolian and Caucasian races. If there is, God pity the Mongolians, for their days are numbered on the face of the earth. The mighty and organized power of Caucasian civilization will soon sweep them and destroy the effete and powerless Mongolian.

The evil is the importation of servile laborers, of diseased and lewd persons, criminals, and paupers. I will vote for any measure that is directed to the correction of the evil. But no necessity to use the words of my eloquent colleague is upon me to vote to exclude the laborers, skilled and unskilled, of one-third of the human race; to vote to forbid the naturalization of any citizen of China; to vote to place this nation subject to the charge of punic faith in treaty obligation; to vote to revive a relic of slavery by establishing a system of passports and registration in this land of freedom; and, worst of all, to vote to fan the fierce flame of prejudice against a race of human beings, created by the same God as we are, endowed with emotions, capabilities of feelings 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 ably and justly argued. In the few minutes I shall occupy I shall confine myself to the practical questions which are so apparent that he who runs may read. For, sir, while I shall I hope be faithful to the interests of the people of Massachusetts whom I have the honor in part to represent, I cannot forget I am also to take care in the discharge of my sworn duty 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 triumphant in the markets of the world, their constituents as well as mine will reap 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 inconsiderate action we shall all suffer equal loss. Therefore, to listen to the siren voice of some promised political and temporary advantage is not only bad policy in statesmen who seek enduring national growth and success, but it is a crime against the generations 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 complete has been our successful competition in these markets as against England, our great competitor, that for years a wail has gone up from the English press over the downfall of a rich trade which had become to be believed to belong to England as almost of right. The 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 Hall, Anson Burlingame, came here with the first mission from China to the United States it was hailed with a joy only equaled by the dismay it created in foreign courts.

And, Mr. Speaker, the advantages which accrued to us from these friendly relations were real, and have been already stated in this discussion 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 manifested toward us a friendship that has endured the severest strain, but we 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 not drawn one-tenth of the profit from the United States to China that our adventurous citizens in China have drawn from that empire to our shores, to be added to the aggregate of our national wealth. Besides, Chinamen bring labor to develop the boundless resources of our country, while we have ships, iron implements, and manufactured goods of infinite variety to sell, and China and India furnish a most tempting and certain market for their sale.

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 the same men ask us to close altogether our commerce with an empire that supplies the largest market in the world for the consumption of our industrial products!

The losses which are to ensue to us upon this legislation are un-

doubted. They are not justified by national honor or some supreme necessity. On the contrary they are in direct violation of our plighted faith and in opposition to every interest of our people. What, then, can be the motive for action so strange and disastrous? It is, Mr. Speaker, not far to find. Let me state it sharply and clearly and boldly. California, Nevada, and Oregon are supposed to hold the balance of political power in the next Presidential contest, and party leaders for party success cater to the labor element of those three States which has the possession of the ballot.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLOR] applied the touch-stone to this whole scheme when he said 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 compete with them in the labor market. It is unjust to the Chinese 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 too dear for 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 un-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 dishonest and dangerous proposition; but on more mature reflection I became satisfied that the people of my State will demand that I shall speak as well as vote against 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 briefest manner possible.

Ostensibly and in theory this purports to be a bill "to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to the Chinese," but practically and 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 unaccountable that a country inhabited 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 its territory a wall against foreigners, deeper and broader and higher 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 vast influx 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 emblazoned, in characters of living light, the immortal declaration that all men are politically free and equal before 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 declaration which not only violates a solemn compact, makes a distinction between races, but which actually discriminates against labor.

The great principle of the right of every man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is 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 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; and
>
> Whereas in the recognition of this principle this Government has freely received emigrants from all nations, and invested them with the rights of citizenship.

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 his natural liberty, and without that his liberty is defective. We claim that the right to liberty is a natural, inherent, God-given right, and his liberty is imperfect unless it carries with it the right of expatriation.

This bill is a bold and audacious denial of this great principle of expatriation; it is a declaration limiting and circumscribing human rights; it flies in the face of the spirit and genius of our institutions, and would, if it should become a law, fix a stigma and a blot upon the history of our country of the past hundred years.

The title of this bill indicates, as I have already said, that its object is "to execute 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—

> Whenever in the opinion of the Government of the United States the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States, or their residence therein, affects or threatens to affect the interests of that country, or to endanger the good order of the said country or any locality within the territory thereof, the Government of China agrees that the Government of the United States may regulate, limit, or suspend such coming or residence, but may not absolutely prohibit it. The limitation or suspension shall be reasonable and shall apply only to Chinese who may go to the United States as laborers, other classes not being included in the limitations. Legislation taken in regard to Chinese laborers will be of such a character only as is necessary to enforce the regulation, limitation, or suspension of immigration, and immigrants shall not be subject to personal maltreatment or abuse.

The terms of this article of the treaty are clear, concise, and free from all ambiguity. It is as plain as the English language can make it, that the only power we have under this treaty is to "regulate, limit, or suspend in a reasonable manner such coming or residence" of Chinese laborers, and this power is accompanied with a distinct 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 laborers to 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 terms of the treaty, and a flagrant violation of our solemn agreement.

In view of this undeniable conclusion, I desire to ask gentlemen whether they think this great Government of ours, which claims to be and is the light and hope of the world, can afford 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 commit such a wrong against China 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. Admit they do; are we to pass it, if it is wrong, to please them? 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 ask us to violate our treaty 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 lucre or political preferment.

If the one hundred and five thousand Chinamen now in this country were armed with the freeman's great weapon of defense, the ballot, you would never have heard of this bill, the eloquent lips of gentlemen who advocate it would be silent, and we should not now be haunted 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 so much do they fear the power of the ballot, even in the hands of these "heathen Chinee," that in order to guard against all contingencies, they provide in section sixteen of the bill that "hereafter no State court or court of the United States shall admit Chinese to citizenship." We are told that we ought to vote for this bill because both political parties have recommended it in their national platforms.

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 advocate 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; that party is made up of a band of Esaus, who are ever ready to sell their birthright for a mess of political pottage: but I deny most emphatically, and challenge contradiction, that any word, sentence, or clause can be found in the Republican platform recommending or foreshadowing such a measure as this. That platform is before me, and I will call the attention of the House to the plank relating to this subject. Hear it, consider it, and mark it well:

> 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 treaty-making power, the Republican party, regarding the unrestricted immigration of the Chinese as an evil of great magnitude, invoke the exercise of those powers to restrain and limit that immigration by the enactment of such just, humane, 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 repudiation of long and well-established principles; there is no national dishonor, but the foreshadowing 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 into this country. To such legislation no reasonable man would object, and such a bill would command the voice and vote of every Republican in this House. I would by all just and reasonable measures, when necessary, protect our people from the evils of the so-called "cooly labor," from criminals, from prostitutes and diseased persons, by providing by the most stringent regulations that such persons should not be landed upon our shores from China or any other country. Such a law would be just and wholesome, would protect the people of California and Nevada, as well as every other portion of the country, and would violate no established principle or solemn compact.

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 record; while I believe it has saved this country and under God will preserve it; yet, if it could so far forget its origin and inspiration, if it could for a moment lose sight of its past achievements and grand 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 do uninfluenced by any platform and unawed 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 protect the people and satisfy every demand of justice and humanity.

The claim made that the Chinese should be excluded because they do not, and never will, assimilate with our people, is scarcely worth our notice. The same objection was made to the Irishman in 1854–'55 under the lead of the Know-nothing organization, and to the negro, previous to 1861, by the people of the South; but these prophecies have all proved false, the fears then expressed groundless, and 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 seem to render it 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 you extend 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 naturalized.

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 associate with Americans or hardly to come out of his dwelling? How can you expect him to become Americanized or become familiar with your ways and customs, when you will not tolerate him in your presence or allow him to come in contact 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 you 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 China from coming in contact with our own, and this crazy fear of allowing Chinese labor to come 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.

Sir, 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 trial against the foolish mockeries and false gods of paganism. I am not ready to concede that free, educated American labor must crouch down and abandon the field when brought in competition with the servile labor of 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 the crescent will give way to the cross, and freedom will triumph over slavery; and instead of destroying the votaries of this false religion and degrading dogma, Christianity will enroll them among her supporters and use them to extend and strengthen her kingdom.

As a nation we have always been taught, and have acted upon the theory, that error is never dangerous when truth and reason are left free to combat it. I am therefore not alarmed for our civilization, and under humane and reasonable provisions of law and proper municipal regulations limiting and restraining, when necessary, the immigration of foreigners to our shores, I have no fears that our laborers will suffer in consequence of being brought into competition with them either in California or anywhere else.

Will any man contend for a moment that American laborers have been degraded or their condition made worse by the immense immigration which has been poured in upon our shores for the past fifty years from every nation on the globe? Why, sir, "while the emigrant has bettered his own condition" and increased his happiness by coming among us, he has increased the wages of the American workman by his presence, and "has raised to a higher grade of social life and wealth the American laborer whose place he has taken."

While I do not claim that a large influx of Chinese would be either desirable or profitable, yet I have no present fears regarding them, and cannot consent to join in this hue and cry, got up by interested and prejudiced persons, many of them no better than the Chinese, who would resort to any measure however wicked, unjust, and cruel to get rid of them.

I do not claim that they are paragons of virtue and morality, or deny that they are, to some extent, afflicted with the failings and vices of the rest of mankind, yet I do claim that they are an industrious race, that they are economical, that they never beg, seldom get drunk, are never lazy, and if we are to credit those who have lived among them and ought to know, they are quiet, peaceable, law-abiding, faithful to trusts, and are rarely, if ever, found in a court of justice either as a party in a civil suit or as respondent in a criminal prosecution. These commendable things, if true, should certainly be set down to their credit in the terrible reckoning you propose by this bill now to have with them.

I am utterly unable, Mr. Speaker, to understand the reasoning or arguments of those gentlemen who oppose this bill in its present form, but intimate that they would vote for it if the time of prohibition was reduced from twenty to five or even ten years. I would not vote for it if the time was reduced to one year, or even one hour, because I believe the total prohibition of these people from our shores for any length of time, however short, is not only unnecessary and uncalled for, but that it is a cowardly repudiation, in our dealings with a weak nation, of a just and long-established principle in our Government, as well as a bold and open violation of the letter and spirit of our solemn treaty obligations with the people of China.

It seems to me, then, that those gentlemen who base their opposition to this bill on the ground that the time is too long, and say they would vote for it if the time was reduced, abandon the whole field, give away the whole case, and might as well vote for the bill as it is. If we have the right under the terms of the treaty to prohibit this immigration for one year, then we have for ten; and if for ten, then for twenty, and so on forever. But the fact is, we have no right to do it for a single moment even, and if some first-class European power stood in the place of good-natured, peaceable China, we never should have attempted it. Aside from the great question of human liberty and personal right involved in the passage of this bill, I would oppose it on the ground of public policy.

Down to fourteen years ago China had been for centuries as a sealed book to the rest of the world. At that time Mr. Burlingame opened the gates of that rich empire to the trade and commerce of the world, and since that our trade with that people has been both large and profitable. Can any man doubt that the passage of this bill, so unjust to China, such a bold open violation of the letter and spirit of our treaty, will greatly injure if not entirely destroy that trade? Such, it seems to me, must be the inevitable result; and in the light of this fact is not this question worth considering, before we are led by prejudice and blind hate to commit an act at once so unnecessary, dishonest, and dangerous?

Sir, it seems to me that the people of California should be the last people on earth to attempt to commit the Government to such a dangerous and disgraceful heresy as is contained in this bill. In the halcyon days of her history, before "sand-lot orators" and red-mouthed communists had obtained control of her government, California was controlled by men who knew the difference between mob violence and liberty protected by law. The stalwart pioneers who had emigrated to her golden shores not only from every State in the Union but from nearly every country on the globe knew the value of human liberty and the inestimable blessings of free government. Actuated by this great principle and imbued with this spirit they declared in her organic law that "We, the people of California, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, in order to secure its blessings do establish this constitution."

DECLARATION OF RIGHTS.

SECTION 1. All men are by nature free and independent, and have certain inalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and defending property, and pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

* * * * * * *

SEC. 17. Foreigners who are or who may hereafter become bona fide residents of this State shall enjoy the same rights in respect to the possession, enjoyment, and inheritance of property as native-born citizens.

This was the deep and broad foundation upon which the State was built, and upon this she must forever stand if she stands at all.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and to sum up my objections to this bill, permit me to say that I am opposed to it—

Because it is in violation of the terms of the treaty of 1880, with China;

Because it is hostile to the spirit of our institutions;

Because it is in direct antagonism with the great principles of our civilization;

Because it is in contradiction of the policy we have always pursued toward all other nations;

Because it is a bold and unwarrantable repudiation of our national declarations on this subject;

Because it is a false and unnecessary admission, in a public law, that we have been wrong for two hundred and eighty years;

Because it is building the same wall against China which she kept up against the world for centuries, and which we helped England to pull down;

Because it is a deadly blow at our growing commerce with one of the richest kingdoms on the globe;

Because it is a palpable violation of the terms of the Republican platform of 1880;

Because foreign immigration more than anything else has built up this country and given us prosperity and greatness;

Because 105,000 Chinamen, even if they are as bad as gentlemen claim, distributed among 50,000,000 Americans can give no just cause of alarm.

Mr. Speaker, I am profoundly impressed with the importance of the great principle involved in this bill.

In the consideration I have given it, I have not been influenced by passion or prejudice.

I have endeavored to look at it from the high stand-point of national honor and true statesmanship.

I am sure this bill ought not to pass, and that every man who votes for it will in the end most deeply regret it.

I would protect our people from the evils growing out of foreign immigration by the humane, just, and reasonable legislation I have already suggested, and beyond this I would welcome men from all lands and climes.

I would bring them in contact with our civilization, teach them our language and laws, instruct them in our labors and industries, educate them in our schools and colleges, let them feel the power and influence of our holy religion, inspire them with our hopes and patriotism, imbue them with our ambition, as fast as possible melt and crystallize them into our social life, and then set upon their heads the crowning glory of American citizenship.

If we pursue this policy in the future as we have in the past we shall go on conquering and to conquer until barbarism shall disappear, the cross supplant the idol, the teeming millions of the world acknowledge our power, and the whole earth bow down before the majestic genius of our civilization.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. 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 during the week or ten days that this bill has been under discussion, and fearing I may have no other opportunity to express my views upon it, I embrace the present though not very inviting opportunity.

I cannot vote for the bill as it now reads, and now express the hope that it will have amendments made to it before the final vote shall be taken. I have no controversy to make with many of the gentlemen who have addressed the House upon the bill, and do not propose in the ten minutes allowed me to discuss the various provisions of the bill. I do not sympathize with some of the views which have been expressed here by gentlemen who have advocated the passage of this bill.

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 incursions which may come to us from Asia or any other part of the world. I assume this position because of our national history. From the very beginning we have been a nation eminently American and our peculiarly distinctive character has not been at all damaged from the very earliest period of our history down to the present time. We have retained our present national character throughout our entire history, notwithstanding this annual and large influx of seemingly incongruous elements coming into the body-politic.

I claim, Mr. Speaker, that this results not simply from our political and civil institutions but also because of our Christian civilization. We are not afraid of these incoming elements, and I insist, sir, that we are more intensely republican to-day than we have ever been in the history of the nation; American republicanism has gained strength year by year, and at this very hour we are able to receive into our embraces as a nation whatsoever may come to us.

I clearly admit that those men who come to us from Asia do not come to us as the other elements have come, and also admit all that may be said in this direction; yet I do not think that a great nation of fifty millions, with institutions broad and generous and liberal, meeting the aspirations of every human breast, need be particularly alarmed about the incoming of a hundred thousand Mongolians. I hardly agree with my colleague [Mr. WASHBURN] who spoke yesterday. He spoke with force, with eloquence, and with good logic, yet I hardly agree with him in his conclusions that American labor is just now put in peril by the immigration from Asia. When this peril shall impend the laboring men of the country, then we will seek a treaty under which we can honorably suspend, fully and forever.

But I rose to speak more in reference to the treaty which we have with China. We all remember the congratulations which the nation claimed for itself from the other nations of the world when we opened the walls of China, and when we made the progress we did in bringing about the original Burlingame treaty. It was claimed that America had achieved the great triumph of the age. We had opened the walls of Japan, we had opened the walls of China, and we had brought about commercial relations with those great nations. We made ourselves proud in our congratulations over our achievements at that time.

After that treaty was ratified and went into operation we have lately had another treaty made. And I say to the gentlemen from California, and to every man who advocates the passage of this bill, that I here reach my stone of stumbling. I will not here or elsewhere find fault with gentlemen who have argued the passage of this bill. I do not propose to combat the views which they have presented, but when we come to the present existing treaty I find my trouble. It hardly will do for a great nation like the Republic of America to make a treaty with any nation and then trifle with its terms and conditions. A nation gets nothing of honor, gets nothing of glory in the family of nations when it in the slightest degree shall trifle with its solemn stipulations.

In this late negotiation the people of the United States said to China, "Enter into another treaty with us, and among other things agree that we may suspend immigration of your people into the United States for a 'reasonable' period." That is our declaration to them. Whether we went too far or otherwise is not the question. We solemnly declared to China, and at the same time we solemnly declared to all the other treaty-making nations of the world that if we did propose suspension that suspension should be reasonable.

Now, right here, I say again I find my difficulty in voting for this bill. If the friends of this bill are wise and are willing to yield the concessions which are demanded, they will consent to strike out the word "twenty" and to insert the word "ten." When the friends of the bill consent to that amendment, then my trouble ceases, and my vote will be secured for the bill as thus amended.

Will the nations of the world say that a suspension of immigration for twenty years is reasonable? Will not the world rather say that twenty years is an unreasonable length of time for a suspension? As some gentlemen have said, a suspension of twenty years is equivalent to a suspension for the life-time of a generation; that it operates as a total and complete suspension.

Fix the time of suspension at twenty years, and during that time all the results of the past will be lost; we will lose not only the commerce that would come to this nation from China, but we put ourselves in the attitude of trifling with the nation with whom we have sought treaty stipulations.

In this city is the house where resides the Chinese minister. He is an intelligent gentleman and worthily represents the ancient Empire of China near the seat of our Government. If I should vote for a suspension of twenty years, I could not ride past that house without feeling that I had played a trick on that nation, and by my vote had indorsed an action that the nation he represents had not agreed to in the treaty.

I have said that here and just here I find the ground of my opposition to this bill. A suspension of immigration for twenty years is unreasonable. By the statesmen of England, by the statesmen of the world, a suspension of twenty years will not be deemed a reasonable suspension. If unreasonable in the slightest degree, then what have we gained for ourselves other than a national taint which will do us infinite damage, not simply now, but throughout all the years to come?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ORTH. Mr. Speaker, the principles involved in the bill now under discussion are as important as any that can be brought to the consideration of Congress or the attention of the country.

The grave question is presented whether sufficient cause exists for our Government and people to cast aside the cherished traditions of our past history—to repeal, at least by implication, the laws which by common consent, have been placed on our statute-book; to infringe upon the spirit if not the letter of treaties most solemnly ratified and to adopt a policy in direct opposition to the genius of our institutions and the cherished principles of the fathers.

Congress is now deliberating whether we shall forsake those principles, turn our backs upon those traditions which adorn the most brilliant pages of our history, and take a backward step which if followed to its logical sequence will, in my judgment, place us but little in advance of the times known in history as the "dark ages" of the world. Let us not forget that this deliberation and proposed action is taking place in the closing hours of the nineteenth century, a century which stands out most pre-eminently in man's history as having witnessed more substantial reforms in human government, as having conferred greater benefits and blessings on mankind col-

lectively and individually, as having made more rapid and permanent advancement in learning, in morals, in science, in practical human knowledge, in the elevation and improvement of mankind than any other century or any half dozen centuries which have preceded it. And in all this grand march, in all these sublime achievements, the American Government and the American people have nobly held the unchallenged leadership.

From the landing at Plymouth Rock, from the settlement at Jamestown down through all our varied history, our people have placed themselves on God's word and announced their belief that He had "made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." This is the foundation stone upon which our people have erected the grandest structure of human government known to man's history.

The first political document promulgated by the feeble colonies in vindication of their action formulated this faith into the declaration that "all men are created equal," "endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which is" "the pursuit of happiness," and from which followed as an inevitable corollary the doctrine of expatriation, which is the right of man to go wheresoever his tastes, his judgment, or his interests might lead him.

And yet we are gravely told in this debate that these are mere "sentiments," opinions founded merely on passion or feeling. Our entire history and the character and conduct of our people contradict such an assumption. The doctrine of "expatriation" or the right of migration is coeval with our national existence, and for which we never ceased to contend until it was conceded by all nations, and on the 27th day of July, 1868, we placed the following declaration on our statute-book, namely:

Whereas 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; and

Whereas in the recognition of this principle this Government has freely received emigrants from all nations, and invested them with the rights of citizenship.

It is rather a remarkable coincidence that on the very day following the passage of the foregoing law, namely, July 28, 1868, we formed our (Burlingame) treaty with China, and which contains this clause:

The United States of America and the Emperor of China cordially recognize the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance, and also the mutual advantage of the free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects respectively from the one country to the other for purposes of curiosity, of trade, or as permanent residents.

I ask again, 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 our treaties, and is the practical 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 case too strongly when I say that the doctrine embraced in this bill is as important as any that can engage our attention? By its passage you strike a blow at the right of migration which might hereafter affect the emigrant from other lands than China. If we shall for some supposed grievance say to the Chinese you shall not come, what is there to prevent, in the frenzy of some fancied evil, the extension of this wall of exclusion to other nations? I grant you, there is at present no apparent danger of this being done, but who can forecast the horoscope of the future, with all its varied phases of ambition, self-interest, excitement, or prejudice, which will then appeal for justification and precedent to the law which we now propose to enact and to the policy which its enactment will inaugurate?

It is but recently, as we apply time to nations, that we desired to bring ourselves into relations with the nations of the East, with China and Japan, whose history and characteristics were to the outside world a sealed book. It could, however, readily be conjectured that the labor, the ingenuity, the productions of its teeming millions, would be an important factor in the future commerce of the Pacific Ocean, and bring untold wealth to the nations which should be so fortunate as to control their trade and commerce.

After the acquisition of California and the rapid settlement of Oregon it became apparent that the commerce of the Pacific would in the near future rival that of the Atlantic; that it would naturally belong to us, and that if we stretched out a friendly hand in honest welcome it would come to our shores.

We extended the welcome, and on the 28th day of July, 1868, a treaty was negotiated between the United States and China, which, among others, contains the following provisions, alike liberal and honorable to both nations, namely:

ARTICLE V.

The United States of America and the Emperor of China cordially recognize the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance, and also the mutual advantage of the free migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects, respectively, from one country to the other, for the purpose of curiosity, of trade, or as permanent residents. The high contracting parties, therefore, join in reprobating any other than an entirely voluntary emigration for these purposes. They consequently agree to pass laws making it a penal offense for a citizen of the United States or Chinese subject to take Chinese subjects either to the United States or to any other foreign country, or for a Chinese subject or citizen of the United States to take citizens of the United States to China or to any other foreign country, without their free and voluntary consent respectively.

ARTICLE VI.

Citizens of the United States visiting or residing in China shall enjoy the same privileges, immunities, or exemptions in respect to travel or residence as may there be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most favored nation. And, reciprocally, Chinese subjects visiting or residing in the United States shall enjoy the same privileges, immunities, and exemptions in respect to travel or residence as may there be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most favored nation. But nothing herein contained shall be held to confer naturalization upon citizens of the United States in China, nor upon the subjects of China in the United States.

ARTICLE VII.

Citizens of the United States shall enjoy all the privileges of the public educational institutions under the control of the Government of China; and reciprocally Chinese subjects shall enjoy all the privileges of the public educational institutions under the control of the Government of the United States which are enjoyed in the respective countries by the citizens or subjects of the most favored nation. The citizens of the United States may freely establish and maintain schools within the Empire of China at those places where foreigners are by treaty permitted to reside, and, reciprocally, Chinese subjects may enjoy the same privileges and immunities in the United States.

When said treaty was ratified the number of Chinese already in this country did not exceed 60,000. The census of 1870, the year after, showed the actual number then in this country to be 62,736, while the number now in this country, as shown by the census of 1880, is 105,448, showing an increase of immigration in ten years of only 42,712. Are these figures so alarming as to require of us this most extraordinary legislation?

Taking the same ratio of decennial increase, how long in the distant future will it be before their numbers in our country will seriously threaten the existence of our institutions and our civilization? And yet, preposterous as is the assertion, it is seriously made by the advocates of this bill. A so-called "public sentiment," however created or for what purposes created, demanded a change if not an entire abrogation of that treaty, and during the last year, 1881, we urged its reformation. The Chinese Government most reluctantly consented to a modification, as follows, namely:

ARTICLE I.

Whenever in the opinion of the Government of the United States the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States, or their residence therein, affects or threatens to affect the interests of that country, or to endanger the good order of the said country or of any locality within the territory thereof, the Government of China agrees that the Government of the United States may regulate, limit, or suspend such coming or residence, but may not absolutely prohibit it. The limitation or suspension shall be reasonable, and shall apply only to Chinese who may go to the United States as laborers, other classes not being included in the limitations. Legislation taken in regard to Chinese laborers will be of such a character only as is necessary to enforce the regulation, limitation, or suspension of immigration, and immigrants shall not be subject to personal maltreatment or abuse.

ARTICLE II.

Chinese subjects, whether proceeding to the United States as teachers, students, merchants, or from curiosity, together with their body and household servants, and Chinese laborers who are now in the United States, shall be allowed to go and come of their own free will and accord, and shall be accorded all the rights, privileges, immunities, and exemptions which are accorded to the citizens and subjects of the most favored nations.

ARTICLE III.

If Chinese laborers, or Chinese of any other class, now either permanently or temporarily residing in the territory of the United States, meet with ill treatment at the hands of any other persons, the Government of the United States will exert all its power to devise measures for their protection and to secure to them the same rights, privileges, immunities, and exemptions as may be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most favored nation, and to which they are entitled by treaty.

ARTICLE IV.

The high contracting powers having agreed upon the foregoing articles, whenever the Government of the United States shall adopt legislative measures in accordance therewith such measures will be communicated to the Government of China. If the measures as enacted are found to work hardships upon the subjects of China the Chinese minister at Washington may bring the matter to the notice of the Secretary of State of the United States, who will consider the subject with him; and the Chinese foreign office may also bring the matter to the notice of the United States minister at Peking and consider the subject with him, to the end that mutual and unqualified benefit may result.

It is by virtue of this modification of the treaty that it is sought to pass this bill, and the reasons given for its passage are more manifold than cogent. Let us examine them.

Among these are—

First. The great influx will endanger our institutions. I have already given the number, both when the Burlingame treaty was ratified and by the census of 1880. I repeat there is nothing alarming in these numbers. There is one Chinaman for every five hundred Americans, and I submit it is not creditable to our manhood to assert that the five hundred Americans are likely to be overcome by the "one heathen Chinee." Then again it is well known that they are by no means a migratory people, nor aggressive in their character. For centuries they have occupied about the same territory, and never disturbed that of their neighbors.

Secondly. They do not speak our language. If we confined our immigrants to the English-speaking nations of the world we should not count them as we do now, by the thousands and tens of thousands who annually seek our land.

Thirdly. They do not wear our kind of clothes. This is doubtless owing to the belief that their mode of dress is more becoming to the human form than the style to which we are accustomed. But who among us felt like raising this objection to the hundreds of Mennonites who lately emigrated from Russia, settled in Kansas, and still dress in the sheep-skin clothes so universally worn by the inhabitants of the plains of Russia?

Fourthly. They are pagans. The crowning glory of our policy lies in the fact that it neither recognizes nor enforces any form of religion,

but leaves that question to the individual conscience of every citizen. We have never excluded any immigrant on account of his 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; why repel him 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 does not immediately on his arrival repair to the "sand lots" 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 give him an interest in our Government or permit him to assume the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. We deny to him the rights which we cheerfully accord to every other immigrant, 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. When he dies 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 untenable. In 1876 Congress, in obedience to the general desire for a thorough investigation of this subject, appointed a joint committee of both Houses, of which the late lamented Senator Morton was chairman. They repaired to the Pacific coast and entered upon a most exhaustive examination of all facts bearing or tending to throw light upon this much-talked-of Chinese question. The testimony, taken from citizens of all shades of opinion, and from every occupation in life, forms a volume of 1,253 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 committee, and the authenticity of these views admits of no cavil or doubt. I shall briefly refer to these views, remarking that they are eminently worthy the head and the heart of the distinguished statesman.

My colleague, [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 to attempt to exclude them altogether, or so restrict immigration 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.

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

In my judgment he 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 Morton report fully bears me out in my position:

As Americans, standing upon the great doctrine 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 resurrect 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 complaints and warfare made against them would have existed to any considerable extent. Their difference in color, dress, manners, and religion have, in my judgment, more to do with this hostility than their alleged vices 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 should hesitate before adopting a new policy which would be at variance with the genius of our institutions, and enable the world to say that the principles upon which we professed to establish our Government in the beginning, and upon which we took our place among nations, have yielded to considerations of doubtful expediency, in conflict with our general professions and character. As before stated, our strength as a republic consists in our faithful adherence to the doctrines upon which it was established, and to the education of our people in their truth, without regard to any temporary interest or condition.

Another reason given for their exclusion is that they are unhealthy and likely to spread disease in any community in which they may be located, and especially that the loathsome disease of small-pox prevails constantly among them.

I beg to say that an examination of the "testimony" reported by the joint committee fails entirely to corroborate these statements. I read the following from page 643 of said report:

Arthur B. Stout sworn and examined.

By Mr. BROOKS:

Q. What is your business?

A. I am a physician.

Q. How long have you resided in this State?

A. Since February, 1849.

Q. Have you practiced your profession since that time?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you held any office under the State connected with that profession?

A. Yes, sir; I am now a member of the State board of health. I have had no other official appointment, although I have been in the public hospital as physician.

Q. Where have you resided?

A. In San Francisco, constantly.

Q. How near was your office and residence to what is known as the Chinese quarter?

A. Right in the midst of it.

Q. You built there before the Chinese came to that quarter?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. During your residence there have you known of any disease, any pestilence, originating and spreading in there, or spreading from there?

A. No, sir; none.

Q. The Chinese live in that quarter very closely, do they not?

A. Quite closely, sometimes.

Q. How is it that you account for the fact that under these circumstances they are apparently so healthy?

A. Their frugal life gives them more immunity from disease. They eat only what is necessary to live upon. They eat to live, and do not live to eat. They are clean in their habits, and they drink no whisky. I have never seen a drunken Chinaman in my life. They consequently obtain a better resisting power to the attack of disease.

Q. What is their habit in regard to ablutions?

A. They constantly wash themselves.

Q. The whole person, or only the face and hands?

A. My observation of the men is that they keep themselves clean. Their clothes are clean. As mechanics or workmen they keep themselves very clean.

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the comparative mortality among the Chinese and the whites of this city—the death-rate?

A. The death-rate is greater among the whites than among the Chinese.

Q. What is the comparative mortality among adult Chinamen and adult white people?

A. The amount is greater with adult white people.

Q. Have they had epidemics in the Chinese quarter?

A. No, sir; the small-pox has been among them, as it has been among others, but I think there has been less small-pox among them—I mean the ratio of population allowed—than with the whites. When you come to take up the question of small-pox, I think I can exonerate the Chinese from the charges alleged against them of having introduced it.

And the further charge made during this debate is that "leprosy exists among them all the time." In reference to this disease and its extent among them, Dr. Stout, in his testimony contained in said report says, in response to the question, "What has been your experience in reference to the Chinese leprosy?"

I think that the hue and cry made about it is a farce. Leprosy is a disease of very ancient origin. It had its existence under certain peculiar circumstances of eastern and east European nations. It has come from Europe when it has come here, and that is exceedingly rare, if at all. It is a disease that is rather passing away. It is a disease of a past epoch, which can never return again owing to the different changes of civilization and of life that have occurred.

Leprosy will probably never exist again. It exists in the Sandwich Islands, where it does not extend, partly because it is quarantined. It is considered an incurable disease. I consider it a curable disease under the improved modes of cure that we possess. I have no idea of its contagiousness by quick contagion, as, for instance, if you were to manipulate a person covered with leprosy you would not take the leprosy; although if you manipulated a person with small-pox you might take the small-pox. It is communicable, we may say, by slow degrees. If you were to sleep with a man for six months or a year, be in close contact, get the scurf from the skin upon you, and breathe his breath for a long time, very likely then you might catch the leprosy; but it is one of those chronic diseases which, although in that way contagious, need excite no fear; and it is not near as horrible as other diseases of the skin that we have, such as psoriasis and phthosis, two diseases which are certainly more disgusting and disagreeable than the leprosy.

I have seen the leprosy in the north of Italy. If you exclude a people because a few cases of leprosy have occurred among them you would exclude the Italians, because in Lombardy it is a recognized disease which prevails there all the time.

So also are the charges in reference to the question of Chinese labor and its effect upon white labor. The Chinaman lives cheaply, is industrious and economical; but instead of degrading white labor his presence there tends to elevate it, for the simple reason, if none other, that he seeks and performs a species of labor which the American does not seek nor has any desire to perform. Labor is not cheap in the Pacific, and no one having due respect for the laboring man desires cheap labor anywhere. On this most interesting question Senator Morton was fully competent to speak, and this is his language:

Looking at the question broadly, and at the effect which Chinese labor has exerted in California, running through a period of twenty-five years, I am strongly of the opinion that but for the presence of the Chinese California would not now have more than one-half or two-thirds of her present white population; that Chinese labor has opened up many avenues and new industries for white labor, made many kinds of business possible, and laid the foundation of manufacturing interests that bid fair to rise to enormous proportions; that the presence of the Chinese, holding out the prospect for labor at reasonable rates, induced the transfer of large amounts of capital and immigration to California, and of large numbers of business and enterprising men, thus making California the most inviting field for immigrants from every class of society, including laboring men; and, lastly, that the laboring men of California have ample employment and are better paid than in almost any other part of the country.

* * * * * * *

The testimony shows that the intellectual capacity of the Chinese is fully equal to that of white people. Their ability to acquire the mechanic arts, and to imitate every process and form of workmanship, ranks very high, and was declared by many of the witnesses to be above that of white people; and their general intellectual power to understand mathematics, and master any subject presented to the human understanding, to be quite equal to that of any other race.

* * * * * * *

The evidence established the fact that Chinese labor in California is as free as any other. They all come as free men and are their own masters absolutely. In many cases they borrow their passage-money in China, with an agreement to repay from their earnings in this country, with large interest, an agreement which, to their credit be it said, they rarely fail to perform. Nearly all of them upon their

arrival become members of one or the other of the Six Companies of San Francisco, for which they pay an initiation fee, and through that they do their business, make their contracts for labor, make remittances to China, deposit their money, and make arrangements for the return of their bones to China, should they die. They are much given to corporations and companies, and understand well the power and advantage of combination. They frequently work together in associations under the direction of a head man, who keeps their accounts and transacts their business. The most of the Chinese who come here are young men and boys.

These "views" and conclusions of Senator Morton are based upon a thorough examination of the subject and substantiated by a large mass of testimony collected by his committee, some of which I beg leave to bring to the attention of the House and the country:

John H. Hill sworn and examined:

I came to California in July, 1850; have resided principally in Sonoma County. I have been East occasionally to visit my children, but Sonoma County has been my place of residence; have been a farmer in Sonoma County; cultivator of fruit principally; employ Chinese labor; I find them, from experience, to be temperate, industrious, honest, and good laborers, creating no trouble whatever; is a common practice in Sonoma County to employ Chinese. I think in my neighborhood there must be, perhaps, some five hundred Chinamen employed. It is principally a vine-growing district. They are engaged largely in cultivating the grape for the farmers

Q. Could you get white labor to do that work?

A. I do not think we could. I think it is one of the industrial resources of the country that would have to be abandoned if it depended upon white labor. There are certain seasons of the year when a large accession to the ordinary number of hands is required, when the crop is ripening, and I do not think white men could be got on the spur of the moment to do the work.

Charles Wolcott Brooks, who visited China to study the people and their civilization. Page 941, Congressional report:

Laboring Chinamen, when poor and in debt, live, save, and thrive on wages far below our laborers, because honesty is inculcated in their religion; but experience has shown that after they are forehanded, they become more free in the distribution of their money, purchasing freely what will most conduce to their comfort. Human nature is singularly alike the world over. It is natural to use the gains our labor has brought us. As a people, they are neat, orderly, and skillful; not readily excelled in handicraft; frugal, industrious, teachable, patient, and intelligent. They make excellent house-servants, and may be trained to cook skillfully in any style. When taught by French cooks it is difficult to excel them. With one explanation thoroughly understood, they will need no further instruction or correction. They may occasionally be sullen, but never stupid. They are not given to excessive hilarity, but are quiet, peaceful, and persistent. Their manipulation is careful, and often extraordinary. They would make dexterous cotton-pickers; never bungling ones.

Page 666, Congressional report:

Charles Crocker sworn and examined.

By Mr. BEE:

Q. How long have you been in this State?

A. I have been here twenty-six years.

Q. What has been your business?

A. For the last fifteen or sixteen years I have been building railroads.

* * * * * * *

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. How long have you lived on this coast?

A. Twenty-six years.

Q. You have 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 effect to deprive white men of employment, or have had that effect at any time.

A. I think that they afford 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 drive these seventy-five thousand Chinamen off you would take seventy-five thousand white men from an elevated class of work and put them down to doing this low class of labor that the Chinamen are now doing, and instead of elevating you would degrade white labor to that extent. For any man to ride through California, from one end of this State to the other, and see the miles upon miles of uncultivated land, and in the mountains millions of acres of timber, and the foot-hills waiting for some one to go and cultivate them, and then talk about there being too much labor here in the country is simply nonsense, in my estimation. There is labor for all, and the fact that the Chinamen are here gives an opportunity to white men to go in and cultivate this land where they could not cultivate it otherwise.

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:

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 treaty-making power, the Republican party, regarding the unrestricted immigration of the Chinese as an evil of great magnitude, invokes the exercise of these powers to restrain and limit the immigration by the enactment of such just, humane, and reasonable provisions as will produce that result.

Even admitting for the sake of the argument the binding effect of everything which a political convention sees fit for the occasion to insert in its party platform, this bill differs essentially from the platform. Mark the concluding sentence which declares for an "enactment of just, humane, and reasonable provisions."

I am opposed to the bill because it conflicts with the platform, because it is neither "just, humane, nor reasonable."

A word in conclusion. I admit that there are some evils connected with Chinese immigration. It is not at all surprising that such do exist, but in my judgment they are not so grievous, not so intolerable as is alleged. I will cheerfully support any "just, humane, and reasonable" bill to remedy and remove those evils.

We have the authority to "regulate" immigration; we have frequently exercised this authority in reference to European immigration, but we have done it justly, humanely, and reasonably. But we have no authority, except "the authority of might," to pass such a bill as this. I oppose it because it violates a solemn treaty of the Government. To "suspend" immigration for twenty years amounts to a prohibition, and this is expressly inhibited by the words of the last treaty.

I will vote to exclude (as we have an undoubted right to do) all servile or cooly labor; but I am opposed to this bill because it excludes "all Chinese laborers, whether skilled or unskilled," however moral and upright in all respects. I shall vote against this bill unless it is properly amended, because I am opposed to all legislation founded on "race, color, or previous condition of servitude." We have no such odious laws now upon our statute-book, and no vote of mine shall ever be given to place any there.

Bring us a bill that is not founded on race or color; one that will protect our people from the influx of servile cooly labor; one that will keep us from contact with disease or crime, or from a class of immigrants who are unfit or undesirable members of the body-politic, and no one will give it a more hearty support than myself.

But this proposed legislation is based on race and color, is in derogation of justice and right, subverts the time-honored traditions of the fathers, tramples alike upon treaties and statutes, strikes at the fundamental principles of republicanism, and seeks to rob our nation of the brightest jewels in its coronet of glory.

Mr. COBB. The gentleman from California, General ROSECRANS, is confined to his room by sickness. He has prepared some remarks upon this bill and desires to have them printed in the RECORD. I ask consent that they be so printed.

There was no objection, and leave was granted accordingly. [See Appendix.]

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

Mr. PAGE. If the gentleman will yield to me I will move that the House now adjourn, so that the next legislative day may be commenced at twelve o'clock.

Mr. SHERWIN. I will yield for that purpose.

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

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at eleven o'clock and fifty minutes a. m., Thursday, March 23) the House adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following memorials, petitions, and other papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, 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 30 others; of J. Mathews and others, of Olive; of Swart Brothers and others, of Kingston; of C. M. Merritt and 20 others; of John S. Bray and 30 others, citizens of Kingston; of 50 citizens of West Shokan; of citizens of Ulster County; of J. M. Van Valkenburgh and others, of Lexington; of 25 citizens of Schohaire County; of 40 citizens of Lexington, Greene County; and of 50 citizens of Hurley, in the State of New York, for a reduction of the duty on sugar to a rate not exceeding 25 per cent. ad valorem—severally to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIN: The petition of citizens of Du Bois, Pennsylvania, praying Congress to take such action as will result in the speedy trial of American citizens now confined in British jails—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: 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 War Claims.

Also, the petition of Joseph H. Rainey, praying to be reimbursed for balance 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 Fredericksburgh, Virginia, for an appropriation to construct a road from said city to the national cemetery located near that place—to the same committee.

By Mr. GIBSON: Memorial of merchants, planters, mechanics, and laborers of Louisiana, in favor of the termination of the Hawaiian treaty—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALL: The petition of William Waterhouse and others, citizens of Barrington, New Hampshire, for the passage of a bill for the suppression of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HARDENBERGH: Memorial of manufacturers 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—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUBBELL: The petition of F. M. Wilcox and others, citizens of Rochester, Oakland County, Michigan, against the passage of the bill to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to sell certain overflowed and unsurveyed lands in Saint Clair County, Michigan—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

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. McConoughey, 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 restoration of officers 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. MULDROW: 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 Cebra Quackenbush and 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 Woodhull and 229 others, citizens of Marinette and vicinity, in the State of Wisconsin, praying Congress to adopt rigorous and efficient measures for the suppression of polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, the petition of citizens of Superior, Wisconsin, and certain railway officials, for an adequate appropriation to improve the Superior harbor—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TALBOTT: Papers relating to the claim of Leif & McKee—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VANCE: The affidavit of Robert L. Fox, in relation to the claim of James Washington Brank, late Second North Carolina Mounted Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WARD: The petition of the Vessel-Owners' and Captains' Association of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, relative to the improvement of the Delaware River—to the Committee on Commerce.

The petition of Joshua Johnson was reported by Mr. HENDERSON from the Committee on Military Affairs, under clause 2 of Rule XXII, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *March* 23, 1882.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. J. BULLOCK, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempre* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in compliance with law, a full and complete inventory of all property belonging to the United States in the buildings, rooms, offices, and grounds occupied by that Department and under its charge; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented the petition of the Independent Order of Good Templars of Illinois, representing 15,000 members, praying for an amendment of the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic beverages through the national domain; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GARLAND presented the petition of Joseph Cossart and others, citizens of Clark County, Arkansas, praying for an appropriation for the improvement of the Ouachita River in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FERRY presented a petition of citizens of Emmet and other counties in Michigan, interested in vessel property, praying for an appropriation for the survey and improvement of Cross Village Harbor, on the coast of Lake Michigan; 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 marine 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 Colorado, 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 ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BROWN. I present the petition of Hon. T. J. Simmons, judge of the superior courts of the Macon circuit, Georgia, and a number of other prominent citizens of Bibb County, Georgia, praying for an adequate appropriation for the improvement of 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. 893) 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. Farrow, United States Army, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon, which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Agriculture, to whom were referred the bill (S. No. 302) to establish a department of agriculture and commerce, and the bill (S. No. 958) to make the Agricultural Department an Executive Department, and to enlarge its duties and powers, reported a bill (S. No. 1562) 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 animal industry, to prevent the exportation of diseased cattle and the spread of infectious or contagious diseases among domestic animals, reported it without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1563) for the erection of a public building at Lynchburgh, Virginia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also 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 Finance.

Mr. FRYE 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 referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1566) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Cramer; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLUMB asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1567) to provide for the compensation of registers and receivers for selling Osage Indian lands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. VAN WYCK asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1568) to establish a board of review of pension and bounty land-warrant claims rejected under existing laws, and to prevent fraud or injustice in the granting of pensions or bounty land-warrants; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ROLLINS asked and, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 1569) making an appropriation for continuing the improvement of the channel of Cocheco River, in the State of New Hampshire; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency 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 Eliza H. Powers be taken from the files and referred to the Committee on Claims.